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Foreword.

In the introduction to his "Spirit of Modern Philosophy" Dr. Josiah Royce says, Haithfulness to History is the beginning of creative visdom. I love the latter and am determined to attain it; thererore I cultivate the former.

Every student who has gone forward in the paths of history will agree with his philosophy and will humbly try to follow the lead in his aime

The exploration and 2 iscovery which are given concrete form in this thesis have baken the form of en enjoyable journey. It has led us through highways and byways and we have met almost race to face some on the chief actors in one historical scene of the Drame of Iffe.

Throughout the length of the journey I have received the encouragement, advice and training of Dr. W. N. Sage. It was this that made the venture possible and that gave it any value that it has. He proved himself a guide and Iriend and whatever worth the thesis possesses is in large measure due to his skill and enthusiasm.
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The Chroniclers of Richard I, Coevr de Lion

## Preface

In undertaking such a work as this, it is very necessary to adopt a definite aim. It might have been possible to select some contentious statement and to support it by internal evidence. Such an attitude would have called for material that could not be found except by extensive travels in England and France. The adoption of another aim may provide an essay that will involve some such critical examination, but may serve the useful purpose of making available a knowledge of the chief sources of our modern books on the period, their authenticity and reliability, together with such information concerning the lives and characters of their writers as shall serve to bring to life again the dry bones of some of the saints and scholars of an age utterly different from ours, who lighted the torch of learning in the Dark Ages and flung it to us, joyfully we believe, but also with a challenge.

One can scarcely help feeling that such challenge should not go unanswered. We are inclined to smile at those who keep diaries, while at the same time we worship
at the shrine of Samuel Pepys, and read with avidity the memoirs of a Margot Asquith or a Marquis of Lansdowne, and consider that the letters of Queen Victoria are "extremely valuable for the light that they shed on the life of the times."

The chronicles under review are either in diary form or closely related to it. It is only through them that "we can hear horns blowing in the mist" or dimly descry through a thousand years'the giants that there were in those days.

The Chroniclers of the Age of Richard I Coeur de Lion.

Chapter I
Manuscripts and Sources.

In the introduction to his History of England David Hume speaks of references rather slightingly. This is not to say that he ignores sources or disbelieves in corroboration. But most of us on viewing a picture look for the "Quis Sculpsit" that reveals the authorship of the composition. In the same way we would here enquire--How do you know these things? How can we assure ourselves that the picture is true to fact or the life of the times? The answer is to be found in the Chronicles.

As the work progresses the life and character of the chronicler at any point will be discussed. Here we will simply mention where their manuscripts are.

The earliest English collector of original manuscripts of whom we have found mention is Matthew Parker, (1504-1575). Archbishop of Canterbury. He edited several of the earlier chronicles and left a priceless collection of MSS to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

The next in order of time is William Camaen, (15511623), antiquarian and historian. He attended Oxford

University and afterwards endowed the Camden Chair of Ancient History there. His manuscripts came to the Bodleian Library on the death of Cotton in 1631. The original library at oxford was founded by Thos. Cobham, Bishop of Worcester about 1320. In 1420 it received a munificent gift from Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, (13991447). He caused a room to be built, still known as Duke Humphrey's Room, and he presented his collection of books to 1t. This collection was dispersed at the Reformation, only a few of his books being now at oxford.

The Bodleian Iibrary was raised round the ruins of Duke Humphrey's by Sir Thomas Bodley, diplomatist and historian, a friend of Camden. On Bodley's death in 1613 the library received an endowment by his will. It was further enriched by the collection of Elias Ashmole in 1685.

Sir Robert Cotton (1571-1631), a pupil of Camden, later at Cambridge, gathered together a great collection of manuscripts, dispersed by the dissolution of the monasteries under Henry VIII. He travelled widely in England and on the Continent, seeking out MSS. He received Arthur Agarde's papers in 1614 and Camdents in 1623. These were added to by his son. The fourth
baronet presented them to the nation in 1700 , and they are now in the British Museum.

Lambeth Library was founded in 1610 by Archbishop Bancroft. It is housed in Lambeth Palace and has been augmented by successive primates. It is largely ecclesiastical manuscripts, though not exclusively so.

Other libraries or collections which possess original manuscripts made use of in compiling the books examined are: The Douce Collection, now in the Bodleian Iibrary; The Stowe House Collection, now in the British Museum; the Library of Trinity College, Dublin University; the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; Public Libraries of Paris and Rouen, and the Vatican Iibrary, Rome. The first step towards making any of this material available to the public was taken in 1838 with the founding of the Camden Society. Its object was to render accessible valuable but little known materials for the civil, ecclesiastical or Iiterary history of the United Kingdom.

The next step was in the form of a suggestion made by the then Master of the Rolls to the Imperial Treasury on the 26th of January 1857. His idea was to collect valuable materials relating to British History from the time of the Romans to the reign of Henry VIII. The work was to be
treated as an Editio Princeps, the best manuscripts being collated and the text so obtained being turned from mediaeval handwriting to modern print. Thus we would have such a book as would have been produced if the author had arranged or been able to arrange for the publication of his own manuscript.

The idea was accepted and the plan agreed to, and in 1858 the first volume appeared. The work was continued during subsequent years and has expanded into the publication of the Year Books.

It is our intention to treat of the chronicles of various men who deal with the times of Richard the First. Their names are here given with the sources of text used:Roger of Wendover: Douce Collection; Cotton Collection and the Bodleian Library.

William of Newburgh: Lambeth Collection; Stowe Collection; Trinity College, Dublin Iibrary.

Richard of Devizes: Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; Cotton Collection.

Robert of Torini: Bodleian MSS.Oxford; Arundel MSS., Cotton and Harleian Collections. Brit. Mus.; Rouen, Bibliotheque Publique; Bayeux Chapter Library; Avranches, Cathedral Library; Paris, Bibliothéque Publique; Rome, Vatican Iibrary.

Jocelyn de Brakelond: Harleian MSS., Bribo Mus. John Capgrave: Cambridge, Public Iibrary; Corpus Chrtsti College.

Roger of Hoveden: Royal Collection (Geo. II) Arundel HS. Brit. Mus.; St. Johns College, oxfond; Harleian MS.

Ralph de Diceto: Lambeth MS., Ralph?s own copy; Corpus Christi, a beautiful presentation copy from Diceto to Archbishop Hubert walter; Cotton and Royel Collections, Brit. Mus.; Trinity College, Dublin.

## Chapter II

## Ralph de Diceto

The three writers whom we have chosen for our chies study of the chroniclers of the Anjevin Age present some reatures in common and some in contrast. Roger Hoveden is the man of worlaly affeirs. While he tales a great interest in the Church it is to a great extent insofar as events in connection with it have a political or social significance. Roger Wendover is a monk. He follows political events it is true, but largely as a spectator. His mind is always ocoupied with thoughts of religion and he sees the Divine Hand guiding events at every moment. Ralph de Diceto, (and we must not omit that de in this case), stands midmay between these two. Jike the present holder of his office-he was Dean of St. Paul's-he is a churchman first of all, but one who takes a keen interest and an active part in political affaim. This brings out the fact that he also stands midway between the other two in this respect, that Wendover was of the regular clergy, de Diceto was secular and Hoveden was a cleric but, at least till after retirement from active life, nota clergyman.

Ralph must have been a man of strong personality, a fact thet is narked in several ways in his chronicle. He is elusive, and though we may know a little more of him
after reading his book we cannot help feeling that there is very much more to know if only the materials could be found. We can illustrate this by a reference ${ }^{l}$ to his first sentence. He begins with a preface which opens thus:

In opusculo sequenti trium temporum, scilicet ante legem, sub lege, sub gratia, poteris aliquantulam habere notitiam.

Now Ralph lays great plans for a magnum opus, which will tell all that there is to know about the times whether "before the law, under the law or under grace", and not merely will the countries be treated historically but also geographically. In the light of this one would like to Ieam in what frame of mind Ralph wrote the two diminutives, opusculo and aliquantulam. Were they written in a spirit of real humility or did he consider his work good? He certainly was ambitious in planning his work, and intended to make it a nodel book. Yet in his own professional career he saw, without a trace of bitterness, other men overtake and pass him in rank. And this in spite of the fact that he was Well connected, and might fairly expect advancement. We conclude that he was an intelligent and well inforned man, of broad culture and that he added to this a very fine character.

1. Dic. I. 3.

Like many of the chroniclers his origin is obscure. He is always very careful to call himself by his full name and other writers also call him Ralph de Diceto. There are two possible reasons why a person should do so, first, to claim a share of the glory attaching to an honourable name, and secondly, to distinguish himself from some other person of the same Christian name with whom he might be confused. In this case no trace has been found of any other Diceto, and for the latter, the only contemporary with whom he could be confounded was Ralph of Langford, his own predecessor in the office of dean. But he already used the style when he was still archdeacon. Diss in Norfolk appears to be the only place in England which approaches his name, but there is nothing to connect Ralph with it, and the living is otherwise accounted for beyond question. There appears to be more evidence in favour of a place in France, especially one named Dissé-sous-de-Iude in Anjou.

His nationality is as doubtful as his name. He shows no bias in his writings by which we can decide it. Stubbs appears to think ${ }^{I}$ that he should show some evidence of national feeling. This should not surprise us. We must $a 11$ have noticed how weak were ties of nationality at this period. In England there is little sigh of consciousness

1. Op. Cit. I Intro. P. XVIII.
of nationality before 1260 and even in Chaucer it is very weak, while in France it was still later in developing. On the other hand we have the example of Walter of Constance, Archbishop of Rouen, who became chief justiciar on the fall of Iongchamp in 1199. Walter betrays no pro French nor un Hnglish traits, and the historic case of Simon de Montfort may be cited as that of a Frenchman who became "more English than the English themselves". We mi.cht also remark that the Normans and Anjevins have revealed as one of the ir Ieading characteristics great powers of adaptability and assimilation. The suggestion that he was an Anjevin appears to us to be the best one.

The date of his birth is equally uncertain, the most likely year is between 1120 and 1130. This makes him over eighty at the time of his death, but we know that he was made archdeacon of London in 1152. This was the post that was often given to a very near kinsman. Hence it has been inferred that he was connected with the family of Belmeis, Richard of Belmeis was the bishop of Iondon who appointed him. The family was all powerful in the chapter of St . Paul's for more than half a century. They were of Norman extraction and had settled in Shropshire. Bishop Richard I did much for St. Paul's, repairing the cathedral, building the schools and enclosing the churchyard. He placed

1. 0p. Cito. I Intro. XX。
several relations in prominent positions, so that by 1120 the family was well entrenched. After the storm of Stephen's reign we find Richard II of Belmeis bishop of Iondon in 1152, and one of his first acts was to appoint Ralph de Diceto archdeacon of Middlesex. Nepotism was extremely strong at the time and the heredtary instinct was strong in st. Paul's. Thus it is highly probable that Ralph was a nephew of Bishop Richard II Belmeis. Support is lent to the supposition by Ralph's references to the elevation of the sons of priests to high office in the Church. The wording of this passage is striking:

Richard, archdeacon of Coventry, whose father was Robert, bishop of Chester, was consecrated in 1161 bishop of the same see by archbishop Theobald. Therefore the sons of priests are not to be excluded from the ranks of priests, or from the care of parishes, or from cathedral churches, or even from the papacy itself, if they, have been of exemplary life.

Ralph hed studied at a university, evidently Paris, and was already 'magister' at the time of his appointment to the archdeaconry. Apparently he returned to Paris, possibly to complete his legal education, necessary for the post. It was at Paris that he formed his life-long friendship with Arnulf of Lisieux, a man who must have been very useful to him later by supplying him with many items of current news.
I. Ibid. I. 305 .

It was also possible that this residence abroad gave him a wider outlook on political affairs.

Two livings presented to him after his return helped him through his sinancial worries, much needed help, for Bishop Richard Belmeis had many troubles of his own and was unable to help him much. To complete the latteris misfortunes he sureered a paralytic stroke in 1161 so that he was unable to be present at the consecration of the Bishop of Reteter. He died a year later and was succeeded by Gilbert Foliot, another member of the family connection.

This gave Ralph an opportunity to secure the future favour of Bishop poliot. The latter was already bishop of Hereford, and it was unusual to translate a bishop except to Tonk or Canterbury. Pope Alerander III was at Paris at the time, 1163 , and Diceto was armed wi th Ietters from the Ling, Becket and the canons, and commissioned to obtain the popeis consent. In the popeis reply ${ }^{2}$ granting the request we find that it was Ralph that negotiated the business. Alezander seys:

Owing to the letters of oun dearest son in Christ our illustrious son Henry, king of the Tnglish, and our venerable brother Thoms, archbishop of Canterbury, and from the arguments of our excellent son Ralph, archdeacon of your church, we accept what the said king wishes most
I. Dic. I. 304.
2. Ibid. I. 309.
strongly and seeks that our venerable brother, the bishop of Hereford, should be translated to yom church in order that he should give this same church his supervision and pastoral care.

The letter is addressed to the Chapter of Iond on.
Foliot helped him in every way possible and introduced him to Henry II. He was then to be found from time to time about the court, but seems never to have obtained any official post. Already there was friction between Poliot and Beoket, and the archbishop had gained the favour of the king for his party. This may account for Ralphts failuse to find a place.

One may well ask why so remarkable a man was not made bishop. The see of London was vacant ${ }^{\text {l }}$ by the death of his patron and relative Gilbert Foliot from 1186 to 1189 . The families of Foliot and Belmeis were still represented in influential quarters, but they were no longer as powerful as in 1170. The choice feli ${ }^{2}$ on Richard Fitz Neal, dean of Iincoln, son of Nigel, bishop of Eiy, the treasurer of Henty II and well-known author of the Dialogues de Scaccario. He had been prominent in Henry's reign, was a personage of consequence at court and was as well connected by birth as the Poliots or the Belmeis family.

1. Dic. ii. 69, 70.
2. Ibic. 1i. 75 .

Diceto was a very prominent person as dean and was present officially, as we shall see, at the coronation of Richard. He practically fulfilled the functions of bishop during the vacancy and in this way received man prominent visitors; and both before and after this period as dean he came in contact with many men prominent in their own nations! affairs and also internationally. Twice a year the canons of st. Paul's entertained sumptuously the archbishops, justiciars, greater barons, judges, sherifes and any other prominent persons who happened to be visiting England at the tine. King Richard I on his return in 1194 was received ${ }^{1}$ with solemn procession on Harch 23 rd. Archbishop Walter of Coutances visited the cathedral ${ }^{2}$, I9th of May in the same year. He preached the sermon and was afterwards enterta ined at a feast in the bishop's palace. In 1201 John of Salerno was received ${ }^{3}$, and it is recorded that Diceto was present.

It was fron such sources that he obtained materials for his geographical sketches of various parts of France, of Steily, Cyprus and Palestine. For historical facts he drew on Gilbert Foliot and Richard of Ilchester, two of Henry IIs

1. Ibia. ii. 114 .
2. Ibid. ii. 115 .
3. Ibid. ii. 173.
most trusted servants. From these two he got most of his facts concernine Fenry. Walter of Coutances was a regular correspondent and gave much information regarding events in France, while he was at Rouen and later, regarding Encland while he was justiciar. All these men lenew that he was writing a history. Fitz Neal supplied him with news concerning several bishopries, and of affairs in the Holy Land In $1190^{3}$. The following year he sent hirn an account of Longchamp's quarrel ${ }^{4}$ with John and the barons, followed by the "battle of Hownslow" and the flight to London. Walter wrote him a letter containing an account of a secret agreement between Philip of Trance and Richard in $119 I^{5}$. The chief article in this is a clause to grant the archbishop of Rouen the power to act alone in excomonications in the Iands of either king. Coutances also wrote to him privately ${ }^{6}$ amouncing Richard's release in 1194.

Longchamp was one of his closest friends and meintained a steady intercourse, especially during Richardts absence in

1. Ibid. i. Pref. IXXV.
2. Ibid. ii. 77.
3. Ibid. ii. 88.
4. Ibid. ii. 98.
5. Ibia. ii. 135 to 137 .
6. Dic. ii. 112 .

Palestine. From him Diceto learned most of his facts concerning current history. He admired the justiciar for his brilliance and sent a letter, of which he gives a copy, ${ }^{\text {I }}$ congretuleting Longchamp on his elevation to the legate's post and the justiciarship, February, I190.

We are given an account of Longchampis fall ${ }^{2}$ which Sollows in the main Hoveden's account. He mentions the attempt to escape disguised as a woman but touches on it very sympathetically and omits the undignified details. one feels that he is sorry for an old friend, and not that he is trying to forget an unpopular acquaintance. One of Longchamp's last communications ${ }^{3}$ enclosed an epistle from the 01 d Men of the Mounta in exonerating Richard in connection with the death of Conrad, Marquis of Monterret. This 4 will be dealtwith later. He preserved everything that he received in the cathedral library or scriptorium, and at his death left everything to the church which he had served so long and enthusiastically. His gift included various types of service books, chapter rules, seculer books and his own letters and manuscripts together with a few vestments, relics and ornaments. He was the true founder of the scriptorium of st. Paulis.

1. Ibid. ii. 177 et seq.
2. Ibid. ii. 100-101.
3. Ibid. ii. $127 . \quad$. See Appendix.

Iittle more is known of his death than of his birth. In 1198 Robert Fitz Neal died and the king summoned the chapter to France. Diceto was excused because of his age, ${ }^{2}$ but did not allow himself to be overlooked ${ }^{3}$, and asked for permission to consecrate the bishop-elect. This was granted and he performed the office. He served as one of the judges in an appeal to Rome of Giraldus Cambrensis in 1201 and was still acting in $1202^{4}$, but by 1204 had been replaced. Stubbs draws the conclusion that he died in 1202 or 1203.

He opens with e preface in which he says thet he will place signs in the margin, (which he does), to indicate the topic. Thus PS means persecution of the church; SC refers to schisms; C0, meetings of the council; a castle, concerning the crowning of kings; a Greek cross refers to privileges of the Church of Canterbury; a crozier, concerning the eleetion of archbishops of Canterbury; a sword refers to dukes of Normandy; a spear, to the counts of Anjou; the sign $D C$ to controversies between kings and priests; a castle and sword concerns the kings of England and dukes of IVormandy; castle, sword and spear refer to kings of Englend, dukes of Normandy and counts of Anjou; a castle with two mailed

1. Ibid. ii. 163
2. Ibid. 1i. 164,165 .
3. Ibid. ii. I66.
4. Stubbs. Introd. to R.S. P. 86。
hands grasping the portcullis refers to the dissensions between Henry II and his three sons. These are used much more ereely before 1174 than after.

A third part of the work is called the Opuscula. This is largely an abstract from the Ymagines, consisting of the more important matters dealt with in the ma in work. In general they show that he had some appreciation of the importance of events around him. Sometimes he includes incidents in which either he or sone friend took part and in one or two cases it would seem that he considered the passage specially well written.

Bishop Stubbs criticizesl Diceto for carelessness about dates, but we must bear in mind that Diceto was possibly quoting from a different authority or he may have found confusion of dates, as we ourselves have, and had not sufficient references to enable him bo reach a true conolusion. Again, it may sometimes be due to a different method of rectroning. One instance of this is the consecration of Robert of Melun which Ralph places in 1164 but which Stubbs places in 1163. The actual date, December 23, shows that there is a strong probability that Diceto is reckoning from some date prior to January lst. We have placed a note on this in the appendix. Stubbs counted seventeen dates between 1164 and 1184 and found two wrong, of which one is

1. Dic. ii. Preface, pp. XXXIII to XIii.
the instance just quoted. It is true that he brashes dates aside in order to proceed with his chronicle, but this can scarcely be called gross carelessness or utter disregard.

The first volume falls into two main parts. The first he calls Abbreviationes Chronicorum and is, as its nane indicates, a resume of other chronicles, starting with Cassiodorus and a treatment of the ages of the vorid and the succession of the patriarchs. The Jews and Greers are treated in short space, anả very considerable attention is paid to the history of Rome. Then a short account on mediaeval Furope is given followed by a foller account of the Saxons and their kingdoms. This section is carried to the year 1147.

The second section he names Ymagines Historiarum which he claims as his own. This term may, for literary qualities be compared with Wendover's Flores. Host of the writers are content to call their volumes chronicles or acts. These two only give some more imaginative name. Roger tells us why he chose his name; we are left to think out Ralph's for ourselves. The word imagines means imitations, copies, inages or pictures. These suggest either that he meant to follov in the footsteps of former witers, or that he intended to give a sort of layils of the kingt. It may also mean reflections, but he is rarely philosophical and only once does he moralize. It may also mean reminders,
and this, almost the equivalent of the modern mernoirs, seems to be the most lilely. There is one other application of the word, namely the use made in entomology. Here it means the perfect insect after ithas passed through the embryonic and preparative stages. This is not a classical use of the temm and further has much in common with Ralphis own conception of his role. He rounded out and perrected fomer recoras.

He admits that the Abbreviationes are not his own wonk. but he claims to be an original writer from 1147, and yet aeknowledges Robert de Monte as his authority ${ }^{2}$ sor events in 1171. He was made archdeacon in 1155 and appears to have set about collecting materials at once, but not to heve compiled them in their present form before 1180 for he is almays referred to as dean.

From the time of the election of Thomas Becket in 1164 he was eviaently much more closely in tonch with affairs. As there was no change in his status between 1155 and 1180 we must assign sone other reason. Supposing him to have been bon a bout 1130 he was twenty five when appointed archdeacon. He wasthen away from st. Paulis at

1. Dic. 1. 23.
2. Ibid. i. 346.

Ieast intemittently for a peri od of from Live to seven years, pursuing his legal studies at Paris. At the age of thifty two he was back in London, more mature, a magister and having formed, as we know, several friendships at the uni-. versity. He was sent on the mission to the pope already referfed to, in connection with the translation of Gilbert Follot to st. Paul's. Having been successful in this he then had as his bishop a relative who owed his position in no small measure to Ralph, and who would give him all the help possible in gathering materials for his book. From 1162 to 1172 his chronicle is largely occupied with the becket struggle. This is a fairly unbiassed account as we shall see, but it is also dispassionate to such a degree that it suggests a much later writing dow. It lacks the detail and the fire of Wendover's account, although Ralph must have heard everything at the time. The account of Bishop Foliot's journey ${ }^{\text {I }}$ into Italy in 1170 was supplied by his letters to Diceto which mould be in the Latter's possession ten years later. Under the events of 1173 we find ${ }^{2}$ a long list of the punishments that have come upon rebellious sons, a declamation that would have been perfectiy natural, If we suppose it to have been written

1. Die. i. 335.
2. Ibid. i. 355 .
about seven to ten years later. Then the fact of his appointment as dean in 1180 supports the hypothesis, for, as we have said, he is always referred to as the dean. One other circunstance must be mentioned which gave st. Paulis a great advantage in compiling histories. This was the situation of the cathedral. It was secular while Canterbury and Westminster were monastic. It was in the trade and social capital of the kingdom and close to the Continent; and al though the royal residence was Windsor, St. Paul's is very near to the Tower of Iondon which was frequently occupied by the sovereign. It is notable the $t$ when Longchamp went to London from Reading he took up residence in the rover, as being justiciar and thereby the King's representative, and itwas at st. Paul's that he chose to deliver his speech in defence of his conduct. Thus St. Paul's was extremely well placed. To this may be added that the canons had to entertain the great and the neargreat of Court ano City at stated times.

Ralph undoubtedly started his book in its final form about 1180 but parts cannot be wholly contemporary writing, for he informs us under 1182 that Henry the Lion, Duke of Saxony was driven into exile in Normandy where he lived in abundant profusion "for more than three years". Obviously

1. Ibid. 1i. 13.

$$
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this was not written till at least 1185.
He was a man of wide reading and his experience tncluded both early and late writers. He quotes Caesar, Vergil. Suetonius, Lucan and Martial among others, Desides Gregory the Great, Sidonius Apollinaris, Fulbert of Chartres with many of the English chroniclers, those deserving mention being Geoffrey of Monnouth, William of Malmesbury, Florence of Worcester and Ailred of Rievaulx. We notice one feature of these quotations. Almost all occur prior to 1180 so that it is quite possible that he found the quotations in those histories which he was abridging. The earliest original quotation that we have discovered is found in an undated letter ${ }^{1}$ from Ralph himself to William Longchamp, already bishop of Ely, giving some good advice and quoting from Fulbert of Chartres, This he places in the Opuscula which is not a chronological history. This consists largely of lists of kings, emperors, bishops and popes with an abridgment of Geoffrey of Monmouth's chronicle. He makes no comnent on this last, but the fact that he places it in the appendix would go to show that he did not regard it highly. Other matters included are a sumary of French history and a 1 Lst of synods from Nicaea to that of Rome in 1179.

We found sefferal passages whose meaning was obscure

1. Dic. ii. 177 . Hence the letter cannot be earlier than 1189.
and whose justipication for inclusion was not plain Thus under the year 1036 we note a collection of stories having reference to the Emperor Henry III. Among these is one conceming an ugly priest" who is reported as chanting: "It is He that hath made us and not we ourselves". That this is meant as a jest would appear from the account of the journey ${ }^{2}$ of John of oxford to sicily in 1176 , which is in an amusing vein.

Diceto appears to have recognized his limitations as a stylist. At times he uses a pretentious manner, on which occasions he often becomes involved and obscure. He seems to heve realized this and hence restricted hinself, as a rule, to a matter-of-fact unadorned style. The result is that he is rarely impiessive or dramatic. We get none of Wendovers atmosphere in Diceto's account of the death of Becket, and the glamour of romance that Hoveden throws over the coronation of Richard is missing from Diceto's 3 factual resume. Yet Diceto as dean of London carried the sacred oil and chrism to the archbishop at this ceremony, as he hinself tells us, through the vacancy of the bi shopric. His story ${ }^{4}$ of the death of Henry II lacks the grandeur and pathos of
I. Ibid. i. 178.
2. Ibid. 1. 416.
3. Ibid. ii. 68, 69.
4. Ibid. $11.63,64$.

Hoveden. In his doscitption of Angerst, especielly of the palace and the river he is almost picturesque but it is someWhat spoiled by difficult phraseology and he appears to have smiled at himself for soaring, for he follows this immediately by a description of Aquitaine that he intends to be facetious.

We are given an account ${ }^{2}$ of the encounter of Richardis fleet with the great merchant ship sent by Saphadin, brother of Saladin, to the help of the besieged Saracens in Acre. It is interesting to note the composition of the ineet. Richard hed "thirteen great ships which are called busses" (these apparently pesembled the Scottish herring busses), a hundred other transports and fifty trireme galleys. The Saracen almost sifiped past,

But the ships betng drawn up in the hiok of time and having all things necessary for a naval fight the ships came together anoumd the boct and very Ifece thmuts vere made on all sides when, the wind failing, the fleet stood motionless. So a centain rower, led by the example of that little bird knom as the diver, swimming under the waten reached the ship and pierced it with an allger. Perhaps he had heard how that Elearer in the time of the Inacabees placed himself under the el ephant around which the whole weight of the battle Tas surging from all sides, and piercing him through the stomach killed him. He was overwhelmed but it was in bearing through the object of the Jews. But the rower, having christ in his heart, returaing to the gelley unharmed, resumed his seat.

1. Ibid. I. 294, 295。
2. Dic. $11.93,94$.

We Leam hov the water ascended to each deck in tum and the men, who previously had been so confident of victory, abandoned all hope and pitched themselves headlong overboend. Richard ordered thinteen hundred of them to be drowned and two hundred to be saved. This tool place on the 6th of June, I191. Then he resuned his prosperous course towards the port he was making for. Then we are told: ${ }^{2}$

Iituorum itaque stridor, ductilium clangor tubarum, horibilis cornicinum strepitus litore repleverunt -a sentence that is almost worthy of Vergil in its sonority.

There is another vivid picture, the arrest of Geoffrey of Yonk on September 18th, 1191, at the church of $S t$. hartin's at Dover on his return from consecration at Tonrs ${ }^{2}$.

Quod facere recusans, stolam gerens in collo, bajulans erucem in manibus, ab altaris comu, per pedes, per crura per brachia, colliso capite super pevimentum violenter extrahitur per viam Iutosam, per immunda loca, cum clericis suis et viris religiosis, qui de paitibus multis ad ipsum videndum confluxerant, perductus est in castellum XIII Kalendas octobris ubi per octo dies est retrusus in carcerem.

Although he breaks out in this grandiloquent style on a Iew occasions he also, as has been pointed out, displays a sense of humour. One other example of this must suffice;

1. Ibid. Ii. 94 。
2. Ibid. Ii. 97.

It is a pun worthy of Pistol or Talstafe. In Dicetois acoount of the quanrel with Becket, given in this chapter, mention is made of the two delegates sent to the pope by Thomas in 1169, namely Gratian and Vivian ${ }^{1}$. Diceto sums up the stalemate of the move with the words: ${ }^{2}$ Gnatian found no grace with the king, nor was Vivian vivid in the memory of the archbishop.

He also, like Wendover, levels strong criticism at the cupidity of the Roman clergy. When Philip, Archbishop of Cologne, and Philip, Count of Planders, visited London in 1184, the city was decorated and the guests were received With great honour. There was a solemn procession to St. Paul's and another to Westminster Aboey, then they were entertained right royally for five days at the kingis palace. Then Ralpb concludes: ${ }^{3}$

But whe ther the archbishop went away loaded with meny gifts, it is superfluous to enquire.
Agein he reports ${ }^{4}$ that by command of the pope a fortieth of all movables and imnovables was le vied throughout the whole of England in 1200,

1. Dic. i. 332.
2. Tbid. i. 335 .
3. Ibia. 11. 3 I。
4. Ibid. ii. 169.
"for the help, as it was said, of the land of Jerusalem, to be carried thither by the hand of the aforesaid Philip, notary of the Pope, but unless by chance the Romans renounce their netural and ingrained cupidity it is never likely to come there undiminished."

Ralphis notice of the supernatural is almost entirely confined to a fev instances of omens. He twice remarks on the happy auspices under which marriages took place and on both of these occasions we think it is more as an excuse for a pun than to tell the omens. He says that it was a felicitous omen that William Mandeville was married on the feast of St. Felix. And again he reports ${ }^{2}$ that Philip of France married Margarite of Hainault at Trunc which was surely a sigh thet the royal stem (tronc) would be fruthful.

One other case occurs. He reports ${ }^{3}$ that on December 26, 1194, the duke of Austria was thrown from his horse and his foot was so macerated by treading that it had to be amputated. He adds that this was surely a judgment for his having incarcerated Richard and, refusing to allow him to walk about, had bound his feet in chains.

Two instances of natural phenomenare recorded. Under

1. Ibid. ii. 3.
2. Ibic. ii. 5.
3. Ibid. i1. 124.
the date 10644 we read:
In the same year a comet was seen, not only in Figland but, as was reported, throughout the whole world, from the 24 th of April for no fever than seven days it shone with splendour.
The other refers ${ }^{2}$ to the aurora borealis and rus:
4. On the 4th of November about the midde of the night for the space of one hour or more the whole appearance of the heavens in the northem part appeared to be surfused with a blood-red stain.

He records three cases of miraculous events. We learn that on one occasion a miraculous light shone round the tomb of St. Thomas à Becket, though no marvellous effects are reported. The only instance where Ralph shows a consequent action occurs in an account of a service at Mentz in 1036 , Where the emperor was present at the Peast or Pentecost. The Abbot of Fulda was singing the mass. Fe sang the last verse: Holy Spirit make this day glorious". Then the choir was silent and from the air there fell a voice, far

1. Dic. 2. 194.
2. Op. cit. i. 396.
3. Op. cit. i. 346 .
4. Ibid. 1. 178.
and wide, which chanted: "I will make this day warlike". A quarrel subsequently broke out between the servante of the emperor and those of the abbot which resulted in a fev broken heads.

Among the gifts which Ralph left to St. Paul's were several relics. These included bones, a knife said to heve belonged to Our Lord, a lock of hair of Mary Fagdalene and a number of vestments that had been wom by various famons holy men. He appears to have considered these faimy precious because they might possess occult powers, but we notice that there is no such list of marvellous cures such as Wendover would have given. Apparentiy Ralph's sense of humour and comon sense were too strong for a simple faith in the supernatural.

He wrote with a strong feeling of attachnent to the House of Anjou, he shows considerable insight into political causes. He writes in a business-like way. His perspective is not always accurate, sometimes he is garrulous, sometimes he becones magniloquent, but he is at his beat when he tells a plain tale. His historical value is vexy high, for he shows a side of the characters of the reigns of Hemry II and Richard that would otherwise be unmown. He quickly le apt to importance. Five copies of the Ymasines were soon in existence. He was quoted as an authority in the I3th Century. Extracts from his writings were embodied in several
chroniclers notably Roger Wendover, Hatthew Paris and Thomas Walshingham. The Tudor writers, like Parker and Camden and still later Selden, preserved his authority.

That he saw the connection between Henry!s reforms and the opposition to them is shown in this passage: ${ }^{1}$
"These men, whom the Kins had condemned to forfeiture for just and proved causes, joined the party of his son, not because they considered his cause as more just but because the father, with a viev to increasing the royal dignity, was trampling on the necks of the proud, was assaulting the suspected castles, or bringing them under his own power; because he ordered nay compelled the persons who were occupying properties belonging to the ezchequer to be content with their own inheritance, because he condemned traitors to exile, punished. robbers with death, struck thieves with terror by the gallows and punished those who oppressed the poor by the loss of their own money."

He also saw the constitutional importance of the Council of Clerkenwel1 ${ }^{2}$, March 18th, 1185. Femy called. together the archbishops, bi shops, earls and barons to ask their advice on the propriety of his proceeding on a crusade to which he was vowed. Diceto shows that Henry was not trying to get out of it, but was concerned for the state of England. They reminded him of his coronation oatm; Diceto repeats the oath clause by clause. They replied that it was better to govern England in moderation, for
I. Dic. 1. 371.
2. Ibid. ii. 33,34 .
the peace and safety of all than to rush off to Jerusalem and perhaps be killed by the baxbarians. He decided to follow their advice and he remained. Ralph does not miss the constitutional importance of Henry's asking advice and acting on it.

One of the great stories in Diceto is his account of the quarrel between Henry II and Becket. The first mention ${ }^{\text {l }}$ we find of Thomas is when in 1154 as archdeacon of Canterbury he is made Henry's chancellor.

TThomas, archdeacon of Canterbury, overseer of Beverley, enrolled as canon in various churches throughout Engl and was created chancellor of the king."
The next mention concerns ${ }^{2}$ his election to the primacy, followed immediately by his resignation ${ }^{3}$ as chane ellon. The date given by Ralph is 1162, but Robert de lionte gives 1161. Unfortunately Diceto does not give the month, so that we cannot examine this difference of ate 4

The general body of the clergy of the whole province of Canterbury being called together at Iond on, in the presence of Henry the son of the king and of the king's justiciars, Thomas, archdeacon of Canterbury and chancellor of the king, no one whatever dissenting, was soleminy elected to the archbishopric.
I. Dic. I. 300 .
2. Dic. I. 306 .
3. Ibid. I. 307.
4. See Appendix re reckoning of ates by chroniclers.

The pope epproved and sent the pall to Thomas, who then resigned the chencellorship.

But after he hed put on the vestments conferred on the highest priests set apart for (the service of) God he thus changed his cloak that he might change (the ocoupation of) his mind. Tor not agreeing with being occupied with the affairs of the Curia, in order that hemight be freed from the Curia, and being released from its di scussions. overseeing the affairs of his church, he sent a messenger to the King in Normandy renouncing the chancellorship and resigning his seal.

We have thought it wowth while to quote these in full to show the unbiassed, indeed friendly attitude of Diceto towards Becket. The king wished to retain Thomas as chancellon, feeling that, with the pastoral staff in his right head and the seal of the Cunia in his left Becket could control both clergy and laity in the interests of the king, as hed happened in similar circumstances on the Continent.

Thomas was not long in showing that he had indeed "changed his mind when he changed his coat", for in July of the same year he summoned ${ }^{2}$ Thomas, Barl of Hertford to do homage to Canterbury for the castle of Tunbridge, saying that this was not held of the king; Hertford refused seying he undoubtedly held of the King. Immediately after this Becket appointed ${ }^{3}$ a certain Laurentius to the vacant Iiving of
I. Ib1d. I. 308.
2. Ibid. I. 311.
3. Ibid. I. 311.

Eynesford over the protest of the lord of the manox, William, a tenant-in-chief, who cleimed the patronage. William drove Taurentius out and Becket excommunicated William.

Henry was furious and declared that no one whatsoever Was to be excommuncated by anyone, if he held in chies of the king, if the king had not been consulted and his consent obteined.

It is worth note that Ralph simply records the consecration of John, treasurer of York, as bishop of Poictiens, and does not make any remark that would shom that he saw this as a deli berate separation of Becket from one of his strongest supporters.

The king was now determined to bend the church to his W111, and called 3 a council at Clarend on for January 25, 1164, at which the archbishops and bishops were to subscribe their assent to the ancient customs of the kingdom. We are told thet the pope released Thomas from the oath which he hed taken but are not told when this took place.

Henry's policy of punishing criminous clerks, Philip de Broe's exile and Thomasis quareel with John Marshall, are treated at very short Iength and Ralph passes on to Becketis

1. Dice I. 312.
2. Ibid. I. 311 .
3. Ibid. I。 312 。
trial at Morthampton on Dotober Izth, Roser, archbighop of Tork, was celled by personal writ as was his right, but apparently Thomes was not so called. He was called to answer a charge of contempt. This evidently consisted in his failure to appear in the king's court in the appeal of John Marshal. Thomas hed pleaded illness but was aisbelieved by Henry. Strange turn of fate that Henry should pass the same way at his own fatal illness. When the council was assembled many charges were leid. He was called to accont for the honours of Bya and Berkhamptead since his elevation. He vas fined $\$ 500$ in the matter of Jonn Marshall, and resisted the demands and claims of the ring in the other matters, saying that he had spent much on the properties and his resignation being accepted, he was free from all responsibility, ant that he would never consent to the mienching away of any of the powers on privileges of the charch. He then Left the council, "much affected by his whonss, lashed with insults and deprived of the advice of his bishops but holding his cross aloft in his hand as he left the chamber". That night he left the town secretly, and, hiding by day from the sight of men and travelling by night he armived in a Iev days at Sandmich and in a very small and freil boat he crossed to Planders, whence he found hisway to the pope at, Sens and won his support. The king's envojs had already arpived and had eddressed the pope who was non-committal.

Both these speeches are given in full consisting of arguments, the king being conciliatory, he did not wish to interfere in the church courts but wished sufficient verbal
submission from Thomas to save his royel dignity; the archbishop being argumentative taking his stand on Render to Caesar the things that are Caesaris", and accusing the king of wicked and crafty machinations, of insults and persecution.

Thomas went to Vezelai where he excommunicated several of his enemies, but these were later absolved through Godirey, bishop of st. Asaph's at the command of two of the 2 candinals. Becket then wrote to the king, agein setting out his case by reasoned axgument and appealing to the king to renember his own coronation ceremony, with its significance, and his charter to the church. , The bishops wrote Degsing Thomas to submit to the king and Becket replied with a letter to the bishop of Iond on ${ }^{4}$, still defiant. Next he wrote to his sureragans ${ }^{5}$, reviewing a II the circunstances, dwelling on Henry's seizure of the goods and lands of the
I. Dic. I. 315.
2. Ibid. I. 320.
3. Ibid. I. 322.
4. Ibid. I. 324 。
5. Ibid. I. 326 to 328.
cathedral, and urging them not to abandon action or even to delay. He evidently wished them to appeal again to the pope. Early in 1169 the pope wro te to the king urging him to become reconciled to the archbishop. He says that he has ignored too long the insults offered and seizures of possessions. He hints that he has restrained Thomas but will do so no longer.

It is very noticeable that so far Diceto has been quite unbiassed. If anything, he has been sympathetic to the primate. In the next paragraph he reports that Bishop Gilbert of London called together the clergy and people in St. Paul's for the purpose of turning aside the intentions of the archbishop (we believe "forestalling" is meant), and solemnly appealed to Rome. Thomas replied by excommunicating Gilbert. Dicetots reference to the spirit in which Bishop Foliot accepted the sentence is certainly sympathetic to him。

The pope aga in wrote unging Henry to lay aside anger and hatred am to be reconciled to Thomas, and sent two delegates to negotiate. But Vivian, one of these, took sides with the king, and Gratiam, the other, with the primate, and Archbishop William of Sens stopped the conSerence.
I. Ibid. I. 333.

The next move was a conference at Paxis between the kings of France and England, where the archbishop was gesent but avoided Henry. Thomas proposed that he should be restored and nothing was to be seid about the claims of the king. The king said that since he had not driven the archbishop out it was impossible to cancel dispositions that he had made of some temporalities. He refused to give Thomes the kiss of peace, and the negotiations fell through. In the latter part of the account Diceto most certainly supports the king.

Meanwile the pope had received Bishop Gilbert's appeal and sent him a letter which he received en route to Rome, granting him absolution and freedom from his excomunication. Ho explanation is given of this step, and it does not help that the next report records the coming together of Roger of York, Hugh of Durham and the suffragans of Canterbury at the canl of the ring, only to hear a letter read ${ }^{2}$ from the pope, forbidding the crowning of Prince Henry, the purpose of the gathexing, in the absence of the archbishop.

Honever, Henry was crowned an the king returned to France and a further conference at Montmirail. Here in the

[^0]presence of the king of Trance and several others, Thones gave Henry the kiss of peace, wi th the words "In honore Dei vos osculon. This appears to have been a convention with a definite understanding attached. But Henry had douns and returned it with certain mental reservations. After another change of venue peace was made at Amboise through the instrumentality of the bishops of Sens and Rouet. Henry wrote to his son that peace was made and that Thomes was to have his rights. Not a word was said of the original causes of the quarrel. Thonas landed at Sandwich on December Ist, 1170.

Diceto says that Thomas brought with hin two letters from the pope. From other sounces we know that Ronry knew of these and tried to prevent their entry. Thomas mowing theis contents tried to get more moderate ones but these not armiving in time he sent the oxiginals on ahead and they reached Rngland safely. Thomss sent the first to Roger of York which suspended him from his office for the insult to the primate in officiating at the crownine. The second reproved the bishops for infringing the ancient richts of Canterbury, suspanded them from their offices and excommunicated the bishops of Iond on and Salisbury.

1. Ibid. I. 339.

One rurther provocation Thomas surfered. He was touring in the diocese and called to see the young king Henry on December 18 th at Woodstock but was refused admission by the castellan Jocelin. Trom there he retumed to Canterbury where he preached the Christmas Day sermon. At the conclusion of the service he solemnly excommaicated ITigel of Sacheville for unlawfully holding the parish of Herges, and Robert of Broc for malicious injury of Becketrs sumpter horse. Four days later four knishts arrived from INomandy about the hout of vespers, namely, William de Tracy, Reginald Fite Urse, Hugh de Moreville am Richard Brito. These burst into the archbishopis private roon, denounced him on behole of the king with furious invective, and demanded that he absolve the excommicated bishops and restore them to their offices. His refusal was based on the grounds that it was impossible for an inferior to amul the sentence of his superior, and that no man was allowed to reverse what the See of Peter had decreed. However he offered to absolve the bishops of Lond on and Salisbury, if they would promise to respect his commands in the future, for the sake of the peace of the church and out of respect for the king.

IIII, ira incandescentes et scelus nefarium, quod in mente conceperant, ad effectum perducere

1. Ibid. I. 342.
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properantes, cum impetu recesserunt. Bvery word of this is in strong contrast to calm, dispassionate words of the motionless prelate.

But they, burning with anger, hastening to push forward rapidiy the impious crime which they had conceived in their hearts, rushed out violently. The archbishop, as the twilight drew on entered the nave in order to sine vespers. But the four "nefarious satellites" doming their armour followed him closely at once. Coming to the door of the church they found it open, as the archbishop had oraered. The y entered shouting out, where is the traitor to the king? Where is the archbishop? Becket, who had ascended three or four steps of the choir, turned back and went to meet them. "If you seek the archbishop, " said he, "behold, you see me openly." And when they offered violence he said, "I am prepared to die, preferring to defend justice and the liberty of the Church rather than life. " Then when the "wicked courtiers" rushed on him with drawn swords he said, "To God and St. Mary and to the patron saints of this church and to St. Dionysius I commend myself and the cause of the Church."
"And so he was sacrificed (imnolatus) before the very altar receiving the fatal wounds in that part of the body where the sacred oil had consecrated him to God."

The whole tone and the use of such words as "nefandi setellites" and "immolatus" show that he took sides strongly against the king and in favour of Becket, which is remerkable,

Henry received the news in Mormandy and at once declared his entire innocence and ignorance of their intents, and denied connivance in the crime . This was all couched in the strongest terms. He offered to submit to trial and humbly to accept whatever was decreed. An embassy was despetched at once to the pope to defend the king. Later at Avranches ${ }^{2}$ in the presence of the legates he swore that he had neither wished the death of Thomas, nor had any knowled.ee, non had he tried to find some design, "But since these evil doers had seized upon some words of his, uttered rather incautiously in the heat of anger and had grasped the opportunity to kill the holy man, he begged and besought absolution in all humility."

Henry retumed to Fngland in 1174 and went straight to Canterbury 3 where he did penance and again disavowed any share in the murder. Diceto's account of the penance follows closely that of Hoveden. He mentions the penitent looks, the procession on foot, laying aside his mejesty, the

1. Ibid. I. 345 .
2. Ibia. I. 352.
3. Ibid.I. 383 .
prostrations, groans, tears and long silent prayer. He adas thet Henry's disevowal, in terms rather stronger than that at Avranches, was made on the occasion of a public sermon delivered by the bishop of London.

We find one or two short references to the fact thet Hency found Thomas dead more trouble than alive and then the story passes ofe the stage with the great ector who produced it.

Another entry we find though smell is important. It reads: 1176 The king with the advice of his son the king, in the presence of the bishops, earls, banons, Knights and his other men and with the consent of these, appointed justices in six divisions of his kingdom, three in each division, who swore to preserve justice in their own parts. This was decided at Noxthampton on January 26th.

Laterwe learn of Henry's efforts to control the sheriffs and to organize the provincial counts. ${ }^{2}$ Fe brole with tradition when he looked for and appointed men as judges forefficienoy and honesty rather than for birth. For he appointed abbots, counts, captains, servants (gentlemen, not servitors) and even friends for the purpose of hearing and examining causes."

1. Ibid. I. 404。
2. IbId. 434,435 .

He employed clexgy and appointed bichops to the bench. The section is introduced by the phrase "Rer pater Anglorum", nether different from the asual Henry the Iord King of Thgland". Ralph notes Richard's benefections to religious houses, and more especially that to Canterbury in memory of Thomas à Becket, in 1179. It was this and similar gifts that caused Roger Wend over to sing Richardrs praises as the pious prince, friend of the church. Dieeto has proved a fascinating character. One Ielt that one was following him by his footsteps down the dusty cloisters of time, unged to continue by the echo of his robust laughter, sounding as if he were just beyond the next comer. One humies after him, for he is full of energy and occasionelly one catches a glimpse of his shadow or of the nan, but never quite sees him in plain view. He was regarded as a great authority, and his books were copied and mede use of par and wide. Fe put chronicling on acientific basis, and placed St. Paul's in the forefront of the scriptoria of an age that had learned the value of a well-written chmonicle.

Chapter III
Roger of Hoveau

One of the best known facts of English history is that the monasteries reached eminence in Northumbria earlier than elsewhere. Whether this was the result of proximity to Ireland it is hard to say. But whatever the cause, it was in Northumbria that there arose the earliest and longestlived and widest spread school of mediaeval history.

Every school boy has heard of the Venereble Bede, and no better proof of the leadership of the North could be given than this, that the man who stamped his character most strongly on the art of chronicling was a Northumbrian.

Bede's Ecclesiastical History became the basis and the model for the future chronicles. It was from Bede that the material was drawn for the early part of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.

Little is known of Roger's early life. He takes his name from Hoveden, the modern Howden, in the East Riding of Yorkshire. This was a place of greater importance in the tweleth century than today. A certain Hugh de Hoveden was a chaplain in attendance on Bishop Hugh de Puiset of Durham. This chaplain possessed a small manor at Howden which was frequently used by de Puiset in his political journeyings,
and here he died. Roger, who appears to have been a man of considerable abilities entered the service of Henry II in 1174. Bishop Stubbs ${ }^{\text {1 }}$ in his introduction draws from these facts that Roger may have been a younger brother of Hugh through whom, by the bishop, he was introduced to the Kingis household. Stubbs admits that it is merely an hypothesis. We think it a very weak one. The similarity of name means almost nothing. We have found lists of monks who are given geographical cognomens. We can even remember some such system in our own school days. The same thing may have occurred in this case also, especially as the two do not appear to have been thrown together much, except on tho se occasions, sufficiently numerous, when Hugh de puiset was In attendance on the King. It is much more likely that young Roger's father, wishing to promote his son's wellare, approached Hugh as a fellow townsman to use his influence In obtaining a position for Roger. There is nothing in the chronicle to indicate who he was, and nothing in the accounts of the career of Hugh de Puiset throws any light on the question of relationship with Hugh de Hoveden. Negative evidence would seem to point to there being none. However this is mere conjecture. The important points are that

1. Chronicles of Roger de Hoveden. Rolls Series. 1868. Vol. 1. Preface Page XIV.

Roger was a native of a town intimately connected with both Church and state, and that by some means the yound clerk. a man evidently of no mean ability, was taken into the household of Henry II, one of the dominant figures on the stage at that time. In this service he came in contact with some eminent statesmen among whom those who would be likely to Influence him most were Ranulf Glanvill, the future justiciar, Richard Fitz Neal, author of the Dialogus de Scaccario, Richard of Ilchester of the Exchequer, and Giraldus Cambrensis, poet, geographer and historian.

It is possible that Henry II took him to the Conference of Gisors in 1173 for in his account of that meeting we find him reporting the violent language of Robert Rarl of Leicester to the King with some other particulars that appear to be words of an eye-witness. The following year he was sent by the King on a mission to Galloway, Benedict of Peterborough thus describes it ${ }^{2}$ :
"Dunque haec fierent dominus rex misit in Angliam unum de clericis suis Rogerum de Hovenden ad Robertum de Vals ut illi duo Huctredun et Gilbertum filios Ferregus convenirent et allicerent eos ad servitium ejus."

1. Hoveden Vol. ii, Pp. 53 and 54.
2. Ben Pet Vol. 1, P. 80.

This tells us that he was sent to induce the chiefs of Galloway to accept Henry as their overlord, and also confirms that Roger was in France (hence the vords ad Angliam) and most likely with the King.

Returning to court he learned of an agreement between Hugh de Puiset, Bishop oi Durham and Roger, Archbishop of York releasing the See of Durham, including Howden from payment of synodal dues to Yom.

The king evidently put great confidence in Roger for we find him in the years 1175 and 1176 managing the elections ${ }^{2}$ to vacancies in various abbeys in the King's interests. This callea for much careful diplomacy and a hard canvass for votes for the $\operatorname{King}^{\text {i }} \mathrm{S}$ friends.

After this he drops from sight until 1189 when the Pipe Rolls fnform us that King Henry appointed him Justice Itinerant for forests in the North of Fngland. It is probable that he had spent the few years preceding this in gathering the knowledge required. Owing to the feelings of both nobles and commoners towards forest regulations this post would call for tact and intelligent care. These

1. Hoveden, Vol. ii.Pp, 70, 7I.
2. Ralph de Diceto, P. 587.
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qualities the King had already observed in Hoveden.
It was in this year that Henry died; and as we know, Richard caused a great shake-up among his father's servants. In all likelihood Roger was removed, and he would naturally retire to his estate at Howden where he busied himself with his chronicle. From the minuteness of his accounts of the quarrels in the Chapter at York we conclude that he was in the neighbourhood and took an interest in events there.

The Chronicle breaks off abruptly in 1201, but a few more notes and letters show that he was proceeding with the work. Evidently then he died shortly after 1201.

He is given the title of Nagister at the head of one manuscript but there is no evidence that he ever attended Oxford. He was at Reading in 1175 and met the deputations from the abbeys and monesteries at woodstock in that year. This is only ten miles from oxford or perhaps fifteen by road. Iet he makes no mention of oxford or any kind of reference, which he surely would have done had he spent four to seven years there as a young man. Iater on in life he is continually referring to matters at York which was seventeen miles from Howden, or maybe twenty to twenty five

1. Ralph de Diceto, Vol. I. P. 401.
by road. Of course it may be objected that there was nothing occurring at oxiord worthy of mention, while at, York quarrels were being fought out on subjects of great interest to him between people whom he mew. We have no grounds on which to decide either for or against, and it must always remain a pure speculation,

His work falls into four natural parts: (I) Narrative up to 1148. (2) TO 1169. (3) To 1192. (4) TO 1201. The first part is a transcription from older works, without alteration or adaition. The second is his own composition, compiled from various sources connected up and recast in his own words. The thiral is the Chronicle of Benedict of Peterborough (Yorks.) with his own notes added. The fourth is entirely his own.

It was natural for a Northerner to take as the basis of his work sone well-known northern chronicle and to build on this. That had been the method employed in the compiling of the work which Roger used. This was the "Historia Saxonum vel Anglorum post obitum Bedae". It was compiled between 1148 and 1161 , for he speaks ${ }^{1}$ of the "monasterium Eboraci in honore ejusdem Dei genitricis

1. de Hoveden. VoI. 1, P. 129.

Mariae"; he then lists the abbots and says "quartum, qui et in praesenti, severinum." Severinus died in 1161. This was almost certainly compiled at Durham, and at least two MSS. are extant. Roger repeats this almost word for word. It is not an oxiginal work being a combination of that of Henry of Huntingdon with Simeon of Durham, the latter of whom himself combined part of the work of Florence of Worcester with the Northumbrian Chronicle. This last was a continuation by an unknown writer of the work of Bead.
de Hoveden made some adaitions to the "Historia post Bedan" perhaps none more interesting than an abstract of a. charter of William the Conqueror', in view of our remanks above on the subject of oxford ${ }^{2}$. This grants the manors of Hemingburgh and Brakenholm to the Bishop of Durham "et sacet sochne, et tol et them et infangentheof." These lie close to Howden, and it is to Durham that they are hereby granted. This grant, "in puram et perpetuam eleemosynam," has an important bearing on the rights and privileges of the county palatine of Durham, a fact which was already

1. de Hoveden, Vol. 1, P. 127.
2. Supra P. 5 of Hoveden.
beginning to be felt in Rogers days. Another important addition is a charter granted by Thomas Archbishop of York to the see of Durham in 1083 out of gratitude to the blessed st. Cuthbert. This frees all churches in the diocese from all dues payable to the archbishop. This had great importance in Hoveden's day in the quarrel between Bishop Hugh de Puiset and Geoffrey Archbishop of York.

For the period between 1148 and 1170 Roger had Iittle material ready made. While this has been a disadvantage to us in some ways it serves to throw light on the character of his work generally. He shows confusion notably ${ }^{2}$ in the matter of the relationship between Fulk and Geoffrey of Anjou. We draw the conclusion that in other cases he would compare the accounts of different writers and fom an opinion. Sometimes it is not a matter of gathering a correct idea so much as one of wealth of informetion and detail. Each author has his own particular chief interest, some phase on which he is well posted. By gathering from a number he gets a composite balanced account. Roger himself is interested in Howdenshire and seizes on every scrap of news relative to Durham or York that concerms the East
2. Ibid. Vol. 1, P. 184 where he makes Fulk the brother of Geoffrey.

1. See Appendix (e), Hov. 1 137,130.

Riding. But for the period up to 1170 he had Iittle matelial at hand and he is obliged to attempt oxiginal arrengement. He frequently misdates events, for example he places the fall of Edesse in 1146 instead of 1144. He says ${ }^{2}$.

Anno gratiae MCXIVI qui erat annus XI regni regis Stephani..... Eodem anno nobilis civitas Edissa Syriae... In nocte Nativitatis Domini proditione capitur a Saracenis....
whereas it was on this very Christmas Eve 1146 that St. Bernard ${ }^{2}$ preached his sermon at Spires before Conrad III, calling for a crusade to recover Edessa, the news of whose capture had reached France from Eugenius III in 1145.

While this is a flaw in Roger's work it shows something of his nature and usual method. We can be sure that If manuscripts could be found he would take very great care in collation; hence we may look on his work, not generally as original, but as very sound and reliable.

Indeed this very point is illustrated in the third section of his work, the period from 1170 to 1192. This is very largely based on Benedict of Peterborough. He

1. de Hoveden, VOI. I. P.
2. Barker The Crusades, P. 52.
usually condenses Benedict's wort, and his expansions are usually illustrations or explanations made possible by the passage of time and the light shed on the events by official papers which Roger saw or became possessed of in the course of his work. Two examples of his treatment of the earlier chronicle will suffice. He gives a condensed account of Henry II's expedition to Ireland, but adas some detail relative to the equipment of the ships, possibly contained in his own office records. The second ${ }^{2}$ is his account of the grant of sadberge by Richard I to the Bishop of Durham in 1189. As this concerns his native Hoveden it receives fuller treatment.

It is notorious that this period is poor in chronicles, and most of those were, in all probability, unknowi to Roger. He appears to have had a copy of the Melrose Chronicle and we know he had the Peterborough one. His lack of comparison and slightness of revision forces us to the conclusion that however authentic the manuscript as an authority on this period, he is not reliable. It appears reasonable to assume that Roger found certain

1. Hoveden ii. 33.
2. Hov. Vol. 1ii, Pp. 13 and 14. See Appendix (e) Sadberge.
records in his office, that he abridged these and occasionally interpolated letters or reports that had come to him in his official capacity.

It is very noticeable how slight is the information for the period from 1148 to 1170. Hoveden has been following the course of events in England and France. But lack of material turns him elsewhere, and in Volume II we find accounts of events connected with the relations of the Emperor Frederick and the Pope Alexander III, of the doings of Isaac Angelus, Eastern Roman Emperor ${ }^{2}$. We are given a picture of the seal of William King of Sicily ${ }^{3}$ and the pedigrees of and agreements between the kings of Navarre and Castile.

This same volume also contains much material not given by Benedict. Under the year 1180 he tells us 5 that Henry appointed Ranulf Glanvill chief justiciar for the whole of England, "by whose wisdom the following laws were consolidated, which we call the English Law. " Then follows the Whole code of William I together with the Assize of the Forests, and that of Clarendon. He also tells the complete

1. Hoveden 11. 137.
2. Ibid. P. 208.
3. Ibid. P. 98.
4. Ibid. P. I22.
5. Ibid. Pp. 215 to 252 .
story of the quarrel between Henry II and Thomas a Becket, large parts of Roger's account not appearing in Benedict at a11. He opens this section by a quotation in full of a letter ${ }^{1}$ from Pope Alexander III to Roger, Archbishop of York, and Hugh, Bishop of Durham, concerning the state of the Church and the behaviour of the king. The letter may have been shown to Roger by Hugh, or may have been on lile in Roger's own office. The source of the detailed account ${ }^{2}$ of the course of the quarrel itself has not been identified. It may have been by word of mouth from Hugh.

Roger was a cleric but not a monk. Hence he never adopts the attitude of the abbey. His training was along lines of constitutional law and administration. His experience was gained under that great lawyer and administrator, Henry II, every inch a king. It is natural that Hoveden should adopt a cautious and non-committal attitude. He limits himself to documentary evidence. He was a servant in the King's household, and he never presumed.

In keeping with this attitude he makes very little rePerence to events in which he took part and avoids mention of himself; he never expresses an opinion, and rarely betrays

1. Ibid. Pp. 7 to 9 .
2. Ibid. Pp. 14 to 25 .
his sympathies. He is a lawyer and speaks like a lawyer. There are a few places where one may guess the bent of his sympathies. In his account of the council of Clarendon ${ }^{1}$ there is a very slight trace of bias in favour of the King. Thomas á Becket appears to whine after the agreement; the King's anger is righteous wrath.

Again in the quarrel ${ }^{2}$ in 1191 between Geoffrey, Archbishop of York, and Hugh of Durham, the Howden chronicler inclines to Durham. Roger at this point has been following Benedict's chronicle, from which, as has been remarked, he borrowed freely for his earlier part. He has rearranged Benedict's account in order to introduce the letter of Archbishop Roger to Hugh de Puiset. As the story stands in Benedict it is almost colourless. Both chronicles report ${ }^{3}$.
"During that year Hugh, Bishop of Durham, on account of the anger which he had in his mind against Geoffrey, Archbishop of York, was striving by all means in his power to release himself from subjection to him." They each report that Hugh refused to obey, for he said that he had once made his profession and obedience to the Church of York and to Roger, former archbishop of that church. This

1. Hoveden, Vol. I, Pp. 221 and 222.
2. Ibid. Vol. 3, Pp. 168 and 169.
3. Ibid. Vol. iii, P. 168.
sounds as if it had been a quarrel caused by officiousness on Geoffrey's part. But between these two, Hoveden inserts the text of the letter from Geoffrey, summoning Hugh to york to do obedience, and charging the See of Durham with having usurped an independent authority not in accord with the deference which Durham owes to York.

From being merely officious Geoffrey's act passes to actual challenge of the "libertas" of Durham, which, as we have seen, claimed immunity from the jurisdiction of York under the charter granted by Thomas, Archbishop of York in 1078. Hence Hoveden is really taking sides in defence of Howdenshire and of his own bishop.

Another instance of a slightly different kind is the story ${ }^{2}$ told by Berter of Orleans to the Pope against Geoffrey Ridel. Ridel, as stabs tells us in a footnote 3 , was elected bishop of Lincoln in 1174 and died in 1189. As we have met two literary references to it, one calling it an example of mediaeval humour, we here quote it in full. It is the only attempt at humour that we have met in the chronicles though We know from the early history of the drama that the Middle

1. Ibid. Vol. i, P. 138. See Appendix (e)
2. Ibid. Vol. ii, P. 58.
3. Ibid. Vol. ii, P. I90.

English" were not without humour.
"In the meantime Richard, Archbishop-elect of Canterbury and Keginald, Bishop-elect of Bath set out for kome for the purpose of having their elections confirmed, and those of the other bishops-elect of Ingland.

And against these Henry the King the Younger (Henry II's eldest son who had been crowned kingl during his father's lifetime, and who died in 1183) sent Master Berter of Orleans. And when these opposing parties stood in the presence of Pope Alexander and of the cardinals, and my lord the Pope was fiercely denouncing the absence of the other English bishopselect, and my lord the elect of Canterbury excused their absence sufficiently, my lord the Pope asked intently why the bishop-elect of Ely had not come. Berter of Orleans thus answered him; My lord, he has a scriptural excuse. And the Pope said, "What excuse, brother?' Then Berter answered, 'He has married a wife and therefore he cannot come. "" Quarrelings arose between the various sections, but at last the Pope confirmed the archbishop's election, gave him the pallium and laten added the primacy. Reginald of Bath wrote ${ }^{2}$ to Henry II shortly afterwards reporting their reception and the outcome. It was possibly from this source that Roger got

1. Hoveden, Vol. ii, P. 5, 1170 A. D.
2. Ibid. ii. 59. (a) mhis was Georerey, bastard son of Henry II.
the story of Berter.
This colourless character of the chronicles may be regarded by an age that has read Macaulay and Belloc as due to stupid heaviness of intellect. But other qualities suggest that these men were not unintelligent. Their style does not belong to the Twentieth Century, but their accounts are clear and logical, and reveal an insight into events and the importance of them that does not bespeak the vacant mind. We may take it that the clergy stand aloof, unbiassed, ready to perform their offices to either side, never plunging into mundane affairs except when the rights and privileges of the Church are threatened.

One other characteristic Hoveden exhibits in common with 211 the writers of the period. This is his belief in the power of sacred relics, and a childlike credulity in his acceptance of reports of supernatural events. Thus the reason for the grant of the charter to Durham by Thomas, Archbishop of York ${ }^{2}$, is given by Roger ${ }^{2}$ in this wise: Thomas explained, When making the grant, that, being sick of fever he was in bed when Cuthbert (patron saint of the church of Durham) appeared to him, laid his hand upon him and immediately Thomas was cured. Hence his devotion to Cuthbert and git of

1. See Appendix (e).
2. Hov. VO1. 1, P. 137.
the charter to Durham.
Then there is the tale of displaying of the body of st. Cuthbert. This is told under the heading: 1104 De Translatione Sancti Cuthberti. "The body of St. Cuthbert the bishop, on account of the disbelief of certain abbots, in the pontificate of Bishop Rannulf, was shown both by Kadulf of Saens the Abbot, and afterwards by Rufus the bishop and then by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the brothers of the convent of Durham, together with the head of st. Oswald, king and martyr, St. Bede and relics of many saints; and by clear evidence it was found uncorrupted, in the presence of Alexander, knight, and of Edgar, brother of the king of Scots and afterwards king, 418 years, 5 months and 12 days after its burial, which was in the sixth year of King Henry ${ }^{2}$ and the sixth of the episcopate of Ranulf."

Again in giving the account of the burial of st. Thomas à Becket he tells us ${ }^{3}$ :

1. Hoveden, Vol. 1, P. 162. This might not be altogether impossible. The present writer, visiting Westminster Abbey in 1910, was informed by a verger that a few days previously the tomb of Charles II had been opened, and the body was found in excellent state of preservation. It had been carefully enclosed in oak and lead.
2. Roger's date is inaccurate. As William Rufus was killed on 2nd August 1100 it could not have been more than the fourth year of Henry I.
3. Hov. Vol. ii, P. 7 .
"And it is credibly reported that when the body lay stretched upon the bier in the choir, surrounded by the bowed forms of the mourners, towards dawn it raised its right hand and gave the benediction. Then they buried it in the crypt."

Hoveden also gives the story ${ }^{\text {l }}$, most circumstantially told, of a woman who had fled from her parentsi home on the approach of the birth of her child. Being overtaken by a heavy storm she prayed to God for help, threatening to turn to the Devil If unheeded. The Devil appeared in the guise of a young man, and led her to a sheepfold where he laid her down beside a fire which he built. Then he went in search of food and drink for her. He helped her with the childbirth but later in the presence of some townsfolk carried off the baby. She told them all that the Devil had said about Hell.
${ }^{\text {"He told }}$ her that ever since Christ had robbed Hell (of himself) there had been no weeping or griel so great as that on account of the capture of the $\operatorname{Cross}^{2}$ (by Richard?) but its grief would be tumed to joy for so great would be the iniquity and sin of the Crusaders that God would blot them out of the Book of life; and many of them, forsaking the religion of the Cross, would become persecutors of the Cross and Name of Christ. And this very thing afterwards happened.

1. Ibid. Vol. ii, $\operatorname{Pp} .302 \& 303$ 。
2. We must remember that Hoveden is writing this after the event, possibly 1204.

No place is named vhere this is supposed to have happened. It is all very obscure and has no connection with What is narrated either before or after, and appears to have no excuse for the telling other than the miraculous nature of it.

There are many manuscripts of Hoveden's Chronicles and there is a singular agreement between them, al though there is a goodly number of variae lectiones.

For the compilation of the Rolls Edition Bishop stubbs chose two. These two appeared to him to be the most ancient and in all probability by Koger's own hand. He considers them as Volumes I and 2 of the same book as they are in the same handwriting and with the same number of lines to a sheet. They are merely two because of their separation. The first is the manuscript in the koyal Collection in the British Museum. It was presented to the nation by George II. This volume opens with the geneology of the Northumbrian kings and carries the "Story of England" down to 1180.

In that year kanule Glanvill was made justiciar and Hovenden breaks his narrative to insert the consolidated statutes as compiled by that remarkable lawyer and statesman. These also are on the same type of sheet in the same hand. This appendix also contains the Assize of Clarendon and the Assize of the forest. We think that herein is the reason for
including these. We must bear in mind that Roger was in the Kingls service and had met Glanvill. He must have used Glanvill's digest constantly in his routine work, and having a copy of his friend's work in his possession he included it.

The Assize of Forests is inserted because Roger was a justice of the forests, and also because Caput 9 forbids 1 any clerk from trespassing there for the purpose of hunting:
9. Item rex defendit quod nullus clericus ei forisfaciat de venatione sua nec de forestis suis: praecipit bene forestariis suis quod si invenerint eos fórisfacientes, non dubitent in eos manum ponere, ad eos retinendun et attachiandum, et ipse eos bene warantizabit.
9. Item: The king forbias any clerk from trespassing there for the purpose of taking his game or for anything concerning his forests. He warns his foresters strongly that if they find them trespassing they are not to hesitate to lay hands on them for the purpose of detaining and attaching them, and he himself will warrant them well.

This regulation would affect many of Hoveden's friends or at least fellow clerks at Howden and at Durham.

This manuscript is not the original draft but the corrected fair copy. There are no signs of its fate until the Sixteenth Century. On the $f 1 y-1$ eaf is the signature of liord Iumley, an eminent scholar in Elizabeth's reign. Stubbs makes the excellent suggestion that it may have been in the

1. Hov. VOI. 11, P. 247.
possession of the tarl of Arundel, Lumley's father-in-law. This family was intimately connected with the events of the period, especially while richard was in Palestine. James I bought the fumley Library and added it to his own, whence it passed in due time to George II, who, as we have noted, gave it to the British Museum.

The second volume is in the Laud collection in the Bodleian Library. It contains the account of events from 1181 to 1201. It consists of two hundred and two folios, of which the first seventy three are in the same hand as the Royal MS. with the same number of lines to the page. After this point the handwriting changes several times. Several blanks where personal names should appear suggest that a professional scribe had been employed who had been unable to read the rough draft. We add the suggestion that this is an indirect proof that it was written under Roger's direction and that some of the blanks were overlooked when reference was made to the author to decipher the name.

Several documents appear, written on the fly-leaf. These all relate either to the city or bishop of Carlisle and extend over a period of time from Henry III to Henry IV. From this we conclude that it was in possession of the cathedral during these years. By some means it passed into the hands of Archbishop Laud in 1636 who presented it to Oxford

University.
Stubbs regards these as one production. This is the first MS. The second is in the Arundel collection in the British Museum. It is probably sonewhat later in date but is very early and is beautifully set up. It is entitled "Incipiunt Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene", whence came the tradition of his having been at oxford. It is very well annotated in the margins, the most interesting referring to the history of St. Edmund. This leads Stubbs to the conclusion that it was probably part of the library of the monastery of st. Edmunds. It came into the hands of a Richard Broke and subsequently belonged to Thomas Howard Earl of Arundel. Part of his papers came into the possession of the Royal Society in 1681, and by this society was given to the British Museum in 1831.

There is a copy in the Cotton Collection that is of no further value than elucidation by comparison. The earlier part is on paper, probably of the Sixteenth Century; the later part, from 1187 to 1201 is of the Thirteenth Century on vellum. The Salisbury Library at Hatfield has a copy of the Fifteenth Century, and there is a further copy in the Cotton Collection.

The Harleian MSS. in the British Museum contain the
second part, 1181 to 1201. It is a fine copy of the Thirteenth Century useful for corroboration. But one story ${ }^{1}$ must be told of it. Nothing is known of its history save an entry on the cover which runs:

Roger Hoveden's Chronicle from the 27 th year of Henry II to the second year of King John: it cost me xlv shillings of Mr. Story, March 3, 1663-4. The book is worth the price.

This latter statement appears to sum up the opinions of nearly seven centuries of readers. I found another statement by Rishanger, who flourished at the end of the Twelfth Century, himself no mean historian, in which he quoted Roger de Hoveden with Matthew of Paris and Ralph de Diceto as his authority. This, if verified, would show that Hoveden was regarded at that time very highly and as very reliable. It occurred in Stubbs quoted from Rishanger's Chronicle.

The Douce collection in the Bodleian Iibrary has a copy of the Thirteenth Century. Another part copy of the Fifteenth Century is found in Corpus Christi; and Trinity College, Cambridge has a very good one of the Thirteenth Century.

The existence of so many copies and especially as so many of these are Thirteenth or early Fourteenth Century would go to show that Hoveden was an acknowledged authority for the reigns of Henry II and Richard $I$, and was held in high

1. R. de Hoveden. Rolls Series, Preface P. EXXXIll.
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esteem. His greatest fault is the weakness of his dates in the very early section and in the period 1148 to 1170. These mistakes are largely due to two causes, the contradictions by earlier writers of each other and the confusion caused by the overlapping of regnal years with calendar ones. Apart from this fault he is very reliable and stubbs speaks of $\mathrm{him}^{1}$ in relation to his contemporary writing as an authority of the first order.

Roger's mention of events in Portugal, Castile, Lombardy and Germany should not be attributed entirely to a desire to supply bulk of newis. It has a much deeper significance. It is a sign of the widening of the English mind. For six hundred years after the withdrawal of the Romans England was almost completely cut off from intercourse with the Continent. Then under Edward the Confessor she began to be drawn back into its orbit. The Conquest definitely linked her with the Continent, and the work of the first two Henries put her into very close touch, physical, social and political, with all the first-class powers of Europe, and laid down the lines of the foreign policy that England was to follow for five hundred years. This is one of the most important features of Henry IIs reign, and is just why Hoveden is so important as a chronicler.

1. Ibid. Preface, P. $\mathbb{U X X X I V}$

We have mentioned that Roger gives the Laws of England, starting with the code of William the Conqueror. There are two sources for this code. They are Roger Hoveden and the Red Book of the Exchequer. The latter contains many interpolations. The Report of the Commissioners on the Public Records ${ }^{1}$, 1837, placed it at Edward I or II. Stubbs suggests that lawyers made the additions, and made Edward I believe that these were the original wishes and grants of the Conqueror. But, as Stubbs points out, serious slips were made, such as the use of the word "alderman" in a connection in Which it is not used before 1260, and mention of Maurice 4 s Bishop of London ${ }^{2}$, twenty years before he was such. On these and similar grounds the Red Book is useless for historical investigation. Roger's account is better, being free from this kind of flaw. It is the second oldest known account. Stubbs places it at about 12013. It is therefore within a century of William the Conqueror and more than a century earlier than the Red Book.

While stubbs was engaged on this preface he found a manuscript, hitherto unknown, among the Rawlinson treasures in the Bodleian Library. As it contains the Constitutions of

1. Hov. 1, Pref. Footnote P. XXI11.
2. Ibid. P. XIV.
3. Ibie. P, XX111.

Clarendon, but not the modifications of the Council of Northampton he decided that it was probably written before 1176. This version confirms Roger's in some respects but not in all and Stubbs places it midway between the Rawlinson and the Red Book for reliability, regarding it as a careless epitome of some other unknown account.

Hoveden's chronicle contains a number of items not found In Benedict. One of these is the Berter story, and another, perhaps the most important, is Roger's account of the illness and death of Henry II.

Henry was recalled to France in July 1188 by a quarrel between Richard and Philip. As Henry's territories were invaded he joined the war and invaded Philipis lands. There was a truce for the winter and in the spring Richard, characteristically, deserted his father and joined Philip. Till June 1189 overtures for peace went on, but broke down ${ }^{2}$. Philip now took energetic steps but Henry remained inactive at Le Mans. Soon Philip appeared threatening seige; the town was accidentally set on fire ${ }^{3}$ and Henry was forced to fly, leaving his birthplace and his father's tomb in the hands of his enemy. His farewell as reported by Giraldus Cambrensis ${ }^{4}$

1. Hov. 11, P. 362 .
2. Same.
3. Ibia. P. 363.
4. Ibid. Pref. P. 1X111.
was typical of him: "My God, since, to crown my confusion and increase my disgrace, Thou hast taken from me so vilely the town which on earth I have loved best, where I was born and bred, and where my father lies buried, and the body of st. Julian toos I will have my revenge on Thee also, I will of a surety withdraw from Thee that thing which Thou lovest best in me."

Throughout the flight his natural son Geoffrey, his chancellor, remained with him. They stayed at La Frenaye and went on to Alençon and thence to Chinon and Saumur ${ }^{1}$. AII this time Henry was suffering from a fistula, a fact which Philip and Richard refused to believe. Philip still pressed on through Maine and took Tours ${ }^{2}$. Henry now met Philip and Richard at Colombieres near Azai ${ }^{3}$, so ill that he had to be supported on his horse ${ }^{4}$. Thus he submitted, asking for a list of the conspirators. This was brought to him the next day, July 5th. John's name was at the head of the list' ${ }^{5}$ "Now," he said, "let all things go what way they may, I care no more for myself nor for the world."

1. Ibid. P. 364.
2. Same.
3. P. 365.
4. P. 366.
5. Same.

Geoffrey remained with him to the last, fanning the flies from his face and rendered what service he could. Henry told. him that he had intended to give him the archbishopric of York. Throughout the day he kept crying at intervals; "Shame, shame on a conquered king." These details are given by Giraldus. Then Hoveden adas (P. 367) the king ordered his bier to be carried into the chapel and placed before the altar. Here he received the communion, made his confession and died.

Richard came next day to attend his funeral and was quite overcome at the sight. Then Hoveden, ever on the lookout for the marvellous, tells us that the body bled under the gaze of his son. He was buried in the choir at Fontraud, being wrapped between cloaks, thus fulfilling the vision of a Cistercian monk in the previous year ${ }^{1}$.

Before passing on to some of the matters dealt with in Dolume II it may be well to make some further remarks on Henry II's foreign policy, for much of the future history of England was shaped by his acts. He gave his eldest daughter Matilda to Henry the Lion of Saxony. He formed an agreement with Frederick Barbarossa, and constant intercourse of other princes of Germany founded a connection that lasted till 1830 if not to 1854.

1. Hov. ii. 356.

Fleanor, his second daughter, was married to Alfonso of Castile, and thus began the interest of the English in Spanish affairs. Henry himself offered an alliance to the Lombard League, and he mariied his youngest daughter Joanna to William II of sicily. While these had only minor political results they brought England into contact with Italy, bringing many men to england of the type of Lanfranc and the two Anselms and sending to Italy such men as Chaucer and sir John Hawkwood, and having a strong influence on social and intellectual life in England.

In the second volume there are three major topics dealt with. These are the foreign affairs of Henry II, the murder of Thomas à Becket and the final struggle of the king with his sons leading to his death. We have dealt, if somewhat briefly, with two of these. It remains to deal with Thomas à Becket.

The quarrel was dealt with in the first volume. The councils of Clarendon and Northampton have been held and Becket disguised has made his escape to the court of Lewis. Now the Pope, anxious to hold the support of Lewis and Henry against Frederick and his anti-pope, has succeeded in having Henry and Becket reach a compromise, which is more remarkable for what it leaves unmentioned. Becket has been forced by Henry to return to England earlier than Thomas wished. Thus Becket has had to be satisfied with Alexander's original
letter, being unable to stay longer in France or to smaggle any letters through from the Pope once he has reached England.

Hoveden contents himself with the cocumentary evidence in the case, and without comment gives the letter from the Pope ${ }^{1}$, and elsewhere, the Constitutions of Clarendon ${ }^{2}$ and the Council of Northampton ${ }^{3}$. This letter from Pope Alexander is addressed to Roger, archbishop of York and Hugh bishop of Durham. Its tone on the whole is apologetic and conciliatory, but nevertheless he suspends them for usurping the functions of the primate in the crowning of the young prince Henry. This was the very thing that Becket feared. It also conta ined the sentence

> Depressio siouidem Anglicanae ecclesiae, et diminutio libertatis ipsius, quae per regem vestrum, sive proprio motu sive potius aliis suggerentibus, facta denoscitur, plurimum jampridem animum nostrum afflixit, et non modicum nobis sollicitudinis et doloris ingressit."

The checking, indeed, of the English Church, and the lessening of its liberty (i.e. jurisdiction, the feudal meaning of libertas), which fact is made clear through (the action of) your king, whether of his own volition, or rather at the suggestions of others, has for a long time very greatly distressed our mind and has inflicted on us no little apprehension and grief.

The first of course is a direct blow to Henry's plan of

1. Ibid. P. 7 .
2. Hov. ii. 248 et seq.
3. Ibid. P. 89.
making sure of the succession of hiw own son and the second is an adverse criticism of Henry's attempts to bring criminous clerks within the reach of the Curia Regis. Hoveden then discusses Thomas's character, showing him to have been ascetic and to have given himself private scourgings.

Then comes mention of the Christmas Day sermon ${ }^{I}$. It was on this occasion that Thomas excommunicated the bishops. But Roger only mentions Robert of Broc, whose crime was that on the previous day he had cut off the tail of the archbishop's sumpter horsel Five days later there arrived four knights, William Tracy, Hugh Moreville, Richard Brito and Reginald Fitz Urse. They broke in on the primate. They hurled insults at his retreating figure. He went to prepare for vespers. they went out to a cloister and put on their armour. Returning they met some monks, who, on being ordered to tell where the bishop was, urged the knights to delay their interview. But they rushed on and found him in the church. The rest of the account is exactly as usually gi ven. Evidently this is the chronicle generally used to supply the story. The name of the monk who interposed is given as tdward Grim. Becket's last words are reported as "To God and St. Mary and to the patron saints of this church and the blessed Dionysius

1. Ibia. P. 14.

I commend myself and the cause of the Church."
The whole account is told very sympathetically to Becret. Undoubtedly it was a horrible sight and its horror was not diminished by the background of the stately Norman nave, the dim religious light and the huddled crowd of monks in gowns with their beads, contrasting with the infuriated amour-clad knights with flashing swords. His description of the monk Grim, protecting the archbishop's head to ward off the blow, is arawn with a pen intended to get every possible aramatic value from the scene. Then he dilates on the needless cruelty of the others, telling how all the other three, after one had struck a fatal blow, implicated themselves that none might be innocent, and plunged their swords into his neck, and when he was lying prostrate attacked him again cutting off the tonsure crown of his head and spilling his brains with blood on the stones of the pavement. Koger pauses to moralize on the sight, the only attempt that we have met to draw a lesson from the course of events.

The four knights went on crusade, to which Alexander sent them, and there they died and were buried in derusalem ${ }^{1}$. If any doubts are left in the readeris mind, after reading Hoveden's dramatic and distinctly sympathetic account
of thomas's martyrdom, of kogeris attitude, they are set at rest by the following letters. Hoveden now proceeds to show how all Europe rose in anger at the deed.

Lewis VII wrote to the Pope urging him to draw the sword of Peter to avenge the martyr of Canterbury and to punish a cruel and base crime. William, bishop of Sens, reminds the pope that he is set above all kingdoms, and says that the ruddy tears of the martyr's blood cry out to the Lord of Hosts, "Avenge, 0 Lord, the blood of thy servant and martyr, the archbishop of Canterbury, who was killed, sacrificed in very truth, for the liberty of the Church."

Theobold, count of Blois also addresses the Pope, reviews the relations of king and prelate and says, "The blood of the just cries out to you and demands vengeance."

William, archbishop of Sens, wrote at great length a second time, reviewing the whole situation, related the story of the murderous attack, drew an appealing picture of the helplessness of Thomas; he blamed the bishops of York, London and Salisbury for aiding the king, whom he called a Herod, a Judas, a Nero, and again exhorted the pope to avenge the martyr.

Against this the only reported friends of Henry are bishops of Roven, Evreux and Worcester, who made a journey
to Rome ${ }^{1}$ and had a highly unsatisfactory interview with the Pope.

Later the Pope was prevailed on to withdraw his excommunication against the bishops of London and Salisbury. and he granted ${ }^{2}$ them absolutions.

In September, Henry came to Avranches and in the cathedral, in the presence of two cardinals, of the archbishop of Rouen and of the bishops and abbots of Normandy he swore ${ }^{3}$ on the sacred relics and on the holy gospels that he had neither ordered nor wished the archbishop to be killed and that he had been heartily sorry when he heard of it. He abjured schism and swore to allow freely the making of appeals to Kome in ecclesiastical causes. He promised to take the Gross the following Ghristmas and to go to Jerusalem the next summer, 1173. He further promised as much money as was considered necessary to maintain two hundred knights for the defence of the lands of jerusalem for one year. He swore that he would restore all possessions, that might have been taken away, to the church at Uanterbury and that he

1. HOV. ii. 27.
2. Ibid. P. 32.
3. Ibid. P. 35.
would discontinue any customs that had been introduced in his time against the Church lands.

The cardinal legates then granted him absolution on behalf of the pope. Later he undertook the conquest of Ireland which the Pope allowed him to count as a legitimage delay of his crusade. In July 1174 he pertormed a pilgrimage to the shrine of st. Thomas at Ganterbury. We are told ${ }^{\text {I }}$ :
> "And his feet appeared to be bleeding to the onlookers in the way as he walked, for much blood flowed out on the ground from his tender feet cut by the hard stones. And when he came to the tomb, it was good to behold the scourgings which he endured with choking sobs, and the punishment which he received at the hands of the bishops and monks and of many holy men. And he even remained throughout the night before the tomb of the blessed martyr, in prayer and fasting and beating his breast, helped by the approval of very many holy men."

Thus closes Roger's account, and it we feel that too little of the king's side and point of view is put before us, we must remember that popular feeling was deeply stirred by the cruelty and sacrilege, that noger had many friends among the higher clergy, and that the account was written long after Henry himself had expiated the crime in a lonely death.

We will now take up, at short length, some of the other matters dealt with by koger, which are usually mentioned by

1. Ibid. P. 62.
historians today. Un page 80 we tind a verbatim report of the convention between Henry and William, king of Scots, drawn up in August 1175, and sworn to by William and his barons at York. The opening sentence is the important one. It reads:

> William, King of Scots becomes the liege man of my lord the King against every man for Scotland and for all his other territories and does fealty to him as his liege lord, as other men are accustomed to do, to him also."

William surrendered Roxburgh, Berwick, Jedburgh, Edinburgh and stirling and agreed to give hostages. This seems to clear up all doubts as to the exact position of William.

Beginning on page 89 Roger gives us a full copy of the Assize of Clarendon as revised at Northampton in 1176. In connection with the development of constitutional law and procedure, the clauses on page 91 are very important. These make the sherife responsible for the seizure of thieves and other malefactors, but sentence is to be pronounced by the king's judges. This makes the rise of Common Law possible. The next item of great interest is a remarkable letter, Which runs from page 168 to 170 , from Pope Alexander to Prester John, dated at Venice the 27 th September 1177 . He appears to have not the slightest doubt of John's existence and writes most circumstantially. He opens thus:

> "Alexander the bishop, servant of the servants of God, to the very dear son in Christ, illustrious and magnificent king of the Indies, most holy priest, greeting and apostolic blessing. "

He then proceeds to assure John that the Papal claims are sound and gives a short resumé of the usual arguments. We then hear that
"we have heard for a long time from all sides and by many references, and by common report, how much you have professed the name of Christ and have striven without ceasing to do pious works and to turn your mind to the things that are pleasing unto God."

Now we learn that it is Master Philip, the Pope's physican, and evidently a most estimable person, who has given much information about John, - everything except the name and location of his city, - and of his desire to learn about the catholic doctrine. May his desires be fulfilled. The Pope has heard that John wishes to have a church in the city (Rome) where wise men of his kingdom might stay and receive instruction in the faith. To consult on such matters the Pope is sending this letter by his physician and intimate friend, Philip. And if John's wish is to learn the apostolic discipline, let him receive Philip kindly and answer this letter, when the Pope will consider his requests carefully.

We hope that the letter reached its destination. What a pity that Roger does not give us a copy of Prester John's
replys
There follows a long section containing many decrees issued by Alexander III, among which we note one instituting or ordering anew the observance of the Truce of God. It runs ${ }^{1}$ :

> "We command that a truce shall be observed from the fourth day of the week after sunset to the second day of the week after sunrise, from Advent Sunday to the eight day of Epiphany and from Septuagesima Sunday to the eight day after Easter, to be observed by all inviolably. If anyone shall attempt to break this truce, after the third summons, if he shall not give satisfaction, his bishop shall pronounce sentence of excommunication against him, and shall report it in writing to the neighbouring bishopg."

The bishops are then urged to act firmly and energetically In rigid enforcement of the decree, with further pains and penalties.

Another interesting decree is given on page 187. This deals with the establishment of schools under the auspices of cathedrals and monasteries. We have often heard it said that the cathedral and grammar schools were especially designed to provide clergy, properly trained. This decree gives no such reason for them. It says that the Church of God should act as a pious mother in all things that tend towards the helping of the body or the improvement of the
mind; and, that the poor, whose parents do not enjoy the necessary wealth, may not be prevented from learning to read or deprived of the opportunity of advancing themselves, therefore every cathedral and monastery shall arrange to have clergy to act as masters to give the necessary instruction. No fee may be charged in any form for this instruction. Another item of popular interest whose origin is given by Hoveden concerns the collection of "Peter's Penny". This was compulsory under the code compiled by the Conqueror and included as No $X$ in the Laws of England ${ }^{1}$. It runs:

De denario Sancti Petri quod Anglice dicitur Romescot.
Everyone who possesses thirty pennyworth of land in his house, of his own, shall give by English law a penny to St. Peter, and by the law of the Danes, half a mark. And this penny is to be called in on the solemn feast of Sts. Peter and Paul, and to be collected before the festival which is known as st. Peter ad Vincula, and so that it is not witheld more than one day longer. If anyone witholds it report thereof shall be carried to the King's justice, since this penny is of the King's charity. The justice shall compel the rendering of the penny or outlawing by bishop and king.

And if anyone have more houses he shall render the penny for that one where he was residing at the time of the feast of the Apostles Peter and Paul.

1. Ibid. il. 222.

## S-ection III

Hoveden.

The third volume of Hoveden's chronicle is devoted to the reign of Richard I up to January 1196. Here we meet the three great figures of the early part of the reign. namely, Hugh de puiset, Bishop of Durhan and Barl of the Palatinate; Geoffrey Archbishop of York and half brother (the "Gaufridolnon ex legitima" of Richard of Devizes) of Richard; and William Longchamp, Chancellor to Richard and Bishop of Wiy.

These three play leading parts while in the background, yet joining in the acting of the other three, there hovers and flits the figure of John-the beloved son of Henry II, who deserves to be called Henry the Lion if his son deserves that bombastic title coeur de Lion.

Longehamp the Upstart, trusted and faithiul servant of Richard wishes to be master of the wole of England. Hugh of Durham, Kinsman of the king, Scion of the House of Blois ${ }^{2}$, Intends to meintain inviolate the County Palatine of Durham and to take a share in the co-justiciarship granted to him and Longchamp. Toh and Geoffrey reveal themselves as true

1. Rich. of Devizes, P. 392.
2. See Geneological table in Appendix.
only to their earlier reputations of being true to little else than self interest, true sons of the House of Anjou of the House of Yea-and - Nay. John is anxious to grasp the shadow of power. But-will he thereby lose the substance? During Richard's absence twice he has to make a choice. Fixst, when Longchamp is deposed by the barons, will he repudiate Richard or play a nobler part? Second, when news comes that the king has disappeared, will he prosecute the search with vigour or should he seize the crown? On the rimst occasion he hed to decide whether to risk the birth of an heir to Richard or to hope that Fate would leave him in the suceession, And like a Greek tragedy, Fate decided to keep that question for the future, and force him to make a definite decision on the fate of Arthur. on every occasion John railed to play the man. Geoferey presents a somewhet different yet strangely similar picture. He shows the same Angevin waywardness and stabormess. He is adamant in his refusal to take a fresh oath of allegiance before being enthroned in his archbishopric, thereby unnecesserily offending berons and clergy. Most strange of all is his hesitation in teking ordination. What went on inside that head? Did the son of the Eair Rosamund cast his mind back; and reilect that his ancestor William the Bastard became King of England? Evidently Joh
thought so, for John was most anxious to see Geoffrey enthroned in York, tonsured and mitred, lest he should be enthroned at Westminster with chrism and crown.

He shows himself quarrelsome and tactless. One of the best examples of his lack of tact is given by Hoveden, not so much to 1 llustrate his character as to narrate the incidents that explain the subsequent friction between Geoffrey and the clergy of the chapter. He tells ${ }^{1}$ how Geoffrey had wished to conduct vespers on the eve of Epiphany in January, 1190. Evidently he was late in apriving, and Henry the Dean and Buchard the Treasurer refused to wait for him, and proceeded with the service.

When the archbishop elect arrived in the choir with Hamo the Precentor and other clergy of this same cethedral, he protested vehemently and ordered them to be silent. The precentor ordered them not to sing. However all were silent at the command of the Archbishop and Precentor. Then the bishop began vespers again and the treasurer ordered them to extinguish all the candles. And when these were put out and vespers finished, the bishop complained to God, to the clergy and to the people concerning the injury which the dean and treasurer had done him."

A little punctuality and a little tact would have prevented a scene which one can scarcely imagine taking place today, and it would have rendered unlikely many future bitter acts.

1. Hoveden, Vol. iii, P. 31.

The other great topics of the volume are the Crusade of Richard and Philip, and the capture and ransom of Richard with the attendant imposts in Richard's dominions and the opposition to these.

One remarkable section must here be mentioned that is not directly connected with any of those mentioned. We must first tell the circumstances that lead up to the sermon of Joachim. While Richard was at Messina he expressed great penitence for his sins ${ }^{1}$. It is interesting to note the words which Hoveden uses here ${ }^{2}$ : "Sed pater misericordiarum Deus, qui non vult mortem peccatoris, sed ut convertatur et vivat....." one cannot help but be struck with the similarity to the words of the Edwardian and modern prayer books. We think there is little doubt that it is an echo quotation from the Twelfth Century ritual. "But God, the father of all mercies, who desireth not the death of a sinner but rather that he should turn (from his wickedness) and live,.. turned upon him His countenance of pity, and gave him a penitent heart and called him to penance." ${ }^{3}$

Wvidently Benedict and Roger were impressed with Richard's penitence and believed him to be sincere, for

1. Ibid. P. 74.
2. Ibid. P. 75 .
3. Hoveden, Vol. iii, P. 75.

Roger continues ${ }^{1}$ :

> "He received absolution from the afore-mentioned bishop, and from that hour forward became a man fearing God and turning from evil and doing good. o happy man who thus falls in order that he may rise again strongerd o happy he who after his penance did not again relapse into sing"

0 happy Eleanor, thine errant knight is become a true knight errant:

Then follows the remarkable sermon of Joachim "in quibus audienis, rex Angliae et sui delectabantur." This consisted in an exegesis of the passage in Revelation XVII which describes the Great Beast and the Seven Kings. As in the Great War when the prophecies of Daniel and St. John were related to contemporary people and events, so apparently in the days of the Third Crusade this same chapter of Revelation was applied to the then situation. The seven kings are stated to be Herod, Nero, Constantius, Mahomet, Mausamuz (Youssouf-abu-Yacoub, second monarch of Almohad dynasty), these are the five who are dead. Saladin is the one who is and Antichrist is the one who is yet to be. He says ${ }^{2}$ :
"and one is, to wit Saladin, who at present oppresses the Church of God and holds it in occupation, with the sepulchre of Our Lord and the holy city of Jerusalem and the land in which have stood the feet of the Master, but he will perish next.

```
1. Ibid P. 75.
2. Ibid P. 77.
```

> Then the King of England asked him, 'When will this be? And Joachim answered him, fhen seven years have elapsed from the capture of Jerusalem. '"

Stubbs notes that the account of Roger has been written after the success of the Crusade had become problematical, while Benedict's which had been written earlier, boldly promises that Saladin will shortly lose the kingdom of Jerusalem and be put to death.

Joachim then expounded his views of Antichrist. Roger's description does not occur in Benedict. Stubbs has a valuable footnote on $\mathrm{it}^{1}$. He says:
"This famous description of Antichrist,was written originally by Adso, to Gerberga, Queen of Lewis "outremer", shortiy before the year 954. Adso was afterwards abbot of Der. It has been at different times attributed to Augustine among whose spurious works it is printed in the Benedictine edition....; to Alcuin....; to Rabanus Maurus...., under these names it appears in various forms and with different titles; as also in the shape of a letter to Archbishop Herebert of Cologne from Albinus cir. 999 A.D.... The form in which it is given by Hoveden closely resembles that in which it appears in Rabanus Maurus ......"

The third volume opens by telling how Richard, after the burial of his father, seized Stephen de Turneham and put hin in chains until he should hand over all the castles and treasure of the late king. Having obtained these

Richard was made duke of Normandy and soiled for England. It is of interest to note Richard's treatment of stephen, for it is characteristic of his policy immediately prior to his departure for Palestine. Richard of Devizes adds ${ }^{1}$ that the King made stephen pay£ 30,000 Angevin in cash and a promise of $£ 15,000$ Ang. more.

Like one of his successors, Henry V, Richard appears to have broken with the friends of his former years. Hoveden reports the change very briefly ${ }^{2}$ :

Illos autem omnes, tam clericos quam laicos, qui, relicto patre suo, illi adhaeserunt, odio habuit, eta familiaritate sua alienos fecit: illos vero, qui patri suo fideliter servierunt seaum retinuit, et multis bonis ditavit.
"But he held in hatred those who, whether clergy or laymen, having deserted his father, had clung to him, and he made them strangers to his friendship: but those, who had served his father faithfully, he retained with himself and enriched them with many gifts."

There was joy in England when Richard and John arrived. Yet everyone was not satisfied, but the discontented tried to console themselves?
"Yet some, a few at least, were troubled at the death of their lord the king, but there was some comfort for them for as some one has said: II will tell wondrous things, the sun set, yet no night followed'."

1. Rich. Divis. P. 385.
2. Hoveden, iii. P. 5 .

There is a volume of public opinion of Henry II and Richard I in the three Jatin lines.

Richard landed on August 13 th, 1189 , but did not hurry on to be crowned. He evidently preferred to secure his friends and especially his relations with gifts and honours. He bestowed ${ }^{1}$ on John the county of Mortain in Normanay, the counties of Cornwal1, Dorset, Somerset, Nottingham, Derby, Lancaster, and the castles of Marlborough and Ludgershall, and the honours of Wallingford, Ticinill and Haia, also the Peak and Bollsover. "Sed quaedam castella praedictorum comitatuum et honorum retinuit dux in manu sua."

Here we see the typical Richard. As the historian merely records we can only speculate on his motives. It may have been impetuosity. The gifts may have been intended as a sop. But if so, how childish. Did Richard inggine that the giving of half the loaf would check John Irom wishing the whole? Remembering that Richard is vowed to a crusade it is scarcely credible. He knew better than any one else the perfidy of John, the beloved son. Nor, clearly has he forgotten it, for he witholds the castles in several of the honours, notably Nottingham, one of the strongest mediaeval English castles.

1. Ibid. P. 6.

He added to these the county of Gloucester with the daughter of the count, and he made John become betrothed to her at once; Baldwin Archbishop of Canterbury forbidaing it, for they were blood relations in the fourth degree." "....et Gaufrido fratri suo notho, qui fuerat Lincolniensis ecclesiae electus archiepiscopatum Eboraci." Roger reports that the canons of York duly elected Geoffrey Archbishop of York ${ }^{2}$.
Hoveden gives a very full account ${ }^{3}$ of the coronation of Richard. This appears to have been a most elaborate ceremony which shows that Richard liked the pomp and panoply, and believed in having things done in correct form. The King was receited at the door of his private room by a procession of bishops, abbots and clergy clad in silken gown, preceded by a cross and accompanied by candle bearers and acolytes with holy water. These conducted Richard to the church at Westminster with well ordered procession and magnificent singing. All the path from the door of the King's chamber to the high altar was carpeted with a woollen cloth. "The order of the procession was as follows ${ }^{4}$ : First came the

1. Ibid. P. 6.
2. Ibid. P. 7.
3. Ibia. P. 9.
4. Op. cit. P. 9.
clergy in their gowns, carrying the crosses, the noly water, the candles and the censers. Then came the priors, then the abbots, then the bishops and in the midst of them went four barons bearing four golden candesticks. Then came Godfrey de Lucy carrying the royal cap and John Marshall next him with two golden spurs, great and heavy. Then came William Marshall, Count of Striguil, bearing the royal gold sceptre on the top of which is a cross of gold. Then came william Patrick, Earl of Salisbury, bearing a golden stafi having a golden dove on the top. Next came David the brother of the King of Scotland, Rarl of Huntingdon, and John, Count of Moreton, brother of the Duke, and Robert, Earl of Leicester, bearing three royal sumptuous swords from the treasure of the King, whose scabbards from the top throughout were patterned in gold. . Then came six earls and six barons carrying on their shoulders one of the very big Exchequer tables upon which had been placed the royal regalia and robes. Then came William de Mandeville, Earl of Albemarle bearing the golden crown great and heavy, and decorated on all sides with precious stones. Then came Richard Duke of Normandy, and Hugh, Bishop of Durham walked on his right side and Reginald Bishop of Bath of his Ieft, and four barons bore over them a silken pall supported on four ornamented spears, and there followed all the crowd of earls and barons

## -93-

and others both cleric and lay, and they entered the nave of the church and went with the duke to the choir.

When the duke came into the presence of the archbishops and bishops at the altar and of the priests and people, he bowed his knees before many sacred relics. And he swore that he would keep the peace and do honour and reverence to God and Holy Church and of its ordained courses all the days of his life. Then he swore that he would do justice and righteousness to the people committed to him. Then he promised that he would annul all bad laws and evil customs if any had been brought into the kingdom, that he would administer good laws and guard them without fraud or evil design.

Then they undressed him completely except his shirt and trousers, and the shirt was unfastened on his shoulders. Next they put on him the sandals woven over with gold. Then Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury, pouring the sacred oil over his head, anointed him king in three places, on the head, the breast and the arms, which signify the glory, bravery and knowledge, accompanied with the words arranged for this act. Then the same archbishop placed on his head the consecrated linen cap ${ }^{l}$ with the pilleus above which Godfrey de Iucy had carried.

1. This must be the prgcursor of the crimson velvet cap of Haintenance used today.

Then they put on him the royal vestments, first the tunio, then the dalmatic. Then the same archbishop handed to him the royal sword, for the seizing of those who injure the Church. Then two lnights fastened on him the spurs Which John Marshal I had brought. Then he was olothed with the mantle. Then he was led to the altar where the said archbishop warned him in the name of Almighty God not to undertake this honour for himself unless he bore in mind the aforementioned oath and vow which he would do all to preserve inviolate; and he answered that with the help of God he vould preserve all the afonementioned words without equivocation.

Then he himself took the crown from the altar and gave It to the archbishop who placed it on his head, and two knights held it up because of its great weight. Then the archbishop placed in his right hand the royal sceptre and in his Ieft the virge, and the king thus orowned was led to his seat by the aforementioned bishops of Durham and Bath, the candlebearers preceding them and the three swords previously mentioned.

Next the service of the Nass was begun, and when the

1. It is interesting to note that Richaxd has taken bo th John and William (see above) Marshall into his service. They were his fathers most faithful servants. William unhorsed Richard in the pursuit of Hemy from Ie Mans to Angers.
offertory was reached the aforesaid bishops led him to the altar, and he offered one mark of the purest gold, for such an oblation is fitting for a king at his own coronation, and the aforementioned bishops led him back to his own seat. And when Mass had been celebrated and everything had been completed according to rule, the two bishops previously mentioned, one on the right and the other on the left conducted him back crowned and carrying the sceptre in his right hand and the virge in his left, from the church even to his own private room, the procession in ordered rank preceding him as above.

Then the procession to the choir was reversed, and the lord king laid aside the royal crown and robes, and put on lighter crown and robes, and thus crowned he proceeded to the feast; and the archbishops and bishops sat down with him at table each according to his rank and dignity. And the knights and barons served in the house of the king as their ranks demanded."

We have considered it worth while to give Roger's account in full for several reasons. It is one of the earliest and most detailed accounts of a corsonation that we possess. Next it is most probable that Hoveden was an eye-witness. Then besides Richard's liking for the outward show already mentioned we think that it reveals something
of the romantic mind of the king that loved the glamour of a great idea.

One other feature of Roger's Chronicle may be pointed out here. The earlier chroniclers, as is shown by the opening parts of Wendover and Hoveden, were mere diarists. The entries are short, rarely elaborated and never woven into a narrative, nor are any connections shown between the events narrated. Roger follows up events and puts them in relation to one another and shows the development and sequence of events.

While the king was sitting at the meal ${ }^{1}$ the chief Jews came bearing gifts for the king. But the door keepers would not allow them to come in and drove them off. Then the people beat them and despoiled them. They invaded the Jewry and burned the houses and killed the Jews, only a few escaping through the help of Christian friends. Richard seized some of the rioters the next day and had some of them hanged, not, as Roger naively remarks, on account of the Jews but on account of the damage done to the houses and property of the Christians.

Twice, in this section, Hoveden shows his interest in

1. Op. cit. P. 12 .

North Country affairs. In the account of the anti-Jewish riot he inserts the story of Benedict of Yorkl, a. Jew who turned Christian. The other place is immediately after this when Richard receives the homages and sells estates ${ }^{2}$. Roger reports the grant of the manor of Sadberge in the county of Durham to the bishop of Durham and quotes the grant in full. We have inserted this in the appendix.

The paragraph ${ }^{3}$ is worth quoting for it illustrates one of Richard's methods of raising money for the Crusade. It is well known that he visited his English possessions only twice during his reign and he seems to have regarded England simply as a convenient banker to keep him in funds or to ransom his person.
"And the second day after his coronation Richard, king of England received the homages and vows from the bishops, earls and barons of England, to whom the king explained that all that he had was for sale, to wit, castles, towns and estates. Hence it came about that Hugh, bishop of Durham bought of the king his rights in the manor of sedberge, together with the wapentake and knight's fee for six hundred marks of silver in pure and perpetual gift and he confirmed it by this charter. Then follows the charter in full:

1. Ibid. Pp. $12 \& 13$.
2. Op. cit. P. 13.
3. Hoveden, iii. P. 13.

We are told further that Hugh gave the king marks of silver, (the number is omitted and a space left. Richard of Devizes ${ }^{2}$ says 10,000) for the county of Northumberland to hold during his own life, together with its castles and its other belongings.

At a subsequent council at Pipewell the king filled many vacancies in cathedrals and abbeys, and made several other appointments. Among these we read that Villiam Iongehamp his chancellor was made bishop of Hly, Hubert Walter was made bishop of Salisbury and Geoffrey was made archbishop of York. Hugh Bishop of Durham and Williom Earl of Albemarle were made joint chief justiciars ${ }^{3}$, and Richard named as commission of the justiceship William Marshall, Goafrey son of Peter, William Bruere, Robert of Wihtefeld and Roger Fitz. Reinfred. This council was held in september.

In the following November William Marshall died ${ }^{4}$ and was buried in the Galilee at Durham Cathedral.

1. Ibid. P. 15.
2. Rich. Deviz. P. 8.
3. Ibid. P. 16.
4. Ibid. P. 19.

We then learn something of events in Palestine, the trouble between Guy de Lusignan and Conrad, and of the opening of the seige of Acre. This connects up with the information that Roger has already given us ${ }^{1}$ about Richard's arrangements for a fleet to transport his troops, to be provided by all the ports of England, Normandy, Anjou and his other possessions, and prepares us for Richard's campaign ${ }^{2}$ in the neighbourhood of Acre and the capture of the city.

The next important event recorded is Richard's release of William, King of Scotland from his fealty, in December 1189. The subsequent charter was very vaguely worded, so that in later years there was dispute as to whether the homage done by William and his successors was done to the king as overlord of Scotland or as feudal lord of Roxburgh and Bervick.

Evidently Hoveden thought that Richard intended to release him for scotland. He says: ${ }^{3}$

Therefore William, King of the Scots came to Canterbury to the king of England in the month of December and dia homage to him for the honours which he held in England such as Malcolm his brother had held. And Richard King of migland,

1. Ibid. P. 8.
2. Ibid. P. 128 et seq.
3. Hoveden, iíi. P. 25.
returned to him the castles of Roxburgh and Berwick in free and quiet possession, and released him and all his heirs free and quiet from himself and the kings of England in perpetuity, from all ligantia and subjection for the kingdom of Scotland; and for this return of his castles and for the quiet release of the fealty and ligantiae for the Kingdom of Scotland, and for the charter of Richard, king of England, issued in consequence, William, king of the scots gave Richard, king of England, ten thousand marks sterling. Then Richard, king of England gave his charter to him in this form. Then follows the charter which will be found in the appendix.

Geoffrey had already had trouble at York and had refused to install the dean and treasurer in September. Now in December Hugh of Durham and Hubert of Salisbury appealed, unsuccessfully, however, against his election. Geoffrey bought Richard's goodwill and the return of some of his possessions with a payment of three thousand pounds sterling. A general reconciliation followed.

When Richard at last crossed to Calais to meet Philip on December 11, for the purpose of proceeding with the Crusade he left ${ }^{2}$ in England as co-justiciars, Hugh de puiset,

1. Ibid. P. 19.
2. Ibid. P. 28.
bishop of Durham and William Longchamp, now bishop of Ely. He appointed to the council of justices: Hugh Bardolf, William Narshall, Geoffrey Fitz Peter and William Bruere. To William Longchamp he handed over his seals and gave him charge of the Tower of London and to Hugh of Durham he gave charge of Windsor Castle and the county of Berks. Roger does not mention any gift of seal to Hugh. No sooner hed the king crossed over than de Puiset and Longchamp quarrelled as to which was the senior.

Richard called all his councillors ${ }^{2}$ to a meeting in Normandy in March, II90, and made Longehamp supreme justiciar of England and Hugh justiciar of the lands north of the Humber, and made his brothers John and Geoffrey swear thet they would not return to England for the next three years, without his permission. Richard applied to Pope Clement for legatine powers for Longchamp which the Pope granted. Richard throughout showed sreat confidence in William which even a baronage united in their opposition failed to shake.

Immediately on his return to England the justiciar began that series of levies and exactions which finally ranged almost the entire Church and peerage against him.

1. Op. cit. P. 29.
2. Ibia. P. 32.

## -102-

There is an almost personal note ${ }^{1}$ in the manner of the northern chronicler as he couples William's fortifying of the power by a very deep moat with the reporting of the commencement of his imposts in the same paragraph. We hear this note again as Roger reports ${ }^{2}$ very fully the first trouble between Iongehamp and Hugh of Durham. Lorgchamp seized the opportunity of the massacre of the Jews at York that same March, to go there and assert his authority even north of the Humber. He set off then to punish the rioters and appointed his own brother Osbert as sheriff of Yorkshire. He acted in a very high handed manner towards both clergy and laity. It is noticeable that Roger gives no cause for these proceedings other than the massacre.

Hugh arrived from France bearing letters and his justiciar's commission from Richard. He showed these to Iongehamp who promptly imprisoned him at Suwell and forced him to surrender Windsor castle and to give hostages before being released. Hugh then went to Howden whither osbert pursued him and forced from him a promise not to move without Iongchamp's permission. Hugh wrote the king reporting these things. Yet nowhere in his record does Roger praise or condemn Richard for his persistent faith in Longchamp,

1. Ibid. P. 33.
2. Ibia. P. 35.
nor offer any explanation of his continued trust, in spite of these acts which, to say the least, appear to the present writer most unjustified and arbitrary.

As hinted above it is from Roger that we learn of the terrible massacre of the Jews at York in March 1190.

It appears that the people of York and of the environs had threatened the Jews who through fear shut themselves up in the Tower of York with the consent of the sheriffs. The mob attacked the tower and the Jews offered money in return for safety. There were five hundred men, women and children in the tower. Counsel was given by a leader, "It is better to die by our own hands than to fall into the hands of our enemies." All agreed and accordingly the men cut the throats of their wives and children and then set fire to the tower. All perished either by fire, or knife or sword, and the people sacked the Jewry, burning their own promissory notes and the houses.

On the eve of Richard's departure the position was this: The great figures of his father's reign were either with him--like Glanvill or at their bishoprics in Hormandy-like Walter of Rouen. In England Hugh de Puiset had been given his ambitions in the north, and John had been granted huge holdings in the west, free from interference by the

1. Ibid. Pp. $33 \& 34$.
royal Exchequer. Across the centre the country was divided everybody's friends being provided for and the crown holding the chief casties. Henry II's friends had been rewarded and Richard's erstwhile supporters had been checked. Richard evidently reckoned that purchase, reward and his father's system would carry affairs through peacefully until his return. If so, he seriously underestimated the personal factor in his father's rule. Possibly the whole situation was no more than the make-shift arrangement of a mind, not primarily interested in this kingdom that had fallen to him, romantic, eager, impulsive, impatient, that felt the glamour of the East and wished to spend its energy on something more lofty than the sordid patricidal and dynastic feuds of Europe. Hugh de Puiset was a remarkable character. He never forgot that he had royal blood in his veins, and he was more a diplomat and politician than a bishop. He was fond of the chase, interested in shipping, a consummate intriguer and a wary politician. Stubbs likens him ${ }^{1}$ to the type of imperial prince bishops. He had charm of manner, good nature, strongly attached to Henry and his sons.

Longchamp was not even of noble birth. Hoveden records

1. Ibid. Preface XXXVII.
2. Ibid. P. I42.
of him: "...eet si aliter attentassent, aculeo pungebantur, quem dominus prae manibus habebat, memor piaerecordationis avi sui, qui, servilis conditionis in paga Belvacensi, et aratrum ducere et loves castigare consueverat; qui tandem ad remedium libertatis ad fines Normannorum transvolavit." So that the justiciar was the grandson of a runaway serf. He raised his family by careful internarriage. Roger's whole description through these three pages shows more personal feeling than any other part of his narrative. He continues, describing him as a hater of the English, ruling autocratically, lgnoring the king's commands-Solus ergo regnabat, et solus imperabat, et a mari usque ad mare timebatur, ut Deus, et si plus dicerem non mentirer."1

Roger gathers together all the Biblical quotations he can to show that Longchamp's fall was the vengeance of God on a haughty spirit: "Let him that standeth take heed lest he fall,"" He that exalteth himself shall be brought low" and many others. In contrast to Hugh's good figure and handsome face, William was ugly. Even Richard of Devizes, who is his least severe critic, can only say ${ }^{2}$ that it took all the greatness of his mind to make up for the shortness of his

[^1]body. He started as a clerk in the chancery and, gaining the confidence of Richard rose rapidly. According to stubbs ${ }^{\text {I }}$ Giraldus Cambrensis is "playing to the gallery" when he attacks Longchamp for his lack of the English language and contempt for English people. This is interesting as a sign that Norman and Saxon were fusing and that the Normans were now regarding themselves as natives.

Having crossed swords with Hugh de Puiset he had no choice but maintain himself supreme. Self defence dictated an offensive rather than defensive line of conduct. To help him he had Richard's letter giving him full power to act and he also had Richard's moral support. He had legatine powers from Celestine III. Against him was his personal unpopularity with the tales of his birth and character and the character and popularity of Hugh de Puiset-a type dear to the heart of every Englishman. He fought a losing fight from the start. One possible supporter he might have had. This was John, who might have been detached from the other barons. But Longchamp was hostile to John's claims to the throne. Richard wrote a letter to pope Clement ${ }^{2}$ explaining all the events leading up to his agreement with Tancred and the arrangement

1. Hoveden, iii. Pref. Xli.
2. Hoveden, iii. 65 .
of a marriage between Mancred's daughter ${ }^{1}$ and Arthur of Brittany, whom Richard acknowledges as his heir in the letter-
"Cum eo etiam pacis et amicitiae foedus arctiori adhuc vinculo astringentes, inter Arturum egregium aucem Britanniae, carissimum nepotem nostrum et haeredem (si nos decedere sine prole contigerit), et illustrem filiam ejus, matrimonium volente Domino, condiximus contrahendum:".

The immediate cause of the break between Prince John and the justiciar was the attack of the latter on Gerard de Canvill. Gerard had bought the sherifidom of Lincolnshire and had married the heiress of the castle of Lincoln. William knew that Richard objected to such an arrangement, as in the case of John and Nottingham. Then Gerard had allowed the castle to become a den of robbers. This charge was laid against him by Iongchamp before Richard ${ }^{2}$ at the Council of Nottingham in 1194. "Deinde per concilium et machinationem cancellari, ut dicitur, Gerardus de Camvilla fuit retatus de receptatione praedonum, qui rapuerunt bona mercatorum entium ad nundinas de stanford; et $a b$ eo recesserunt ad rapinam illam faciendam, et de rapina illa redierunt ad eum." Gerard appears to have been a vassal of John, and when Jongchamp called on Gerard to give up the sheriffdom John seized the

1. Ibid. P. 61.
2. Ibid. P. 242.
castles of Tickhill and Nottingham ${ }^{1}$ which Richard had withheld from him and the justiciar beseiged Iincoln castle.
"Interea orta est gravis discordia in Anglia inter cancellarium regis et Johannem.... propter castellum Lincolniae, quod cancellarius obsederat, expulso Girardo de Camvilla a baillia vicecomitatus Iincolniae... Dum cancellarius obsideret castellum Iincolniae, castellum de Nothinham et castellum de Tikehil regis, reddita sunt comiti Johanni, qui statim mandavit cancellario quod nisi cellerius recessisset ab obsidione castelli Lincolniae visitaret eum in virga ferrea ."

The two moves resulted in stalemate and an agreement ${ }^{2}$ was reached in July 11\%1. John surrendered castles, and Longchampx promised in future cases to have recourse to the proper processes of law.

We will now follow the fortunes of Richard. He parted from Philip at Vezelai, going to Marseilles, while Philip went to Genoa ${ }^{3}$. Richard had a great advantage in the possession of a fleet of his own while Philip was dependent on the Genoese. This fleet had crossed the Bay of Biscay, thence to Lisbon thence via Majorca to Marseilles. Richard went aboard and followed the coastine of Italy, touching at many points, eventually reaching sicily, after running the gauntlet of Scylla and Charybdis, whose dangers he describes. ${ }^{4}$

1. Ibid. P. I34.
2. Ibid. Pp. 135,136 .
3. Ibid. P. 37.
4. 0p. cit. P. 67 .

## -109-

So complete is Roger's account of Richard's journey and so minute the detail of Mediterranean voyaging that it is hard to believe that Hoveden was not there. Certainly someone must have kept a diary, and must have interviewed members of the fleet. One remark would seem to point to Rogeris not being there. He reports the presence of flying fish near Sardinia, whose existence appears so improbable that he adas ${ }^{I}$ : "And he who saw this bears testimony, and his witness is true, that when he himself was seated at table on the deck of the ship, some of these flying fish fell on the table in Iront of him." The form of expression here seems to bar Roger as the witness.

Fighting broke out between Richard and Tancred, King of Sicily, in which Richard was victorious. But he behaved in a most chivalrous maner renouncing certain victor's rights. Later he gave some ships to Philip ${ }^{2}$ and distributed presents to the soldiers and servants of the whole armies, so that there had never been any Iiberality like it before. As Roger says here, The Iord loveth a cheerful giver, and Richard made a name that day that has clung to him ever since.

It was at Messina that he was joined by his mother and Berengeria of Navarre.

1. Ibid. P. 53.
2. Ibid. P. 95.

## -110-

Philip meditated treachery with the Duke of Burgundy against Richara which was revealed by Tancred ${ }^{l}$. This caused coolness between the two and resulted in Richard's paying Philip two thousand marks sterling to break off finally Richard's engagement to Philig's sister Alais. The contrast between Richard's conduct and Philip's throughout the whole crusade has been a big factor in creating the Richardian tradition. These events were in March. In April Pope Clement died and was succeeded by Celestine III. Eleanor returned to England, Philip sailed for Acre, and also Richard and Berengaria. But Richard's fleet was driven by a storm to Cyprus ${ }^{2}$ where two ships were wrecked. Isaac Emperor of Cyprus imprisoned the people and Richard attacked him, finally conquering the whole island ${ }^{3}$. The emperor surrendered on condition that he would not be put in irons. Richard bound him in chains of silver and gold. Here Richard and Berengaria, were married and set sail for Tyre. The guards of the city, on orders from Philip and Conrad refused him admission and they slept that night in tents outside the city. Proceeding by sea he captured a Saracen ship bringing much

1. Ibid. P. 98.
2. Ibid. P. 105.
3. Ibid. P. I11.
4. Ib1d. P. 112.

## -111-

needed supplies to the beseiged Saracens at Acre. Arrived there he found everyone quarrelling, Guy, soi-disant king of Jerusalem with Conrad and also Geoffrey de Iusignan. Richard set up his engines, borrowed Philip's engineers and pressed the seige. Philip was inclined to give trouble but was held by Richard to their agreement and urged to attack the city. Through June and July 1191 the selge was pressed. Saladin made an offer which was rejected. Then the crusaders prepared to assault and Saladin made a further offer. The kings demanded ${ }^{1}$ the return of the true cross, the surrender of Jerusalem and its territories and the release of all prisoners. These terms were refused, and the French assaulted, while Richard held his forces to the walls. A breach was made but apparently the French could notenter. Here Conrad showed cowardice, withdrawing himself and his men rather than face the danger from stones and arrows. Saladin again offered terms, which included permission to himself to march three days unmolested. He refused the stiffened terms of the kings and the seige went on. A sortie was repulsed. The English assaulted, doing much damage to men and walls and making another great breach. Saladin again offered impossible terms which were refused.

1. Ibid. P. 116.

At this point Roger again reveals ${ }^{1}$ his belief in the supernatural. He reports the appearance of the Blessed Virgin to English soldiers watching before the walls on July 8th. She told them to lear nothing that she was sent by God to tell them that the city would fall in four days' time. Then there was an earthquake. She faded from their sight at the same time as the great light that had shone round about them. Cheered by the vision the army attacked, and on July l2th the city was taken. By the terms ${ }^{2}$ it was agreed that Acre should be given up with the five hundred Christian captives in it, the holy Cross was to be restored and the kings were to choose one thousand people and two hundred soldiers from among those held elsewhere in the power of Saladin. Saladin was to pay two hundred thousand byzants. The chiefs were to remain as hostages for the fulfillment of the terms within forty days. Saladin fled and made fresh offers which were declined. The quarrel between Guy and Conrad was patched up. Conrad got Tyre, Sidon, Baruth and Philip's share of Acre, Georfrey de Lusiguan got Joppa and Caesarea and Guy got the kingdom of Jerusalem.

Philip sailed for home on August 3 rd leaving Richard to

1. Ihid. P. 120.
2. Ibid. P. 121.
deal with Saladin. The latter failed to observe the treaty and Richard attacked him at Arsouf. The result was a great victory for Richard and henceforth his reputation was secure. By his fidelity to the cause and by his prowess he was now Coeur de Iion. Richard had always kept in touch with the Papacy, and sent reports of progress to the pope. He wrote one letter to some unknown friend, given in Hoveden only. He says ${ }^{1}$, HYou must learn that after the capture of Acre. and after the withdrawal from us of the king of France, who thus shamefully abandoned his plan of a crusade and his oath contrary to the will of God and to his eternal shame and that of his kingdom we pressed our march towards Joppa." This was written on Oct. Ist, Il9I, Philip being then at sea. On the loth Philip landed at otranto and visited the Pope. He spoke much evil of the king of England and said that Richard had compelled him to withdraw from the Holy Land ${ }^{2}$. But neither Pope nor cardinals believed him. Philip then visited the Emperor Henry VI and arranged with him that Richard would be seized if he should enter Henry's territories. On his return to his own lands Philip continued to calumniate Richard ${ }^{3}$.
3. Op. cit. P. 129.
4. Ibid. P. 166.
5. Ibid. P. 167.

The Crusaders spent the winter in consolidating and in the spring, after further quarrels and love-feasts they started a new campaign. Richard found a part of the True Cross at a chapel about three leagues from Jerusalem, and shortly afterwards he captured a great caravan with arms, engines and food bound from Babylon to Jerusalem for Saladin's forces. He then proposed vigorous steps and the seige of Jerusalem but the French troops refused and returned to Acre. Saladin captured Joppa but Richard managed to rescue it. Saladin challenged Richard to battle but on the Crusaders receiving reinforcements he agreed to a three year trucel. Richard agreed and sailed from Acre on 8 th October. He landed somewhere on the coast of Dalmatia, but Roger's geography at this point is not clear ${ }^{2}$, possibly it was near Pola. Richard disguised himself with a beard and long hair and clothes like those of the people of the country. But apparently injudiciously large expenditures led the people to suspect him, and word was sent to the Bmperor.

Richard left all his party except one at this place with

1. Ibid. Pp. $183 \& 184$.
2. Ibid. P. 185.
instructions to stay four days longer and to spend as freely as before. He himself with one earl mounted fast horses and, travelling day and night, came to Vienna, They obtained lodgings in a suburb and Richard went to bed. The earl went out to buy food, but was recognized by some servants of the Duke of Austria. He was compelled to reveal the king's hiding place and Richard was seized in his sleep ${ }^{1}$. The rest of his party were seized but released, and there is little doubt that it was by them that the news of Richard's fate was carried to England.

The capture took place in December 1192. The Emperor Henry wrote at once to Philip telling him the good news. In his letter ${ }^{2}$ he adds the details that Richard had been shipwrecked between Aqueia and Venice and that the first village was Frisach in the archiepiscopate of Salzburg in Carinthia. The Duke handed Richard over to the Emperor in March $1193^{3}$.

A letter, which is not in Benedict, nor in the first manuscript, from Walter Archbishop of Roven to Hugh de Puiset, gave the news of the king's fate. This letter ${ }^{4}$

1. Ibid. P. 186.
2. Ibid. P. 195.
3. Ibia, P. I94.
4. $\mathrm{Pp} \cdot 196$ \& 197.

Which is unfortunately too long to copy, speaks in terms of the greatest affection for the king and sorrow for his fate. He encloses a copy of the letter from the Emperor, (evidently his secret service was efficient) and urges action. The letter is undated but urges Hugh to attend a meeting at oxford on the third Sunday in Lent. That would be about the end of February.

Walter sent two abbots, one English one Norman, into Germany to seek Richard. After much wandering they discovered him at "villa quae dicitur oxefer," possibly ochsenfurt near Wlluzburg' about Palm Sunday. "And when the king found that the abbots were from England, he showed himself to them in joy and friendiness, asking about the state of his kingdom and the fidelity of his men, and the safety and prosperity of the king of the scots." They reported what they had heard and seen. Richard was overcome at the perfidy of John, to whom he had granted so many benefits and honours, and especially for John's dealings with the King of Erance.

For three days ${ }^{2}$ he was hectored, lectured and questioned by the Emperor, concerning events and his

1. Ibia. P. 198.
2. Ibia. P. 199.
behaviour in the Holy Land. The information was quite evidently supplied by Philip. One of the great charges is that Richard was implicated in the assassination of Conrad at Tyre ${ }^{1}$ in April 1192. Richard carried himself with dignity, caution and energy, showing the mind of a ruler, and winning the golden opinions of everyone including the Fmperor. The king answered freely, steadily and boldly and the Enperor was convinced through Richard'⿴ courtesy and dignity. He gave the King the kiss of peace, heaped honors and assistance on him, and promised to assist in bringing Philip and Richerd to an agreement. Should he fail in this he promised Richard release without ransom, the king having promised 100,000 marks. Richara also, on the advice of his mother ${ }^{2}$, resigned his orown and received it back from the Emperor under a tribute of 5000 a year. On his death Henry released Richard and his heirs from this.

Celestine threw his weight on the side of Richard, threatening Philip and Henry with excommunication, and through the offices of the chancellor William Longchamp an agreement was reached. This was all the more necessary as Philip and

1. Ibia. P. I81.
2. Ibid. P. 202.

John wexe plotting and were offering the Emperor bribes to nold Richard. John had told the people that Richard never would return.
 Iondon, 100,000 marks of pure silver, Cologne measure. Richard was to pay a further 30,000 marks to the Emperor leaving sixty hostages till paid, and 20,000 marks to the Duke of Austria secured by seven hostages. Eleanor, Arthur's sister was to be married to the son of Leopold of Austria. The emperor was to provide an escort and safe conduct to the port of embarkation of Richard. The emperor and Richard swore to observe this before an august assembly of prelates and barons.

But what of Blondel and his song, the romantic story of our chilahood days? Stubbs inserts this footnote on Page XV of his preface to Vol. iiis I had intended adding a third appendix from the early French Chronicle, extant in the MS. 432, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, which may be called a romance of the history of Europe during the period of the Crusades. The MS. is of the Thirteeth Century and is a

1. Ibid. P. 203.
2. Ibid. PD. 215-216.

## -119-

better version of the little known work published at Paris in 1837 by $M$. Louis Paris under the title of "Chronique de Rains". The portion I had selected was the story of the discovery of Richard by the minstrel Blondel; for which this is first authority. However, on reading over my MS. for the press, the work appeared to me to be too fabulous and frivolous for any part to be introduced of real history, and I content myself with referring the curious reader to d . Paris's edition."

When Philip heard of Richard's release he wrote to John ordering him to take care of himself since the devil is now 10osed. John immediately crossed from England and joined Philip, not daring to await the arrival of his brother, the king in England ${ }^{\text {I... }}$

We must now return to the affairs of Iongchamp. Relathons between him and John appear to have been peaceable after the agreement of July until the return of Geoffrey in September 1191. Geoffrey was consecrated in August at Tours, and though like John, forbidden the kingdom, he landed at Dover. Longchamp was prepared for him and the archbishop in disguise fled to the monastery of St. Martin. The church was beseiged and taken, and Geoffrey in vestments was seized

1. Ibia. Pp. $216 \& 217$.
at the altar. John ordered his release which was granted. Geoffrey met John and the other magnates in London and laid a formal complaint ${ }^{1}$. It was decided that Iongehamp must stand trial for wrongs done to Geoffrey and to Hugh of Durham. He was summoned to appear at Reading but did not come. The party of John decided to go to London Ior further discussion and action. Longchamp who was at Windsor heard of it and started off by the northern road. The soldiers of the two parties met where the two roads crossed ${ }^{2}$, and a sharp fight took place. Longchamp failed to check the march, so both went on. The chancellor went to the Tower, the others held a meeting at st. Paul's ${ }^{3}$. Here there were John, Walter of Rouen, William Marshall, Earl oi Striguil and many other bishops and earls. They accused Longchamp of illegal procedures against Hugh and Geoffrey and of doing things without the advice of others. The letters of Richard from Messina were produced in which he had named the council of regency. They advised Longchamp's removal and that his place be filled by Walter of Rouen. This was done.
2. Ibia. P. 139.
3. Map in Appendix.
4. Ibid. P. 140.

The same day John and the council agreed to recogrize the commune of London, and the citizens swore fealty to Richard and John. The Rower was not victualled Ior a seige and Longchamp surrendered it and Windsor castle. He went to Dover for some time, then decided to fly to the Continent. For this purpose he disguised himself as a woman, for what reason is not plain. While sitting on the beach a sailor and a woman detected him, a mob assembled and handied him roughly, dragging him along the ground by the wrists and mocking him. Eventuaily he escaped to IVomandy ${ }^{l}$ where we hear no more of him till Richard's return. He appears to have been in touch with Philip but if so it was as a spy on Richard's behalf. He was one of the first to see Richard who received him joyfully ${ }^{2}$ and in spite of everything sent him to Rngland "not as chancellor, not as justiciar but in the character of a bishop, to arrange for the raising of the ransom. 13

Roger's account is taken solidly from a letter of Hugh of Nunant, Bishop of Coventry. The letter which occupies six pages, 141 to 147 , is extremely bitter, and exults gloatingly in Iongchamp's downfall.

1. Ibid. P. 150 .
2. Ibid. P. 209.
3. Ibid. P. 212.

## -122-

The only other point is rather laughable. Longchamp, using pope Celestine's waming not to interfere with the chancellor', through the agency of Hugh of Inincoln thundered excommunications against all and sundry. These thunders and counter thunders must have brought the weapons of excommunication and interdict into disrepute.

We have found no trace of any personal feeling between Hugh of Iincoln and Geoffrey except a paragraph dealing with Hugh's official visit to Godstow near oxford. Here he found $a^{2}$ beautiful tomb before the altar surrounded by cendes. Learning that it was the sepulchre of the Foir Rosamund he ordered its removal with her bones, and she was buried in the churchyard, as a warning to other women against illicit and adulterous concubinage.

Longchamp retumed to Richard and is mentioned frequentiy in the accounts of various councils that Richard held while still a prisoner. He is not mentioned as travelling with Richard nor agein until Richard's coronation at Winchester on April 17 th, 1194, when he walked on the king's right hend in the procession. After this he again drops from sight.

1. P. 151.
2. Ibid. Pp. $167 \& 168$.
3. Ibia. P. 247.

Richard wrote to ${ }^{1}$ Hubert now archbishop of Centerbury giving January I7th as the day for his release. John and Philip were still trying to influence the Emperor to hold him ${ }^{2}$, and a delay did take place. Richard sent Iongchamp to interview John in France. The bishop succeeded in inducing John to return to his fealty to Richard, but when the wardens of his castles in Mrormandy refused to give these up John returned to Philip ${ }^{3}$.

Richara was removed from Speyer to Mentz on February $2 n a$ and released on the fourth ${ }^{4}$ receiving his safe conduct from the Emperor himself. He proceeded to Cologne, thence went to Antwerp and then to Swine in Flanders. From here he crossed to Sandwich which he reached on March I3th.

Meanwhile Geoffrey was having trouble at York. In 1193 he had laid an exaction of one fourth part of their incomes on the Chapter to be devoted to Richard's ransom 5 . Rvidently Richard had written to him. After some other trouble the canons locked the cathedral. Eventually the pope appointed a committee to enquire into it. Geoffrey refused to appear at Rome and was suspended.

1. Ibid. P. 227 .
2. Ibid. P. 229.
3. Ibid. P. 228.
4. Ibid. P. 233.
5. Ibid. P. 222.

The archbishop of Canterbury sent a commission to York to try to reach a settlement, in July 1194. Georfrey refused to appear' and the bishops seized his lenas. Geoifrey went to Richard, now in Normandy, in september, and by a gift of two thousand marks got an order from Richard restoring his 1ands. Richard also ordered his restoration to all the archiepiscopal rights. The Pope sent a second comnission of enquiry with power to act. Geoffrey was agein ordered to appear in Rome, and having feiled to do so was suspended by the Pope's order on December 25th, 1195. The Pope wrote a long letter ${ }^{2}$ to Simon of Apulia, dean of York, in which he gives in detail the charges against Geoffrey. These were that he neglected his duties, thet he was overbearing with his canons, that he was avariciovs, that he had behaved violently within the cathedral and that he had improperly used his powers of patronege.

Richard on arrival in London, held a council at which John was alsseised of all his holdings in England. Some places still held out Por John. Hugh de Puiset laid seige to Tickhill, the Rarl of Chester went to Nottingham and Hubert Walter of Centerbury captured Marlborough ${ }^{3}$. Iancaster

1. Ibia. P. 262.
2. Ibid. Pp. 312-316.
3. Ibid. P. 237.

## -125-

and St. Michae1's Mount surrendered. Richard ame to the area of Nottingham. Tickhill surrendered and Nottingham was stormed. ${ }^{1}$, A greet council was held at Nottingham when Richard sold various sheriffdoms and castles.

The following month, that is, on April i7th, Richard appeared in his coronation procession at Winchester. He proceeded from the castle to the cathedral where mass was celebrated, then returned to the palace where a banquet was served. He appeared crowned under a canopy borne by four earls and surrounded by earls, barons and bishops, with William of Ely on his right and Robert of London on his left ${ }^{2}$. Stubos says of this ceremony that it wes not so much a renewal of his, inauguration after an eclipse of aignity as an assertion that the dignity has undergone no diminution. Almosta month later, on May l2th, Richerd set sail from Fortsmouth and landed at Barfieur. He was reconciled to John ${ }^{3}$ and carried on a war with Philip, which left things much as they had been.

Another interesting event ${ }^{4}$ of the year 1195 was the death of Hugh de Puiset. He died on March 3 rd at his place

1. Ibia. P. 240.
2. Ibid. P. 247.
3. Ibid. P. 252.
4. Ibia. P. 284.
at Hovedene, and was buried in the cathedral at Durham. Thus passed away a man who, looking back over fifty years of diplomacy and politics, misht have exelaimed Magne pars fuin.

## Chapter III

## Part IV

In the Rolls Series the third volume of Hoveden carries the chronicle to the year 1196. Repeated reterences have shown that Roger relied mainly on Benedict for his material. The section dealing with the period from 1148 to 1169 appears to be his own work. It is certainly not derived from Benedict, nor does it draw on any other known work sufficiently to be regarded as a paraphrase or enlargement of such work. But we must bear in mind that koger's ehronicle was known long before its connection with Benedict was discovered. It is not impossible that some manuscript might be discovered which would prove to be the source of the second part, which, though apparently original, deals with a period rather too remote from Hoveden to be first hand information to him. The fourth part, however, appears to be undoubtedly his own. It starts with the year 1192. He deals so largely with northern affairs and in the way that one would expect him to do that there seems little doubt that the section is Roger's own work. He has dealt very fully with Hugh de Puiset and Geoffrey of York in the third $v$ olume. We meet Geoffrey again in the fourth and we hear northern affairs discussed again. Again we note that though these two
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prelates were important men they were not so important nationally as Longchamp or his successor Walter of Coutance, Bishop of Rouen. Yet they hold as large a place in the chronicle.

Another feature foreign to Benedict is the sharp almost sarcastic tone adopted towards the worldiness of the clergy. He complains about Geoffrey's secular employments ${ }^{1}$ mentioning his love of the chase, and he quotes ${ }^{2}$ verbatim Hugh Bardulf's advice to Hubert Walter when he as archbishop was made chancellor in May 1199. He warns him that a chancellor may become an archbishop, but that it is difficult for an archbishop to become chancellor.

Again we note the fulness of treatment of such matters as the Laws of England, the Forest Assize ${ }^{3}$, and the Assize of Measures ${ }^{4}$, with similar affairs which would be the very sort of document that would pass through Roger's hands.

Finally there is the matter of the supernatural.
Benedict in common with all the chroniclers introduces the marvellous, but in Roger's case it is an obsession that

1. Hoveden 1ii. 240, 274.
2. Ibid. iv. 90, 91.
3. Ibid. iv. $63,64$.
4. Ibid. iv. 33, 34.
amounts to a marked characteristic. We have noted a few of these miraculous incidents. We note here only their wide distribution. In the earlier parts it was noticeable that they were almost always an addition to the chronicle of Benedict and that in the fourth part they are much more common. William the Conqueror's grant to Durham is explained as the outcome of the miraculous result when he outraged the relics of st. Cuthbert. Archbishop Thomas's charter ${ }^{2}$ was given because of the remarkable cure by the vision of St. Cuthbert. Then we have the neglected warning to Henry II concerning the heretics of Guienne ${ }^{3}$, the prophecy concerning Henry's death bed and its fulfillment ${ }^{4}$ and the delivery of the woman of a child with the aid of the Devil'. The story of Antichrist ${ }^{6}$ will illustrate the presence of this element in the third section. And though the fourth volume is much the shortest, there are at least thirteen instances of credulous belief in miraculous events recorded in it. Some of these will be noticed.

In January 1197 William Longchamp, bishop of Ely and

```
1. Hoveden Vol. 1. 108-111.
2. Ibid. 1. 137, 138.
3. Ibid. ii. 272.
4. Ibia. ii. 354, 367.
5. Ibid. ii. 302.
6. Ibid. iii. 80-85.
```

sometime chancellor of England closed his stormy career at Pioctiers. Roger thus records it: ${ }^{l}$
"And when he (Philip, bishop-elect of Durham) had come to Pioctiers, William, bishop of Ely and chancellor of the King, was sick even unto death. he died and was buried there. And when he was seen to be at the point or death a certain cross of wood in the cathedral church of that city, which is called the cross of St. Marilal, was seen to weep so bitterly that the streams of water, as it were, flowing down from the eyes, bedewed the face. The people said that this was now the third time that this had happened... ."

Again he tells us most circumstantially how one German pilgrim murdered another for the sake of his money ${ }^{2}$. The murderer carried the corps round his neck to throw it into some water, but could not get it off his back. He thus hurried to the Pope who ordered him to carry it with him to Jerusalem, and thus expiate his horrible crime, and turn his thoughts to heaven. This he did to the praise of the good and the terror of the evil doers.

He tells a story ${ }^{3}$ of the cross in the cathedral of Dublin similar to the one given above. Because the archbishop is exiled the Figure on the cross became suffused and poured blood and water.

1. Ibia. IV. 17.
2. Ibid. IV. 27.
3. Ibid. IV. 29.

Another type of these mediaeval miracles is the story told of the Genoese possessed of devils, for their sins. Phis one has a possible natural explanation, and the obvious demoniacal behaviour of these unfortunate outcasts would not only help to spread this wonder, but would also serve to strengthen popular belief in some other miraculous event.

Further on we learn of the preaching of Hulk of Neuilly ${ }^{2}$ in 1198 and the miracles he performed. He cured the blind, deaf, dumb and sick and the possessed. He turned evil women and usurers from their wickedness.

Hoveden tells that it was thus Hulk who urged Richard to provide for his three daughters. Richard denied having any daughters. To this Full answered that they were Pride, Cupidity and Excess. Richard replied "I will give to wife my pride to the Templars, my cupidity to the Cistercian monks and my excess to the prelates of the churches. "

The next miracle is told of Eustace, abbot of Flay ${ }^{3}$. He directed a woman, who sought to be cured of a devil, to drink of a holy well at Wye in kent. When she did so she vomited two great black toads which immediately turned into two great black dogs and then to donkeys. When the guardian

1. Ibid. IV. 67.
2. Hov. IV. 76 .
3. Ibid. 123.
of the well scattered water from it between the woman and the donkeys these ascended and disappeared in the upper air. At the funeral of St. Hugh of Lincoln in vecember $1200^{1}$, a woman, blind of one eye for seven years, at the appearance of the bishop's corpse received her sight.

Then we have the story of the five moons seen at one time in Yorkshire ${ }^{2}$, and almost at the close of the book the numerous miracles by which Eustace of Hlay demonstrated his divine mission. These are supposed to have taken place in 1201 at Beverley, Nafferton, Wakefield and in Lincolnshire. All of these deal with breaking the Sabbath and result in some form of punishment or signs of Divine displeasure. A carpenter falls to the ground paralysed; a weaver is paralysed and struck dumb. Some bread baked on Sunday poured blood when broken next day. Wheat milled on Sunday filled a crock with blood instead of flour, and the wheel stood still against the full force of the river.

This account, though not exhaustive is sufficiently representative in character to throw some little light on the times and on Hoger, and is chosen from suficiently far apart portions of the chronicle to show that they were not

1. Ibid. P. 143 .
2. Ibid. P. 146 .
included merely by chance but as part of a detinite scheme in Roger's mind. It was noticeable in the earlier volumes of Hoveden that these miraculous events were very far from being as numerous as in the last and that even here they were quite frequently interpolations of Roger's own and did not occur in Benedict's chronicle which Hoveden was following.

We cannot think that roger was a conscious, intentional impostor. We may regard them as part of the current popular belief. We shall find even so independent a thinker as William of Mewburgh forced to accept the evidence of prodigies and giving a half-hearted approval to such stories. We cannot blame the people of the period. To them God's omnipotence was revealed in stories like Joshua's halting the sun and of Elijah's and Elisha's experiences and the Plagues of Egypt and the miracles of the New Testament. They expected Him once more to interpose in the courses of nature.

Many of these stories are coincidences, which are linked and explained as cause and effect. Some are based on credible facts which have a natural explanation, known to nodern science, though much embroidered in retelling. only a residue are pure invention which succeed in establishing themselves because of the possibility of other miraculous events.

It is strange that Bishop stubbs should mention ${ }^{1}$ the
particular type of Iegend, namely, living dogs and toads hermetically sealed in beds of rock as reported by William of Newburgh . We ourselves hesitate to reject flatly newspaper reports of ducks or frogs found embedded in a tree trunk and still alive, or of living frogs found at considerable depths in sinking a well, as recorded in the press Within the past two years. Hence their inclusion should not lead us to question the general credibility of the narrator. The period to which this volume is devoted is a rather uneventful one. Some of the greatest characters such as de Puiset and Longchamp have been removed from the stage, and in others, like Geoffrey of York, soon to follow them, the fires of personal hatreds and angers have burned $10 w$. The few excommunications uttered by Geoffrey are but feeble echoes of those all-inclusive interdicts, excommunications and anathemas, with their resultant cross-fire and counter proclamations, hurled with mighty thunders in the later years of Henry II and the earlier years of Richard I. Only distant mutterings are heard of wars in the Holy Iand. There is a lull in constitutional struggles. The positions, privileges and rights of the Church in general, and of Ganterbury and Durham in particular, and of the justiciar

1. Wm. Newb. Lib 1. C. 28.
and chancellor, have been crystallized, and the barons have not yet girded themselves to go to Runnymead.

There are, however, some important events recorded. In 1198 a great council was held at oxford. At this meeting Hubert, archbishop of Canterbury and justiciar sought on behalf of the king the maintenance of a force of three hundred knights in foreign service

> "or that they should give him the same amount of money, whence he himself could retain three hundred knights in his service by the year, that is to say three shillings per day for each knight measured in English money, in release of the requirement of sending the men. And when all the others who were present were inclined to do this, not daring to resist the wish of the king only, Hugh, bishop of Iincoln, a true champion of God, keeping himself from ali evil works, replied that for his part he by no means rested satisfied with this wish of the king, first because it would, in process of time, rebound to the hurt of his church, and then because his successors would say, "our fathers wasted the unripe grapes and struck dumb the mouths of their sons, Hubert the archbishop, he warned himing towards do nothing that would cause shame, whence shame should mark his forehead, the thought of which, would twist his mind, or disgrace should injure the fair Iame of their tradition.

The Council refused the request, a very important step, for it set a precedent. It does not appear whether Hugh's words impelled the others to protect the rights of the Church, or Whether his boldness induced them to stand up for their own, different, objections. We might infer from the wording that
some members had voiced some dislike of the idea but were afraid to vote against it, because of the possibility of the king's being displeased. Posterity, however, did not trouble itself with the reasons but only concerned itself with the fact that the council had refused a grant of money to the king。

The other important event of 1198 was the exaction of a carucage. This is remarkable in several ways. It was an attempt on Richard's part to reach those who had escaped taxation and to distribute the burden more evenly. Hence it was levied ${ }^{1}$ on every carucate, but those holding by honorable service other than knights were exempt ${ }^{2}$.

Another feature is that it does away with the variable carucate and its fixation at the same size as a hide, that is one hundred acres. Hoveden says:
"The same year Richard king of England took from each carucate or hide of land in the whole of England an aid of five shillings ...... Those who were elected and appointed for the carrying out of this business for the king decreed through the agreement of the lawful men, one hundred acres of land to each carucate of wainage."

Not only does this fix the carucate, but of necessity this involves a resurvey of the whole kingdom, and the almost

1. Ibid. P. 46.
2. Hov. IV. 47.
total abandonment of the Domesday survey. Thus events are leading towards Magna Carta.

There is a second way in which this prepared for the Charter. Richard enforced both the Forest Assize and the carucage against the clergy ${ }^{1}$ with great severity. John started where fichard left off. In 1200 he collected ${ }^{2}$ an aid in the form of a carucage on all England of three shillings on each hide of land. This first roused the barons and gave them a definite predisposition to resist John.

The most important feature of this tar is still to be mentioned. This is the method of collecting ${ }^{3}$, which, for a tax, was entirely new.
"And for the collecting of this tax the king sent through each county of england one clerk and one knight, who, with the sheriff of the county and the knights lawiully chosen for this purpose, duly sworn that they would carry out the king's business, caused to come before them the senechals of the barons of that county and from any manor the lord and bailiff of that manor, and the reeve with four lawful men of the manor, whether free or villein and two lawful knights of the hundred who swore that they would declare faithfully and without fraud.... (then the various classifications, and that they would record the amount, at five shillings on each hide, in each of four copies of a roll).... These monies will be received by the hands of the two lawful knights of each hundred and by the hand of the bailiff of the hundred, and they shall

1. Ibid. IV. 66.
2. Ibid. IV. 107.
3. Ibid. IV. 46.
answer for it to the sheriff and by the atore mentioned rolls the sheriff shall answer for it at the Exchequer in the presence of the bishops, abbots and barons assigned to this work."

The method of choosing the knights and lawful men is not clear, but it is plain that they were no longer nominated by the Crown. Hence, with no spectacular clash, it is admitted that elected representatives have some voice in the assessment of taxes on property. The setting aside of Domesday for a new valuation to be made by representatives of the taxpayers gives these latter a direct voice in the determination of taxation. It only remains to call these knights to appear at the Curia Regis to answer to the king and advise him of the state of their counties and a parliament of commanes will have come into being. The machinery by which this would be brought about was already working--for knights were already appearing there to defend their verdicts in the county courts. This is one of the best examples we have met of England's method of progressing "from precedent to precedent".

In 1197 Richard issued ${ }^{1}$ an Assize of Measures standardizing the weights and measures in a national system and laying down rules for widths and quality of cloth. This was the first attempt that was made to set up uniform standards and to check fraud in measures and quality. It proved too severe

1. HOV. IV. $33,34$.
and after a failure to enforce $i t^{1}$ at St. Botolph's Fair in 1201 John had to relax some of its provisions.

We left Geoffrey at the point ${ }^{2}$ where he had quarrelled with Richard in 1195 because he rebuked the king's sins, and when a new order was received from Rome cammanding the arehbishop to appear Geoffrey went to Rome where he found his opponents. He appears to have won over Pope Celestine ${ }^{3}$, convinced him that the charges were false and was restored by the pope to his see. Richard was furious, forbade him to return and left Adam the archdeacon in charge. Roger showed the pope's letter, excommunicated Adam ${ }^{4}$ and returned to Rome. His secretary, Ralph of Wigetoft confessed that he had sent some forged letters to England and had tried to poison Dean Simon of York--as he said by Geoffrey's orders ${ }^{5}$. Many of Geoffrey's friends and his own appointees turned against him. In 1198 Geoffrey met Richard in Nomandy ${ }^{6}$ and made peace

1. Ibid. IV. I72.
2. HOV. III. 287.
3. Ibid. IV. 7.
4. Ib. IV. 9.
5. Ibid. 15.
6. Ibid. IV. 44 .
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with him. Richard proposed arbitration of the chapter quarrel, but was won over by the dean and canons. Only Hugh Murdac remained faithful to Geofrrey, and Simon the dean promptly excommunicated him. At this point Celestine III died and was succeeded by Innocent III. Geoffrey hastened to Rome and laid his case before him. The new pope saw through all the intriguing and decided in favour of Geoffrey. Geoffrey was to confirm the king's acts and Richard was to restore the archbishop to his see ${ }^{2}$. Geoffrey would not agree. Richard was dead before any settlement was reached. Immediately after his coronation in 1199 John ordered everything restored to Geoffrey3. The latter thaving concluded his business with the pope according to the desire of his own heart returned to Normandy and was received by his brother John honorably and in Priendly fashion. "4 After a funther attempt at reconciliation between Geoffrey and the chapter by Hugh of Lincoln ${ }^{5}$ agreement was finally reached between all parties in $1200^{6}$.
I. Ibid. IV. 52.
2. Hov. IV. 67.
3. Ibid. IV. 92.
4. Ibid. 93.
5. Ibid. 98.
6. Ibid. 126 .
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Affairs, however, did not go smoothly and John, after his second coronation, at Westminster, with Isabel, again aispossessed Geoffrey, who replied by excommunicating the sheriff and other officers. ${ }^{1}$ John restored his estates but ordered him to appear and defend himself, and apparently he satisfied John ${ }^{2}$. The following March, I20I, he was reinstated on payment of a money fine to the ling. 3 This seems to have been the use and fate of Geoffrey. Both Richard and John squeezed all the money they could from him, making his life unbearable, and then punishing him when he struck back.

Immediately after restoration he appointed his friend Hugh Murdac archdeacon of Cleveland. This orfended the dean ${ }^{4}$, Simon, and the chepter and their nominee Honorius of Richmond. The latter appealed to Rome. The pope investigated and wrote to Geoffrey, rebuking him for his overbearing conduct, and ordering him to correct his abuses. John removed him and again replaced him on payment of one thousand pounds sterling 5 , and surrender of his baront.
I. Ibid. 139.
2. Ibid. P. 140 .
3. Ibid. P. 157.
4. Ibid. 158.
5. Ibid. 163.

Honorius was granted the archdeaconry by the pope but Geoffrey would not agree. There follow twenty pages of the quarrel, appeals and conferences. On page 184 we are told that Honorius was upheld, evidently Geoffrey was left in possession of his see. This is the last mention in Hoveden of this stormy character, who appears to have had some good traits, notably his love of and fidelity to his father. But he possessed the waywardness, the fiery temper and the stubbornness of the Anjevin and these spoiled an otherwise fine character. He died in exile at Rouen in 1212.

Hoveden gives an account of Richardis death. It appears that in 1199 the Viscount of Iimoges found a great treasure of gold and silver in a well on his land. He sent a small part of it to Richard who refused it, claiming the whole. This the viscount resused, and Richard besieged his castle of Chaluz (Chaluz-Chabrol) with a large army. The garrison came out and offered to negotiate surrender. Richard refused, swearing to storm the castle and hang the garrison. He therefore rode round examining its defences and while he was engaged on this a certain Bertram de Gurdun fired at himwith a poisoned arrow, hitting him in the shouldere Richard rode off to the hospital and the siege was continued and the castle stormed by Marchadeus.

The doctor tried to extract the arrow but only the wood
came away leaving the poisoned barb in the wound. There were no means of cauterizing at hand and the iron was extracted wi thout it.

When it was seen that he was dying, he named John as his successor, thus setting aside Arthur. Then they brought Bertram into his presence and the king asked him, What ham have I done you, why did you wish to kill me?n And Bertram answered him,
> "You killed my father and my two brothers with your own hand, and novi I have wished to kill you. Therefore take your vengeance on me in what menner you wish, I will suffer glady whatever greater punishment you can conceive, now that you are killed, you who have conferred so many and so great evils on the world."

Then the king ordered him to be set at liberty, saying, "I forgive you for my death." The youth flung himself at the King's feet, begged hir to take his vengeance and urged him to live and be the hope and example of the vanquished. He was released but after Richards death was seized and flayed alive.

Hoveden gives definitions ${ }^{2}$ of the terms used in feudal rights, well known to readers of mediaeval history, sac and soc, tol and therm and infangentheor:-

1. Hov. 1i. 229.

What is Sac? Sac is when anyone shall have accused anyone by name, of something, and he shall have denied it, it shall be the right of the former whether the exacting of proof or of denial shall be proceeded with.

What is Soc? Soc is when anyone shall enter a plea in his own lands, it is in his own jurisdiction whether it shall be tried there or not.

What is Tol? Toliswhat we call teloneum, that is when one has the right of selling or buying in his own lands.

What is Theam? Theam is when anyone shall Iay a charge against anyone for something and the accused shal1 not be able to hold (or stay) the warrant, the forfeiture (or loss of Pi ght of defence) shall be the latteris, and similarly (i.e. vice versa) the cessation from the exercise of justice of the accuser if he shall have failed (to uphold the warrant).

What is infangentheof? All, who have sac and soc and theam and infangentheof, that is to say, the arorementioned customs, have the right to do justice on thieves known to have committed theit, where it concerns his own man (i.e. anyone who owes him homage), if such shall be taken upon his own (i.e. the lordrs), land. But they who have not this custom, of right, shall do justice in the presence of the court of the lord the king, in the hundreds, and in the wapentakes or in the shires.

We shall conclude our survey of Hoveden by quoting two
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of several epigrams ${ }^{2}$ on Richard.
Virus, avaritia, scelus, enomisque libido
Foeda fames, atrox elatio caeca cupido Annis regnamut bis quinnis arcubalista Arte, manu, telo prostravit viribus ista.

Spleen, greed, wickedness, lust without limit. Disgraceful glattony, brutally headstrong blind desire, These bore sway for twice five years, then an archer By his skill, his strength end his weapon laid them all Iow.
The second gives the other side of the picture:-
In hujus morte perimit formica Leonem Proh dolors in tanto funere mundus obit.

In his death the ant killed the Lion
Alas, what sorrowg the world perishes in so great a murder.

1. Ibid. IV. 84 .

## Chepter IV

Roger de Wendover.

Iittle is known of the writer of the work called "Flores Historiarum". Evidently he was born at Wendover in Buckinghamshire. The year of his birth is not known with certainty. A study of the recorded ages of monks at that period reveals that they commonly lived to some sixty five years. This would place Roger's birth at about 1170 A.D. Internal evidence gives little help or corroboration. He borrows largely for his account of events down to about 1180, after which date he appears to be an original writer. This suggests that 1170 errs perhaps in being too late, but that gives him an age at the time of his death of sixty seven years.

He entered the Abbey of St. Albans, Hertforashire, where he rose to the rank of prior. Somewhere between 1214 and 1235, possibly in 1224, he was degraded ${ }^{1}$, the cause, alleged by Walter de Trumpington the abbot, being that he had wasted the property of the house by extravagance. He was later recalled to the abbey and died there on the 6th of May 1237.

1. Wendover Chronica. Rolls Series London 1889 Vol. iii. Introd. P. IX.

In the preface to his work, quoted by Mr. J. A. 1
Giles, he states his reasons for writing. He says, in part, TThe lives of good men in times past are set forth for the imitation of succeeding times, and that the examples of evil men, when such occur, are not to be followed, but to be shunned." This, he proceeds, justifies the committal to writing of the stories of Cain, Abel, Job, Esau, the sons of Israel and of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah.

St. Albans was just such a spot as would inspire a literary-minded person to write a history. It is close to the site of the Roman town of Verulamium. The Roman buildings were made use of even before the conquest to furnish materials for the monastery buildings, and after 1100 the monastery was completed from this source. Indeed many stones show Roman inscriptions, and the austere character of the older parts is in no small measure due to the nature and origin of the materials used.

Another factor that might tempt such a person as Roger is to be found in the dates of various parts. The abbey was consecrated in 1115 and in 1155 the chapter

1. Wendover Fl. Hist, trans.Giles J.A., Iondon, Henry Bohn 1849. Preface $P .1$.
house was added, together with the cloister in which Roger must often have paced in studious mood. These, then, were comparatively recent events at the time when Roger entered the great gateway, which alone of the purely monastic builaings survives today.

The reason for the choice of name for his book is suggested in the preface mentioned above ${ }^{1}$.
"Finally, that which follows has been taken from the books of catholic writers worthy of credit, just as flowers of various colours are gathered from various fields, to the end that the very variety noted in the diversity of the colours, may be grateful to the various minds of the readers, and by presenting some which each may relish, may suffice for the profit and entertainment of all."

It is pleasant to note that the "smale fowles" are already "maken melodye" in the soul of a monk two centuries before Chaucer.

He concludes the preface to the second Book ${ }^{2}$ by a reiteration of his object in writing; "to the end that being admonished by past evils, men may betake themselves to humiliation and repentance, taking an example for imitation from the good and shunning the ways of the perverse."
I. Op. Cit. P.2.
2. Ibid. P. 3 .

He follows the pattern of his predecessors, from whom he borrows so much. In those days when histories were largely a matter of chronology it was natural that a writer should use previous compilations, transferring in extenso or condensing as seemed good to him. Thus it became the practice to begin with the Creation and to follow the history of the World, the Jews, of Aurope and of one's own country down to contemporary times. In this way Roger is indebted to many chroniclers, more especially Marianus Scotus, Bede and William of Malmesbury.

Matthew of Westminster reveals this characteristic very clearly. In his preface ${ }^{1}$ he gives his reasons for setting forth the chief events of the time. He then goes on, in an almost perfect echo of Roger of Wendover, to reply to the questions of "certain dull auditors" as to Why such things should be committed to writing. He answers thus ${ }^{2}$ :

Het them know that the good lives and virtuous manners of men of old time are recorded to serve as patterns for the imitation of subsequent ages; and thet the examples of the wicked are set forth, not that they may be imitated, but that they may be shunned."

1. Matth. of Westminster, Preface $P .1$.
2. Ibid. P. I.

Comparing this with the quotation given above ${ }^{1}$, we see e very close resemblance. He even continues, with like references to "prodigies and portents" as Roger does ${ }^{2}$. An even closer copy occurs in the list of Biblical characters where Roger speaks ${ }^{3}$ of

```
"the innocence of Abel, the envy of Cain, the
sincerity of Job, the dissimulation of ESau,
the malice of eleven of the sons of Israel,
the goodness or Joseph the twelfth, the punish-
ment of the five cities in their destruction
by fire and brimstone, to the end that we may
imitate the good, and carefully turn from the
ways of the wicked; and this not only does
Moses, but also all the writers of the sacred
page, who, by commending virtue, and holding
up vice to detestation, invite us to the love
and fear of God."
Matthew follows this closely}\mp@subsup{}{}{4
"...the innocence of Abel, the envy of Cain,
the simplicity of Jacob, the craftiness of
Esau, the malice of the eleven sons of Israel,
the goodness of the twelfth, to wit, Joseph,
and the punishment of the five cities which
were consumed by fire and brimstone; in order
that we may imitate the good, and avoid being
followers of the wicked and by shunning all
temptations to sin, we may radically weaken it;
```

1. Supra Ch. IV. P. I.
2. Rog. of Wend. Preface P. 3.
3. Ibid. Preface P. 1.
4. Matthew of Westminster. ed. C. D. Yonge. Vol. $I_{\text {, }}$ Prerace P. 2 .
and this is the effect produced in us not only by Moses, but by all the authors of the Holy Volume, both in their historical and moral works, where they commend virtue, and show their detestation of vice and so teach us at the same time to fear and to love God."

Who can doubt that Matthew had a copy of Roger?s nanuscript on his table as he penned the above passage?

Some information concerning the Chronicles and their writers can be obtained from the "Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani", by Thomes Walsingham who was historiographer to the Monastery of St. Albans in the reign of Richerd II. It is from him ${ }^{1}$ we leam of the removal of Roger from the post of Prior of Belvoin, "tempore guerrae". Henry Hewlett, Keeper of the Records of the Land Revenue snd editor of the Rolls Series edition of Wendover places this ${ }^{2}$ at either 1224, 1227 or 1231-4. He remarks that any of these dates will suit as the next entry is a report of a fire which occurred at Hatifeld Cell in 1231. But against this we must place the fact that the chroniclers did not always keep their narratives in strict chronological order. Indeed Hewlett points out that this very thing has occurred at this point in the "Gesta". If we are to assume

1. Wendover Rolls Series, Vol. iii, Preface P. VIII. /Vol.inin
2. Roger de Wendover Introd $P$.IX.
that Roger compiled his chronicle after his return to St. Albens the date 1231 leaves but little time before his death in 1236 in which to write his whole chronicle. We ourselves prefer to think that it was the well-stockea library at St. Albans that started Roger on his life-work. Which he may then have begun before his promotion. The date of his removal is then of little importance.

To the present writer it wolild seem to be of greater interest and importance to learn more of the circumstances of Roger's removal from the post of prior. Hewlett quotes a passage from Thomas Walsingham in which the official visit of the abbot of St. Albans, William de Trumpington is mentioned:
"Et cum visitasset Cellam de Bealvair, audivit arcanas querelas de Priore illius domus, Domino Rogero de Wendovere $u a s i$ dissipasset bona ecclesiae in prodigalite incircumspecta, ..... . Correptus igitur hoc ab Abbate, Prior se promisit talia profecto correcturum. Tamen Abbas ad horam dissimulans observabat omnia, haec conferens in corde sua....."

It is unlikely, from the tone of the last uncompleted sentence that the full text would answer our modern queries. One is tempted to ask, Why were the complaints secret, (arcanas)? Does it mean that Roger's examination was

[^2]private or that the charges were anonymous? If the latter, was it customary to take such drastic and summary action in monasteries of the Thirteenth Century? on the face of it, all that we can answer is that such was the case. Again what did the Abbot consider a "prodigalitas"? He may have spent a disproportionate amount of the Cell's allowance on parchment-he was an enthusiastic writer. In what way was it "incircumspecta"? Does he mean ill juaged or indiscreet? After his arrest the Prior promises complete amenas. "Nevertheless the Abbot, dissembling at the time, notices everything, hiding these things in his heart." Is Roger to be given no chance to defend himself and equally none if undefended with an unnamed accuser? Is he not to be allowed to make good the indiscretion? To judge by the abbey financial accounts given in such books as the Register of Malmesbury it may have been wine. This aiscussion brings out the contrast very well between the ancient historiographer and the modern philosophic historian. The monk has not only detachea himself from the world, he has withdrawn into his cell, There he lives his life aloof, alone. He chronicles What he observes and learns, and "nothing extenuates on sets down aught in malice." He is a recorder, he must have no opinions, he has no personal feelings, he must show only disinterested interest. That is almost as far as his
philosophy of history goes. The incident serves to show the difference between the Thirteenth and Twentieth Century attitudes, for today a recorder woud discuss the circumstances, the full causes, the justice or otherWIse, and perhaps the community attitude towaras the defendant and his punishment. In connection with Hoveden's account of the Council of Clarendon it has already been noted ${ }^{l}$ that we do find occasional passages that reveal personal bias, though in that particular passage it is difficult to call it other than bias, it scarcely rises to the level of judgment or considered opinion. In the same way Hoveden's fuller treatment of the affairs of the See of Durham is probably due to his fuller knowledge of that area.

Since Roger, in common with so many of the writers. and especially the earlier ones, starts his nerrative with 010 Testament history it may be of interest and profit to trace his sources and to discuss as far as possible with the materials available, how much of himself is in his chronicle and wherein his composition is original.

Thomas of Walsingham, the monk of St. Albans, witing

1. Supra Chap. III, P. 7.
in the Fourteenth Century speaks thus of Roger:
Consequentur in nostro monasterio flomait Roger us de Wendover, noster monachus, cui paene totius regni chronographi quicquid habent. Nam plane et perlucide ab initio mundi per annorum distinctionem digessit cronica sua usque ad tempora Regiso

Modern scholars consider that the earlien part of the work is an adoption and adaptation by Rogex from an earlier Writer but the author is unknown and his manuscript is lost. Mr. Hewlett quotes ${ }^{2}$ from Sir Thomas Hardy's writings on the subject of Roger's sources. The latter was of opinion that the portion down to the Mativity of Our Lord was taken from the $01 d$ Testament, extracts from Bede, Methodius, St. Augustine, Geoffrey of Monmouth and others. From this point to 1066 he draws on the New Testament, Bede, Geoffrey of Monmouth, William of St. Albans, Henry of Huntingdon, Florence of Worcester, Sigebert of Gemblours, William of Malmesbury and others. The period from 1066 to 1154 is obtained from much the same sources together with the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. In the section down to about 1200 he araws from some of those already mentioned and from Ailred of Rievaulx, Ralph de Diceto, Benedict of Peterborough, Roger de Hoveden and others.

The Rolls Series edition does not incluae the earlier

1. Wendover, Rolls Series Introduction, $P$. XI.
2. Wendover, Rolls Series, Vol. iii. Intr. P. XIII.
part of the work, but opens with the year 1154 A.D. From this point possibly to 1200 he is drawing his materials from other chroniclers who are more reliable than those used for the earlier part, and hence this section of his work is extremely useful.

From 1200 to 1235 we may assume that he is writing of contemporary events. This part is regarded by scholars as his own original work.

Mr. Core edited Wendover's works for the English Historical Society and it was his text that Dr. J. A. Giles translated. This edition opens with the coming of the Angles in 447 A.D.

Dr. Giles has this ${ }^{1}$ to say of the earlier part:
To all this portion of his work, copies from the Roman and Greek writers, and from the romance of Geoffrey of Monmouth, not the slightest value is to be attached.
Of the same section Mr. Coxe says ${ }^{2}$ :
The history of England, indeed at this period, is to be sought.... in the works of Caesar, Tacitus, Dion Cassius, Suetonius and others, whom Wendover, we regret to say, has rejected for the fables of Geoffrey of Monmouth whom he has made almost his sole authority3.

1. Wend. Chronicle. Giles Vol. I. Preface P. VI.
2. Wend. R.S. iii. Preface P. XIV.
3. Wend., Coxe Vol. IV. Preface P. XIII.

The section from 447 to 1200 A.D., we have remarked, was a re editing of various historians. He appears to have altered little of the original, and indeed this gives it a curious value, on which Dr. Giles remarksl:

It is well known that the monastic historians were in the habit of copying largely from one another.... Every monastery had its chronicler whose duty it was to record the events of the day. When a history or chronicle of past events was to be copied....it was an obvious proceeding to bring down the narrative to the time of the writer. A new writer, moreover, did not hesitate to copy or abridge.... and in some cases in consequence of this practice, the original disappeared altogether from existence. This would have been the case with hoger de Wendover were it not for the curious fact, that the very copy of his work, which Matthew Paris, his continuator, used as a basis for his own more extended labours is still in existence. From an inspection of this MS., and a comparison of it with other copies of Matthew Parisis own history, it appears that the latter writer embodied Roger de Tendover verbatim in his own work, altering occasionally a single sentence, or adding a few paragraphs of his own.

It was due to this fact that Roger's work was formerly ascribed to Matthew Paris.

Dr. Iuard, in the preface to his edition of Matthew Paris, makes some comments on Roger de Wendover which are made use of by Mr. Hewlett in his introduction ${ }^{2}$. In most cases he follows his authority word for word, sometimes, however, he merely abridges. Frequently he enlarges and

1. Wend., Giles, Vol. I. Pref. P. VII.
2. Wend., R.S., Vol. III. Pref. P. XVI。
embellishes, introducing rhetorical flourishes merely for effect. He seems to consider all his authorities of equal value and his stories, whether legendary or historical, of equal interest. He affixes dates to his stories, and sometimes alters details to suit his own times. He makes no attempt to correct wrong quotations in his own authorities. There are also attempts to make the fabulous stories more probable by altering the names given in them which would be inconsistent with the dates to which they are assigned. Sometimes he tries to reconcile discrepancies by minute alterations, but more frequently he is not deterred by finding contrary accounts in different authorities and simply copies both.

The only personal trait that shines through to our own day is his apparent magnanimity. Walter de Trumpington, the abbot had dismissed him from his priory, giving him no opportunity to redeem his promise to mend his ways. Yet Roger shows no spite in his account of Walter's abbacy, though he is often outspoken in criticism of those in high places, and the abbot was dead before Roger finished his work.

His worst fault is his acceptance of rumour as proof of fact. For example he tells the story of the death of William, Earl of Salisbury, ${ }^{l}$ uncle of Henry III. William

1. Ibid. Vol. II. P. 297.
arrived at Marlborough to visit the king, after a stormy voyage from France. A rumour had gone out that he had been drowned. The justiciar, Hubert de Burgh, gained the kingis consent to a marriage between the countess and his nephev Raymond, The lady refused, saying that she would have nothing to do with him, even if her husband were dead, which she doubted. Salisbury, on arrival, laid a complaint against Hubert, who was compelled to nake amends. After giving presents he invited Willian to a banquet, where, "ut diciturn, he was poisoned. Then Roger tells with full circumstances of Salisbury's death after confessing himself a traitor to the king. We are then told the usual miraculous event, how candles, carried in the funeral procession for about a mile through wind and rain were not extinguished, proving that the earl had been forgiven.

The story rests entirely on the probability of hatred between the two men being pushed to extremes. It is told by Roger as seriously as any well authenticated incident, and as if de Burgh had been tried and convicted. Yet, as even Roger tacitly admits by his "it is said", it was only a rumour.

In 1230 after a baronial war the nobles of France with-

1. Ibia., II. 29.

## -160-

drew their allegiance from the king, Roger assigns as the reason that they scorned to serve under a queen who had been mistress to the Count of Champagne and also to the Roman 1egate. Coxe says ${ }^{2}$ that French historians have rejected the story as at variance with reliable evidence. Roger states it as true.

All the early chronicles are disjointed owing to the ir close adherence to diary form. Hoveden could break from this on occasion and follow an incident or a person to a climax. Wendover shows no such ability. Again Hoveden places ecclesiastical events in their true perspective. Nendover breaks his narrative to record the consecration or death of some wholly unimportant cleric. Church affairs loom too largely in his writings. Under the years 1180 and 1181 we had been reading of the important events between Henry of Ingland and Philip of France. Then we are given the letter from Pope Alexander to Prester John, which also occurs in Hoveden. Next we are told that Geoffrey, son of Henry II, resigned as bishop-elect of Lincoln ${ }^{3}$; that he is succeeded by Walter of Constance; that Walter of Rochester died; that Simon, abbot of St. Albans died and was succeeded

1. Wend., R.S. III. 4.
2. Wend. ed. Coxe, IV. 216 note.
3. Wnd., R.S. I. 128.
by Warinus, the prior. ${ }^{1}$
Again, the death of Henry brings Richard into prominence. Wendover follows the latter fairly persistently tili his coming to England for his coronation. At this point he injects a paragraph to inform us ${ }^{2}$ that Geoffrey, bishop of Ely died. Then he resumes, with a description of Richard's coronation.

Under the years 1204 and 1205 he devotes very considerable space to religious affairs, telling of the death of Geoffrey, bishop of Winton ${ }^{3}$ and the election of his successor; he gives a long account of the death of Hubert, archbishop of Canterbury, and election of his successor. ${ }^{4}$ This is followed immediately by an account of the election of John as bishop of Normich and at once we are plunged into the quarrel between the regular and secular clergy of Canterbury over the election of Reginald as archbishop. This is out of all proportion to the importance of the events.

Often he records events in parts yet fails to see the connection. To illustrate this we will trace the story of the Becket quarrel as given by Roger.
1.
2. Ibid., P. 163.
3. Wend. R.S., ii. 9.
4. Ibid. P. 10 .

The first reference is to the agreement arrived at between king and archbishop in 1170. We are left to infer, from the preceding account of the coronation of Prince Henry by the Archbishop of York and the Pope's letter of veto, that the quarrel arose from Henry's persistence in pressing on with the coronation in spite of Canterbury's absence. No modern historian, as far as our researches have gone, uses Wendover as authority for the story, which is told by Diceto ${ }^{2}$. Wendover simply records the meeting at Amboise and the reconciliation. Then he gives the text of King Henry's despatch to Prince Henry, restoring Thomas's possessions and that of the Popers letter to the archbishop. He traces the acts of the primate excommunicating the archbishop and bishops and the command of the king to withoraw his ban. Without further narration or explanation we are brought to the Christmas Day sermon. Immediately the arrival of the four knights is recorded and the martyrdom consumated.

No reason is assigned for their conduct, nor is any comnection shown between them and the king. Stranger still,

1. Ibid., I. 79.
2. Diceto I. 313 .
3. Wend. R.S., I. 83.
we are told of the king's grief and repentance ${ }^{l}$, and of how he put on sackcloth and swore that he had neither wished nor connived at the murder. Later we find him in conference with the popers envoys denying complicity in the murder, yet promising to maintain two hundred knights for a year in defence of the Holy Land. Here for the first time do we learn anything of the original cause of the murder when it is reported that the king explained to the envoys that "his words spoken in anger, that he provided for a sorry set of knights and followers who were too cowardly to take his part against the archbishop, had caused his murderers to put the man of God to death."

Even this does not connect up the parts of the story as well as could have been done by an early recording of the words, Who will rid me of this troublesome monk?"

It may be pointed out here that a reference to the original MS. Would be necessary to elucidate the authorship of the account. It is known that Matthew Paris in editing Wendover requently rearranged the paragraphing and often inserted sentences which clear up obscure references. This may be an emended passage.

Hewlett criticizes Wendover ${ }^{2}$ for his omissions and
I. Ibia., P. 90 .
2. Wend. R.S., iii. Intro. P. XX.
appears to regard Paris more highly because the latter saw why the obscurity arose and corrected it by inserting material. Hewlett instances the halting account which Roger gives of the dealings of John with the Pope. He inserts an appendix ${ }^{1}$, quoting from Paris the account on John's secret embassy to the Emir of Morocco, offering to become his vassal. This is a most circumstantial account, apparently by an eye witness, probably told to Paris long after Johnts death. The emir rejected the offer with becoming dignity but great scorn. ${ }^{2}$ John had no hope of help from any other quarter and this may have brought political affairs to a orisis.

While holding no brief for Wendover, we would like to point out that it is highly probable that John's acts appeared as inexplicable to Roger as they would to us, had Paris not written his account and that Wendover's lack of clearness may be due not to short-sightedness but to his never having heard of the embassy to Morocco. It is noticeable throughout that his reports of despatches from John are brief ${ }^{3}$ and usually in indirect narration, whereas

1. Ibid., P.IXix.
2. Ibid., P.Ixri.
3. Ibid., Vol. ii. P. 138 .
those arriving, and especially those from Rome, which would the more easily become known to a monk and a prior, are given in full in direct narration. This is notably true of the Pope's first despatch on the subject of the conduct of the barons.

John's despatch to the Pope, just mentioned, is reported in half a page. Only the Pope's exclamation is reported directly. The papal bull annulling the barons! liberties is quoted in full occupying four pages.

In passing we may note the Pope's remark ${ }^{2}$ beginning "verum etiam plenariam libertatem contulit ecclesiae Anglicanee". The passage reads:-1"... but also granted full liberty to the English Church; and further, both deorees beins annulled, he yielded his kingdom of England as well as that of Ireland to St. Peter and the Church of Rome, receiving it from us in fee under an annual charge of one thousand marks, and under oath of fealty to us as appars by his charter sealed with the golden bull."

Thus, the grant of freedom to the Church of England contained in Magna Carta is wiped out; the Crown loses the right to make appointments and the Church is forever chained in subjection to Rome.

The childike mind of the mediaeval monk is not the best mechanism for the appraisal of character. Richard and

[^3]John differed considerably. The characteristic of Kichara which has shone most steadily through the ages is his chivalry coupled with his semi-brutal military skill of brain and arm. That of John is his fatal weakness of will. coupled with that underground craftiness that is so often found in a weak character. But viewed from the point of moral standards and character there is little difference between the brothers. Yet we find that Wendover praises Richard for his wisdom and heroism ${ }^{\text { }}$ and does not blame overmuch his unfilial conduct ${ }^{2}$ to his father or cruelty to the Jews 3 , while he reports, with little comment it is true, the harsh things said about John. This is especially true of criticisms of the Pope. And we think that herein is the explanation of his blindness and bias, for kicherd was the Kright who tool the Cross and went to the Holy Land and was the benefactor of religious houses, while John took the Cross but turned back, and was the one who sold the English Church for a mess of pottage.

Wendover waxes almost eloquent ${ }^{4}$ over Kichard's military provess when he defeated the force at Joppa in 1192 sent by

1. Ibid., i. 215 .
2. Ibia., i. I54.
3. Ibid., i. 166.
4. Ibid., Pp. 214-215.

Saladin to capture him at all costs. According to Wendover there were sixty-two thousand Saracens while Richard had but eighty lnights, only eleven being horsed, and four hundred cross-bowmen. Surely Leonidas and Alexander must have looked on from the clouds.

Roger forgets his customary coldness and breaks out into picturesque phrases to speak of "quivering lance", "thunderous blows", "clashing sword" and "helmed heads". And towards the end of the description he speaks of the "invincible bravery of the king and his men".

We have mentioned that Roger says little in criticism of Richardis conduct, especially his treachery to his father and his cruelty to the Jews. In contrast to this we would place the account of the death of Hugh of Coventry. In order to catch the tone it should be quoted in full, but it is too long for this. This reveals one of his leading qualities. More space is given to this death than to matters that profoundy affected England and Europe.

It appears that Hugh, bishop of Coventry or of Chester, took seriously ill in Jormandy on his way to Rome in 1198. Feeling that he was about to die he sent for all the abbots and priors, that could reach him, to come. Then when they were assembled, "flens at ejulans" he confessed sins, faults

1. Ibid., I. 273,274 。
and offences. So dreadful was his confession that the monks were aghast at so great wickedness. He begged them to name his penance but they were wholly unable to do so. Then he condemned himself to purgatory till the day of judgment. They agreed that this was very meet and right. We have now read a full page of weeping and hand clasping, and the bewildered lay mind begins to wish that the writer would tell us to what depths of degradation the bishop had sunk, what blasphemies, what immoralities in an amoral age. At last he tells us. He had expelled the monks from Coventry and adding to the heap of all his evils he had introduced irreligious priests in their places

As we turn the pages of Chaucer we wonder if this was a curse or a blessing to Coventry, to Hugh's discredit or glory.

In the same way, we find that Hugh, bishop of Lincoln, receives but a poor obituary notice. It runs ${ }^{1}$ :-

In the same year, (1235) died Hugh bishop of Lincoln, the enemy of all monks, on the 7 th of February, and was buried in the cathedral church at Iincoln.

Where the commentator is so obviously biassed we can put little trust in his opinions. We find ourselves unable to agree whole heartedly with Mr. Hewlett when he speaks of Roger's even-handed justice. He cites ${ }^{2}$ Vendoveris

[^4]recording of the Christian mercy of the unnamed knight as being just as well displayed as the virtues of Richard. But it might be argued that the story of the knight is told in full for two different purposes. First it gives Roger a chance to mention the miraculous bowing of the head and 2
shoulders of the figure on the cross, and secondly, it leads on to a hymn of praise of Richardis mercy and magnanimity that quite overshadows the tribute to the knight.

Richard had conferred many favours on the monasteries, Ior which Roger admires him. It was safe to do so, for Richard was already something of a tradition and had long been a popular idol. His censures of John ${ }^{3}$ are not very daring for John was dead, he had never been popular and the party that had checked him was still in power. He attacks the clergy, with what justification we are not sure. Further it required little courage to do so, for it was well-known that the regular and secular clergy were not on good terms, and besides it was unlikely that any of the latter would see the chronicle, at least during Rogeris life-time.

1. Ibid., iii. 24.
2. Ibid., iii. 23.
3. Ibia., ii. $47,63,162$.

The most daring of his criticisms are directed against the Papacy. Bven here we notice that most of his remarks are levelled at papal legates, and his censures of either the papacy ${ }^{7}$ or a legate are concerned with excessive exactions. Now this is a perfectly safe course for these levies were causing much opposition both by clergy and laity. The Church in England had always shown a wayward insularity, and both legates and the papacy were at this time suffering from an increasing unpopularity. Since he shows little sense of appreciation of the relative importance of events, as already noted, it is not surprising if he serves out praise and blame to high and low with little distinction of persons.

We are not prepared to write down his value as an historien simply because of his short-sightedness. He had not access to all the information required for fair eraluation, - and he was too close, in time, to the events he recorded to get a true perspective.

Wendover gives an uncoloured picture of the times in recounting events belonging to the revellion of the barons in 1173-74. We are apt to speak of "Stephen's stormy reign", and to consider the Wars of the Roses as a serious breach of the king's peace which, we take it, was the normal state of affairs. Roger'stotal lack of comment or

1. Ibid., i1. 360 。
of personal bias would lead us to infer that marchings and counter-marchings with the siege of a castle or town vere very usual proceedings. We read ${ }^{\text {l }}$ :

In the same year (1173) on the 3rd of July, by the order of the king, the city of Leicester is said ${ }^{2}$ to have been besieged, because the earl, the lord of that city, having left the king, the father, had fled to the king the son; but at length, since a great part of the city had been burned the citizens treated for peace, having given the king three hundred marks so that they might have leave to go wherever they wished.

Then we learn that William, king of Scotland, harried the North, burning several villages, killing women and children and collected priceless booty.

Under the following year we learn that Roger of Mowbray ${ }^{3}$ renounced his fealty to Henry II and repaired a ruined castle in the island of Axiholm, Iincolnshire. But a large number of men of that county crossed the Trent in boats, laid siege to it and compelled it to surrender.

In these and similar accounts there is no protest raised against the lawlessness of the war or the personal or property damage. Evidently such things were taken as matters of course.

1. Wend. R.S., I. 94 .
2. It is not clear to which word, rege or Legecestria, dicitur refers. There is no need to assume that the siege was only a matter of rumour. Miss Norgate reports it on the authority of Diceto and the Gesta Henricii, in England under the Angevin Kings Vol. ii, P. 146.
3. Wend. R.S., I. 97 .

We must not leave the topic of Wendover's criticisms of high and low without some remark on the standards of the day. It may have been an age of disorder, of force rather than of counsel; an age of superstition and credulity, rather than one of spirituality, yet above the welter of violence and immorality, there shines out clearly the fact that it was also an age that recognized that the Christian ideal, whose main principles were well known, was to be the aim of high and low.

Such a situation is not one of despair. Given a people of intelligence, with powers of organization and administration, it only requires experience, with the passage of time, to produce a nation that will give to the world a practical philosophy of "British justice and fair play".

It has already been remarked that the chroniclers of the period gathered up many stories of the miraculous and supernatural. Several instances have been quoted in the chapter on Roger Hoveden. Ho chronicler can surpass Wendover in this respect. One can find some such story on almost every page. They appear to be the breath of his nostrils, and certainly a world in which the re were not innumerable instances of Divine intervention with the natural course of events would be a very unnatural world to Wendover.

## -173-

One of the longest and most detailed of these stories concerns the discovery of the relics of St. Amphibalus ${ }^{1}$. It seems that St. Alban appeared one night to an honest and detout burgher of the abbey town. The saint ordered him to arise and follow that he might be shown the burial place of St. Amphibalus. This was discovered in a mound some distance north of the town. On the opening of the mound a light shone forth which gradually lighted up the whole world. Then they closed up the ground again.

The abbot decidea to open the tomb, but nothing was done fon some time. Meanwhile people thronged to the place, so that it was never deserted, and many miraculous cures were wrought and other supernatural incidents took place. On st. Alban's day the sepulchre was opened and the bodies of St. AmphibeIus and nine companions were found.

The passage desciibing the ontry of some one bringing the news ${ }^{2}$ is one of the very few whene Roger becomes animated. The monks were at dinner and were listening to an account of the nartyrdom of st. Amphibalus with all the harrowing deteilso The messenger bursts in with the news and Roger is quite overcome. He can only bring in his

1. Wend. R.S. I. 109.
2. Ibid., P. II4.
favorite flourish--Quid ergo?, to be folloved a page later by his other phrase, Guid multa?

Several supernatural circumstances attend ed the transfer of the martyr to the abbey church and many healing mixacles were recorded subsequentiy. Roger asks pardon for the digression. One can almost imagine that he is really asking it for his show of feeling.

Another remarkable story is that of the monk of Evesham ${ }^{1}$. This is told at great length and with a remarkable wealth of detail. It concerns a monk who thought that he was dying, and hence prayed that he mi ght be shown something of the future life before he departed this one. His prayer was answered and in a vision the world of the spirit was revealed to him by a venerable though comely person. His guide conducted him throush the first, second and third places of punishment, which are described with Iurid though not artistic detail ${ }^{2}$.
".... some were burned in the fire, others vere roasted in a pan, for some, red hot nails were driven into their bones..... others suffered torture in baths of pitch and sulphur with horrid smell, or with liquid brass or lead and other kinds of metals..... immense worms with poisonous teeth gnawed others, others in dense array were transfixed on stakes with ifery thoms."

1. Ibid. I. 246-266.
2. Ibid., Po 253.

## -175-

And so he proceeds through the other two places of punishment. He does not specify the people or their sins. A dishonest gold-smith and an unconfessed lawyer are the only ones mentioned.

He next passes through the three dwellings of the blessed. In the first we meet an abbess, a prior and a priest. In the other two no one is mentioned. The description lacks the vigour and liveliness of the purgatory. Sweet odours, rest and increasing brightness appear to be the only attributes of the paradise.

The whole story bears such a resemblance to that of Dante, though without his magic genius, that one wonders if there was some traditional tale commonly current in Europe in the Thirteenth Century, which Roger has boldiy included. Under the date 1204 we 1 earn' of the conversion of some drops of oil from a figure of the Virgin to flesh and b10od. This took place in the prison of the Christian soldiets in the castle of Damascus.

Another long story concerns the daughter of a noble house, who joined the order of the minorites. After many Jears she began to regret what she had given up and then the Devil assailed her. However she fought him so successfully

1. Ibid. ii. 3.
that he became her slave. Then one night while lodging in a private house a young man tried to ravish her. But three times the Devil hurled him across the room so that he desisted.

We read ${ }^{2}$ that on the 8 th of April 1233 in the district of Hereford and Worcester there appeared four fictitious suns of different colours around the real sun. This wonderful spectacle was witnessed by more than a thousand trustworthy people, some of whom, on account of the unusual sight, painted suns and circles in various colours on parchment.

Almost at the close of his chronicle he tells us ${ }^{3}$ of a miracle performed by Roger de Lawes, a Minorite who was preaching in 1235 on behale of a crusade in the town of Clare.

It appears thet a woman, who had been unable to walk for three years, had herself carried to hear Roger's preaching. Here she lay groaning and lamenting. At the close Lawes questioned her and, ordering her to go home, discovered that she was paralysed. On her declaring her faith in God's power Roger lifted her up and she returned to her house

1. Ibid. ii. 292 。
2. Ibid. $11 i .50$.
3. Ibia. iii. I07.
completely restored.
Before leaving the detailed examination of the text, mention should be made of Wendover's report of papal exactions, the behaviour of Roman priests in England and the reaction of the English to these matters.

We are told that the Pope demanded prebends for his own use to do away with the evil practice of giving presents. His request was refused by subterfuge。 Roger's account is colourless in this. Three years later, in l229, the Pope asked tithes ${ }^{2}$ to carry on war against the Emperor Fredericir. The Church appears to have bowed to this, but there was much discontent. Roger reveals his own sympathies very clearly as Iying against Rome and reports: ${ }^{3}$ The land was filled with constant but secret maledictions, and all prayed that such exactions might never benefit the exactors.

A long passage ${ }^{4}$ deals with the insolence of the Roman clergy resident in England. Roger describes the formation of a secret, informal league of passive resistance to these clergy, and later tells how grain belonging to some of the

1. Ibia. ii. 295 .
2. Ibid. ii. 3750
3. Ibid. ii. 377.
4. Ibid. iii. Pp. I6-I9。
alien priests was seized by men who wore hoods over their neads. This was done with the connivance of the justiciar, Hubert de Burgh. In this passage Roger clearly sides against Rome, and throughout, although Wendover is very cautious, we can see that a strong national, insular feeling is rising. All classes are willing to acknowledge the spiritual leadership of Rome, but pegular and secular clergy; nobles and commons reveal a spirit, surprisingly like the temper of Englishmen in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and the present day, of opposition to arbitrary acts from within the kingdom or exactions or interference from without.

As an annalist he cannot compare with Hoveden, ei ther in style, matter or reliability. So little is momn of him personally that judgment is difficult, but he appears to have been a man of little if any better education than the average monk. He certainly was not well placed for foming an estimate of the political significance or value of the incidents he narrates. His life was too circumscribed, he cannot have travelled much. He had not the quick, active and highly intelligent mind of Hoveden. On the other hand, although Hewlett thinks that Rogex was unfavourably placed,

1. Ibid. Iil. Intro. xxix.
he admits later that Vendover's story of the Wandering Jew ${ }^{2}$ was obtained from a Inight of the retinue of the Archbishop of Armenia major, who visited the abbey in 1228.

This brings out a point worth mentioning. The abbeys Were the great hotels and guest-houses of those days, and as we learn from Jocelin de Brakelond, all sorts of travellers were entertained, either by the abbot in his own quarters or by the abbey in the guest-house. Thus Tendover would often meet both high and low, under circumstances where they could be induced to talk, more freely than they would have done had they been guests in a neighbouring castle where discretion would often have sealed their lips.

Another fact that was of assistance to Roger was that John de Cella who was abbot of St. Albans from 1195 to 1214. built up a valuable library ${ }^{3}$, and appears to have encouraged the writing of chronicles. He would be certain to give every assistance to the abbey chronicler.

Wendover has neither the scholarly style of that man 01 the world, Hoveden, nor the conversational tone of the

1. Ibid. iii. Intro. Exrry.
2. Ibid. ii. 352.
3. Ibid. iii. Intro. xii.
typical monk Jocelin, but he presents a fairly lively arafive, occasionally adorned with a few pet phrases or trite classical quotations. Which of us is free of these let him cast a stone.

He is not analytical, yet he uses judgment, especially from a moral standpoint. Here he is fair, frank and fearless, no respecter of persons and a bitter enemy of all unjust oppressors.

He may be regarded as the founder of the school of historians of st. Albans which reckons Matthew of Paris and Matthew of Westminster in its ranks.

These two things--the definition implicit in his work, of the duty and attitude of the historian, and the founding of the school-are the life work of Roger of Wendover.

## Chapter V.

## William of Newburgh.

Thus far we have dealt with major chroniclers in Hoveden and Ralph de Diceto, and while Wendover may be omitted from the list of major writers, he may be so classified for our present purposes as being the real founder of a. famous school of chroniclers. These, then, may be taken as representative of that class, which also includes Matthew Paris and Giraldus Cambrensis. Newburgh has been chosen because he stands midway between the major and minor writers and because of certain features of his book peculiar to itself, which will be treated in the course of this chapter.

Somewhat more is known of William than of most of these men. He himself tells us that he was born in the first year of Stephen, that is 1136 , and Howlett ${ }^{2}$ proves Pairly conclusively that he died in 1198. At a very early age he entered Newburgh Priory where he passed the whole of his life. The priory was situated in the neighbourhood of Byland and Rievaulx abbeys and there appears to have

1. Newburgh i. 19.
2. Ibid. 1. Pref. po X。
been considerable fraternal intercourse between the three. This would be of assistance in compiling their chronicles, for each would pass on whatever was learned, especially from their visitors. We know that there were such relations, for William opens his book with a dedication ${ }^{2}$ to Ernald, Abbot of Rievaulx, in the course of which it appears that Newburgh knew the brothers of Rievaulx and what they discussed. We lean later ${ }^{2}$ some facts that help to reveal more of his birthplace. He is describing the intermittent springs in east Yorkshire and says:

> "In provincia quoque Deiorum haud procul a loco nativitatis meae res mirabilis contigit, quam a puero cognovi. Est vicus aliquot a mari orientale milliariis distans, juxta quem famosae illae aquae, quas vulgo Gipse vocant, numerosa scaturigine e terra prosiliunt......

At the present day the Gipsey Race rising near Wold. Newton runs into the sea near Bridlington. As there was a priory at Bridlington which was the parent of Newburgh, and the springs at Wold Newton are not far from Bridington it is more than possible he was born at this latter place.

In II 54 the priory was removed to a site near the village of Coxwold by the side of the highroad from York

1. Op. cit. i. 3 .
2. Op. cit. i. 85 .
to the mouth of the Tees. This would place it in a very favourable position for meeting important travellers and no doubt brought William much information. The buildings have all disappeared and Newburgh lives on only in the celebrated history of its canon.

The sources of his work are harder to trace than almost any other writer. He opens the history with a prefatory chapter. In this he makes short mention of Bede and Gildas and then passes on to a very critical examination of Geoffrey of Monmouth. He shows how Geoffrey has passed beyond all bounds of being considered trustworthy. Thus it would seem that he knev several authors, but he never acknowledged his authorities. In connection with contemporary events he often says, "A boy told me," as in the case quoted, or "An old man says." Hoveden and Diceto like to quote a letter or proclamation in extenso, wherever possible and they leave the reader to fom his own opinions to a large extent. Newburgh tries to make it vivid by reporting events as far as possible in airect speech. often he has conveyed the substance but the words are his own invention. Thus both Hoveden ${ }^{1}$ and Newburgh ${ }^{2}$ give what

1. HOV. i. 169.
2. Newb. i. 29.
purports to be an eyewitness's account of the death of Thomas, Archbishop of York, in 1114. Both report Thomas's words, which differ widely in the two accounts. Hoveden says that in answer to the anxious queries of his friends Thomas answered: "Alas, through this sickness, no medicine avails against a life of luxury." Newburgh reports that being earnestly exhorted by his friends, because one would kill himself who did not obey the advice of the doctors, Thomas answered: "Be silent, no medicine of yours may whisper anything further of this advice, for I shall not at length lose the immortal glory of long-delayed virtue for the sake of the safety of the flesh."

This passage illustrates what we said above of Newburgh; he is careful to give the true substance of a story but he clothes it in a form of his own invention. Hoveden, on the other hand, is careful of both, and if he happens to possess the original, whether letter or proclamation, he gives an exact transcript of it. It is this habit that makes it, as we have said, hard to trace Newburgh's sources. He rearranges and recasts the narrative until it is often impossible to recognize the real author. Occasionally he leaves a sentence or clause unchanged and the original can be traced. In his account
of the death of William the Conqueror he says: ${ }^{1}$
Thus he slept with his father, a man quick in arms from his years of adolescence, of lofty mind, happy in success, a unique ornament to bastards; and was buried at Caen in the monastery of the protomartyr Stephen, which he himself had constructed from the foundations and had enriched exceedingly."

This sentence is said by Howlet ${ }^{2}$ to be the actual words of Symeon of Durham, the place given in the margin of the text as Column 214, line 4. Newburgh appears to follow Symeon up to the crowning of Stephen in 1136. The closing sentences of Chapter $V$ dealing with the war against the Scots in 1138, and the succession of Theobald of Eec to the primacy are taken from Henry of Huntingdon, as the quotation ${ }^{3}$ from Book VIII of the latter writer, gi ven as a footnote, goes to show.

In 1174 King Henry sent Rannulf de Glanville against
Hugh Bigod. This army captured William the Lion of
Scotland. Newburgh's style becomes quite animated at this point 4 . The messenger, sent to the king, urges the necessity of seeing Henry at once, though it is the middle of the night.
"And when the king had been wakened, 'Who," said he tare you?, And he said, 'I am the boy of

1. Op. cit. i. 21, 22 .
2. New. i. Pref. XXV.
3. Op. cit. p. 35 .
4. Ibid. 1. 189.

> "Rannulf de Glanville, your trusty servant, sent by whom I his messenger am come to your highness. Then the other, Is our Rannulf, said he, 'vell? And the first, 'He is well, my lord, and lo, he holds your enemy, the king of the Scots a captive in chains at Richmond.

Hore conversation is reported and the king leaps out of bed and with tears gives thanks to God, Who al one works marvels. This all follows closely the account, equally picturesque, given by Jordan Fantosme. 1

The Itinerarium of Richard the Canon appears also to have been read by Newburgh. Here again it is difficult to trace the use that has been made oving to Newburgh's habit of reading a portion and then recasting the whole from memory in his own style and phraseology. Yet his style is almost always affected by an author especially if that writer has a strongly marked literary style. There is a distinct change in form between the account ${ }^{2}$ of the quarrel of Richard and John with Philip in 1187 and that of the situation of the kingdom of Jerusalem, which immediately follows it. Here we see another characteristic of Newburgh, wherein he differs from most of the chroniclers of this period. The passage referred to above forms an

1. Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I, Vol. iii. Ed. by R. Howlett, Rolls Series, Iond on, Longman and Co, 1886. P. 366. II. 1966-1970 and 1985-2018.
2. New b. 1. 248 .
introduction to the account of the succession of Guy of Iusignan to the throne and of the fateful campaign of 1187 which led to the capture of the True Cross and the fall of Jerusalem. His introduction does not consist of any chain of events leading up to the campaign but of philosophising ${ }^{1}$ on the evils that the Holy Land has always sent upon any of her occupiers who have turned aside from the true religion. Here we see the first sign of the development of the chronicler into the historian.

Another source used is Hoveden. This is scarcely to be wondered at for Hewburgh was near Howden. Yet it was either Hoveden himself or someone who knew both men who gave the information, for little is borroued except two letters ${ }^{2}$ which are found only in Hoveden. These came from someone who was with the king throughout his journeys and the fighting. The first deals with Richardis course after the departure of Philip, and his massacre of the garrison of Acre, nominally for Saladin's failure to restore the Cross, but really as retaliation for the Saracen leaderis massacre of the Templars ${ }^{3}$ after the battle of Hittin in 1187. The second treats of the battle of Arsûf in 1191.

1. Newb. i, 250 to 255 .
2. Newb. i, 359,361 .
3. Ibid. i. 259.

All commentators are agreed that this person was Anselm, Richard's chapla in, who is known to have written an account of his experiences which has never been found. We recall that Hoveden closed his account of the flying fish observed in the Mediterranean with the words, "and he who told these things is he who saw them, and we know that his witness is true." One or two other items have been borrowed from Hoveden. He also draws from Ralph of Coggeshall.

It is most noticeable in reading through this chronicle that the author is thinking primarily of his manner of putting his tale before his reader and secondarily of the content and truthfulness of his tale. This is in strong contrast with others, notably Ralph de Diceto who told a plain unvarnished tale, and was far more concerned about telling facts as they happened with as little personal bias as possible. This is not to say that Newburgh deliberately invented; we cannot for a moment think of him as being in the same class as Geoffrey of Monmouth who is surely the Munchausen of chroniclers. It is Newburgh, and he alone, who attacks ${ }^{1}$ Geoffrey and at some pains, shows how absurd and fantastic is his story.

1. Iewb. i. Pp. 11 to 19。

It is very remarkable how often he relates an event in direct speech quoting the words of the persons concerned with many an "inquit" or "ait". An interesting point lies here. Howlett remarks that both Newburgh and Hoveden often report matters that must have had a common source, -the lost book of Anselm the chaplain. He further remarks that quite frequently the two accounts are not so much different, retellings of the same story as mutually supplemental accounts. We would advance the pure hypothesis that either these two were present when Anselm recounted events, an incident which may have taken place after his return from the Emperor's court, or even more probable, Anselm visited both Newburgh Priory and Howden. He would be likely to visit either of these or both en route to Durham. It will be recalled that Hugh de Puiset was still alive in 1194, and Anselm would be almost certain to visit him. This style is not developed fully until he begins to record the events of 1174 . Three cases occur before this, the first being a very simple one, so much so that one can hardly call it a literary device. It is in his account ${ }^{\text {I }}$ of his own visit to St. Godric, hermit of Finchele on his deathbed in 1170 . When it was seen that the spirit was
almost fled his lips often repeated the familiar words "Father, Son and Holy Spirit". A much more extended use is made of it ${ }^{1}$ in recounting the legend of Ketell, a rustic of Farnham in Yorkshire, who was reputed to have the power of seeing and conversing with devils. Here it has a definite literary and psychological value. He reports the actual conversation between Ketell and the devils. Then with the account of the invasion of the northern counties by William the Lion, King of Scotland in 1174, he begins to make it a regular feature.

The suggestion that this is due to his meeting eyewitnesses of these events is plausible. He is by this time a man of mature years and judgment and he hears echoes Within the cloister walls of the din of the outside world. But it is not the only possible explanation. A comparison with John Fantosme shows that it is equally probable that the latter's Iively style and dramatic telling galvanized at least temporarily this quiet monk who evidently was a man of considerable abilities and who, with the opportunities of Roger Hoveden or Ralph de Diceto, might have left a deeper mark on his nation.

1. Ibia. i. 151 to 154 。

There are nine manscripts of this chronicle although none of these is the original. There is reason to believe that the copy in the stowe collection was in the priory library during William's life-time. These are in the stow, Lambeth, Corpus Christi and Trinity College, Dublin, collections and in the Bodleian, the cotton and another British Museum collection. Three of these are apparently derived from the same source, but are too similar to have any value for comparisons. They are the Stowe, Lambeth and Cotton manuscripts. The first is of the Twelfth century beautifully written, and has suffered some mutilation. The second is also well written, of the Thirteenth Century, which is used to check up on the readings in the first and to supply the missing parts. The third is also of the Thirteenth Century. It gives a complete text of Newburgh's works, and serves to corroborate the two previous ones. Thomas Wykes, canon of Oseney in the late Thirteenth Century appears to have used this copy. Wykes grouped William with Bede and Matthew of Paris as an authority. The only other manuscript of great importance is the Dublin one, which contains only Books IV and $V$, but is in a clear Fourteenth Century hand and very free from contractions. Everything about the various manuscripts tends to show that the author wrote out a rough draft and intended
to write a revised copy, that possibly he did revise a small portion, but never completed it. When we think of the imperfect means at his disposal, we can only wonder at how much was accomplished in a period of about three Jears, when he was in failing health.

He opens his book with the prefatory letter addressed to Ernald of Rievaulx, which he follows with an index of Book I. This shows a careful division into chapters, each dealing with a topic. This is a departure from the scheme of other writers, for though none shows an unbroken chronology, on the whole the arrangement is chronological and any breaks and returns to dates already mentioned are more for geographical reasons. In Newburgh we find that each chapter deals with a separate topic. Thus we learn that Chapter 6 tells of Bishops Roger of Salisbury and Alexander of Iincoln, and how they were captured by King Stephen. Chapter 18 tells concerning the cause of the second expedition to the Holy Land. Practically the whole of this book is a transcript from Henry of Huntingdon. In like manner the other four books are indexed showing a careful arrangement and a definite planning, but also showing that the history has been written out at a later date and not contemporaneously.

[^5]1174. This is fairly original or from sources now lost, and in view of the paucity of material for this period is one of his most valuable contributions. He opens with an account of Henry II's arrival in Englanal, and remarks that the people looked forward hopefully to better things under this prince than under the former king, in whose reign so much evil had flourished. He continues with a description of Henryis energetic actions in reducing the country to order and obedience to the Crown. The parts where Henry took military action that are mentioned by Newburgh are all northern, Yorkshire with the castles of Scarborough and Bridgenorth. Malcolm of Scotland gave up ${ }^{2}$ the extreme north and west and received back the earldom of Huntingdon.

Malcolm's submissi on took place in 1157 and wi thin a few days a dispute arose ${ }^{3}$ between Henry and the Welsh, "a restless and uncivilized race". This was caused by Henry's demand for certain things that were not customary. Henry decided to invade by the easiest possible route with a large army, but the Welsh made use of the woody nature of their country whether hill or valley, and concealing

1. Newb. i. 101.
2. 0 p. cit. i. 70 gives an account of the confirming of these parts to the King of Scotland in 1149.
3. Op. cit. i. 106 .
themselves cautiously, watched the narrow places of the roads. The king therefore, on entering, had to contend with the natural difficulties of the region and hence made an unfortunate start on the affair. Part of the army advanced through a wooded and damp place and was caught by an enemy ambush. There Eustace, son of John, a noble famed for wealth and wisdom, and Robert de Coury perished with many others. So great was the loss of both men and nobles that a rumor spread that the king had been killed. Henry of Essex, hereditary standard-bearer to the king, believed the report and proclaimed it to those coming together round him. We are told here that afterwards ${ }^{1}$ he was challenged to a duel by a certain noble on account of this and was beaten. The king, at Reading, out of pity for him cancelled the sentence of death and ordered him to become a monk, and seized his whole patrimony for the treasury. At the time the king speedily restored the spirit of the army by showing himself to the men. He reduced the confusion, re-formed the ranks and laid an ambush for the enemy. He then ordered a large pleet to be prepared and he attacked the enemy from the sea. This expedition was successful and soon the chiefs cane begging
4. This was in 1163 , so that the account was written much later.
for peace. Henry compelled them to hand over certain fortifications and to give sureties for the oaths of the ir chiefs. "Then a happy peace smiled more pleasantly after the cloud of war, the army returned with joy to its own land and the king turned to other more delightful affairs." Returning to the year 1154 he tells us of the election of Nicholas Breakspeare to the papacy as Adrian IV. He seizes on this event to tell the life-story of the Englishman who became pope. It opens ${ }^{1}$ with a characteristically written sentence:

We must tell about this man how he was raised, so to speak, from the dust that he might sit in the midst of princes, and should hold the seat of the Apostolic glory.

His father was a clerk of not over-much ability. As a beardless youth he was made a monk at St. Albans. They were so poor that he was not able to attend the school and only did so thanks to a gift. This made his father ashamed, he was constantly chiding him for his dulness, and, depriving him of all solace, drove him out with great displeasure. Rather than beg in England young Nicholas crossed to France. Here he was even less successful so he migrated again, crossed the Rhone and entered

1. Op. cit. i. 109.

Provence. He got work at the abbey of St. Rufus where his splendid figure, jolly face and wise speech commended him to the brothers. They urged him to take the habit which he did, and he showed such zeal, skill and knowledge that he was eventually made abbot. Later they turned against him, apparently only because he was a foreigner, and they appealed to Pope Eugenius to remove him. The pope could find nothing but good concerning him and refused their request. A second time they appealed and Newburgh quotes ${ }^{1}$ the exact words of the pope in reply:
"I know, brothers," said he, "where the seat of Satan is, I know what has stirred up this storm in you. Go, choose a father for yourselves one with whom you will be able to keep the peace, or cather whom you wish, for this man will not be a burden to you any longer."

The pope made Nicholas bishop of AIbano, and sent him to Denmark and Norway, "Very fierce people", as legate. He was very successful on this mission, acting with great tact and energy. On his return to Rome he was tendered a great reception. Fugenius had meanwhile been succeeded by Anastasius, already an old man. He died very shortly after Breakspeare!s return and he was chasen unanimously as Adrian IV. He never forgot St. Albans, honoured it With gifts and gave it special privileges.

1. Op. cit. i. III.

Newburgh supplies ${ }^{1}$, under the same year 1154, some fresh evidence in connection with the well-known story of the death of William, Archbishop of York. William had been deprived of the see by Eugenius who had nominated his friend Henry for the post. Henry and Eugenius dying within a short time of each other, William was restored to York and proceeded thither in April. At the beginning of June he was seized with a fever and snatched from this life to the great grier of clergy and laity on June 8 th. He continues:

> "Indeed on account of the unexpectedness of his passing it was believed by many that he had been removed by poison, for they asserted that he had drunk from the sacred chalice a fatal drausht, with the wine of life, mixed vith it either by certain of his opponents or on their behalf, being fired with jealousy.

The runour was spread among the people "wantonly just as if it were established evidence". In that clause we have our authoris own opinion. But he does not choose to leave it there, proceeding to show ${ }^{2}$ that he had reason to disbelieve the story :
"Then I, in the course of time, when this story continued to spread, bethought me of a certain prominent and aged man, a monk of the monastery of Rievaux, now feeble and close to death, who

1. Op. cit. i. 80 .
2. Ibid. i. 81.
"had been at that time a canon of the church at York, and was familiar with the story of the archbishop who should be questioned upon oath concerning this. And he steadily replied that this was utterly untrue contrived by people of preconceived opinion, that he himself was indeed in the presence of and in attend ance on the archbishop when that crime was said to have been undertaken, and that it had been by no means possible for anyone whatever to slip in among the faithful friends standing, around him for the purpose of attemptind any such evil deed."

He continues in this strain, pointing out that the story of his refusing to take an antidote was also false, and remarking on the credibility of his witness. This is one of the best examples of Newburgh's real historical gift.

Newburgh tells a considerable number of stories of the improbable and the supernatural. One of these is the account of Econ, a Breton, who could work marvels by the aid of devils. He gathered a number of disciples, but was sought by the church as a heretic. The Archbishop of Rheims captured him in 1148 and he was tried and condemned to prison where he died shortly after.

Apart from this tale he gathers practically all his non-natural events into Chapters 27 and 28 of Book I. The first of these ${ }^{2}$ is devoted to the story of the green

1. Op. cit. i. 63.
2. Ibid. i. 84 .
children, a boy and a girl who were supposed to come out of an ancient ditch, known as the Wolfs pits. This was situated near a village four or five miles from Bury st. Edmund's. These children were brought into the village and were baptized. Suitable food seemed to cause a difficulty which may account for the boy's early demise. The girl lived on, married, and was said to be still alive a few years previously. Newburgh recounts the questions and answers on various features of their former country and life, asked them from time to time. He concludes the chapter by saying "but as for me it has not bothered me to have exhibited the prodigious and marvellous event". The word "exposuisse" leaves one in doubt as to whether he meant exposed it or made it public.

The next chapter contains four items. The first concerns two grey-hounds which were found in a eavity when a rock was split in a quarry. The next is the tale of a frog found similarly, with a gold chain round its neck. Then follows the account of the intermittent springs already referred to. The last tells of a country fellow who heard scunds of convivial rejoicings coming from a mound. Approaching it he found a door in its side through Which he saw a party of men and women. One of the servants offered him a cup. He poured out the drink and went off with the cup. This was of an unknown material, and of
unusual colours and shape. The rustic gave it to Henry I and by him to his brother-in-law David. King of Scots, who preserved it in his treasury for many years.

Following this Newburgh makes some remarks on each. He would like such stories to be vouched for by reliable people. In view of the incantations of the Magi, and of secret charms he is not prepared to take a stand. There may be a perfectly natural explanation. Only the green children cannot be easily explained. The reason is nore abstruse and the poverty of our intelligence is not sufficient to explore it.
only one other story ${ }^{1}$ of this type is told. This concerns a certain rustic called Ketell of Farnham. He was credited with the power of seeing and talking to devils. The tale is told very circumstantially but without any comment.

We have found just one remark ${ }^{2}$ that shows superstition. He remarks on the coincidence that Henry II was doing penance at Canterbury at the very, time when the barons of Yorkshire were seizing the king of Scotland.

From Newburgh also we learn ${ }^{3}$ the story of the discovery

1. Op. cit. i. 151.
2. Ibid. i. 188.
3. Ibid. i. 116.
of the bodies of the Three Kings at Milan and of their transference to Cologne. He recounts how Barbarossa captured Milan in his Italian campaign of 1160-1162. Certain sacred buildings stood outside the walls which might be of use to the beseiged in future military operations. These were destroyed and anything deserving reverence that was found there was carried within the city, and especially the bodies of the Three Magi who had presented mystic gifts to the Infant Saviour. They also found treasure that had been deposited there long ago. The bodies were discovered in a state of perfect preservation with the bones, nerves and skin. Aiter the fall of the city the victorious emperor bore off the sacred relics and they were interred at Cologne.

In the following chapterl we are told of the second schism in the Church. Adrian IV died in August, 1159. A certain Roland was elected as Alexander III, While a small part of the college, almost none, chose Octavian as Victor IV. Newburgh leaves us in no doubt of the direction of his sympathies, calling Alexander a religious and cultured man who was elected by the "more discrect" section and whom the lesser part "reviled by the words of their curses", while he, nudo nomine et fallaci omine", of no

1. Ibid. i. 118.
lustre of name and of deceitful promise who was called Victor was destined to experience the shame of defeat. Frederick Barbarossa favoured Victor. A council was heId at Pavia in 1160 which, swayed by the emperor, sustained Victor. Alexander then sought to gain the support of the Kings of France and Engl and. But they, not being influenced and cautiously suspending judgment until the full truth should be learned, called another council. This assembled soon after, possibly in 1161, and to it came on behalf of Octavian the cardinals Guy of Cremona and John of St. Martins, and for Alexander three cardinals, Henry of Pisa, John of Naples and Nilliam of Pavia. Evidently there was an equally distinguished assembly, which Iistened attentively to well-delivered speeches by the cardinals. Newburgh gives praise equally to both sides for eloquence, but says that Villiam of Pavia tore to pieces, with very sound arguments, the objections to Alexander. Thus by this duel the truth was made plain, so that neither prince delayed any longer but found for $A l e x a n d e r$ and repudiated Octavian. Hence the schism with its confusion and disgrace was wiped out, and, with the usual solemn excommunications against all of the other opinion, the council dissolved. Alexander, who had been keeping himself safe in the territory of the king of sicily now crossed into Gaul. The whole Latin world accepted him as pope except the province
of Germany where the emperor ciung to the other party. We are next given an account of Henry's expedition against Toulouse. Because of the alliance between Henry and the Count of Barcelona, this leads our author to give some details of the history of Aragon. The siege was aband oned and we pass on to read of the murder of the Viscount of Béziers and Carcassonne. One could wish to be given some picture that would bring to us the glamour and romance of mediaeval Carcassonne, other than the details of the horrible murder of Raymond Prencavel, its lord. Perhaps the mists of subsequent centuries have thrown a softenine mantle over its starkness and we may rejoice that we did not go to Carcassonne, at least in 1167.

The orthodox monk gives his attention ${ }^{1}$ to the arrival of thirty heretics from Germany in 1160. After six years they had made one convert who deserted when they were seized, tried and condemned. They were branded and driven out half naked to die of exposure. We observe a note of half sanctimonious approval of this by Newburgh.

Pope Alexander's first official act ${ }^{2}$ was to call a council which met at tours in 1163 and which dealt with the powers and duties of the various ranks of the clergy

1. Ibid. i. 131 to 134.
2. Ibid. i. 135 to 139 .
and with the question of the Albigenses. Newburgh gives in these pages the actual wording of the resulting decrees, after the style of Hoveden.

His next topic is the quarrel with Becket, but at this point he decides to return to chronicling instead of writing history. Hence events of the years from 1164 to 1170 are inserted between the opening phases and the tragic climax. We learn of the continued schism in the Papacy with the election of the anti-pope Paschal, of the building of the city of Alessanaria in 1178, of the second war against Wales, the donestic plans of Henry and affairs in scotland. Then he gives the Legend of Ketell, already referred to, and the story of the two expeditions against Egypt by Amalric, king of Jerusalem in 1164-67. With a short chapter on the conclusion of peace between England and France in 1169 and Henry's arrangement to marry the younger Henry ${ }^{2}$ to the daughter of the king of France, IVewburgh is ready to continue the story of Becket.

The opening sentence of the chapter on Becket is very characteristic of Newburgh and his style. Hoveden and Diceto begin with an unadorned "eodem anno" or some such phrase. But Newburgh 3 starts:

1. Ibid. i. 143.
2. Ibia. i. 159.
3. Ibid. i. 139.

> "Anno concilii e jusdem nondum emenso, adversus venerabilem Thomam Cantauriensem archiepiscopum, ira regis Anglorum excanduit, multorum et enormium malorum, quae secuta noscuntux, infame principium."

Another difference between Newburgh and others is seen here. While they narrate the facts and trace the actions of the people concerned leaving the reader to form his own estimates, Newburgh very frequently introduces a topic by some comment or judgment of his own. On this occasion he gives ${ }^{1}$ us his appraisal of thomas. He says:
"And indeed this same Thomas of London arose, a man of keen intelligence and capable in speech, gracious in appearance and manner, and in his efficiency in getting anything done second to none."

Then we are told how Henry made him chancellor. Now comes the insistence of the king on punishing clerks for such crimes as secret thefts, robbery with violence and homicide. Being greatly stirred he passed laws against such wrongdoing. William thinks the king was right but was too zealous in carrying it out. The bishops, however, were concerned for the privileges of the Church and protected offenders. At the Council of Clarendon Henry obtained the sssent of all the bishops except Becket to his wishes. Becket obstinately held out. We hear nothing of a qualified submission from Newburghts account. Henry now began
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to pursue him with demands for the production of his accounts as chancellor. Becket fled to France and was declared banished. William says that no good could come of such action, and, that it served no useful purpose is plain from the great evils that aiterwards sprang from it. He blames Becket for his obstinacy.

Newburgh picks up the threads of the story once more with the year 1170. He carries us ${ }^{1}$ very quickly through the account of the crowning of the young Henry, Becket's complaint to the pope and the reconciliation. With the permission and favour of the king the archbishop returned to his own church. But he had in his possession, without the king's knowledge, letters from the pope against the archbishop of York and the others who were present at the ill-omened crowning, now about to be the disturbers of the agreement and the provokers of future greater anger.

The brevity of the account, with its quiet tone and unrelieved style, shows either that it was condensed from some other writer's account or that it was written down long afterwards, and almost certainly it is not the writing of an eye-witness or intimate or even of first-hand information. If we take it that it was a much later writing, under

1. Ibia. P. 160.
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either Richard or John, and if we recall that the murder shocked the whole of Europe and left Henry with scarcely a single apologist, there is no special bravery in Newburgh's comment ${ }^{l}$ on the popels conduct. It is the only instance that we can recall where the author uses the first person singular in expressing an opinion. He says,
"I I think that the (most) most blessed pope Gregory acted, up to this time, in a rather gentle and considerate manner towards the question of an understanding with the king, and that he conducted the matter in a fashion that was able to be justified without risk to Christian good-faith, having to disguise his conduct as a counterbalance to the times, following up the prophecy: He will observe a prudent silence in those days because the times are bad.' And so as something had to be done by the venerable pontiff at that time, neither judge that he is to be praised nor do I presume to censure him.

As there was nothing to be done about the letters from the pope, which were too immodere, Thomes proceeded to suspend the bishops from all official aignities. The king in exasperation over the quarrel groaned aloud and was disturbed beyond measure, and "from the abundance of his tortured heart he belched forth words that were not wisel. Four nobles went out from his presence, jealous for their master and erossed over by ship, "at such great speed that they seemed to be hastening to a solemn feast", and came to Canterbury. They found Becket at his devotions and

1. Ibid. I. 161.
waited until he was seated at a meal with his distinguished men. This detail was not given in any of the previous three chronicles. They order him to withdraw his sentence against the bishops, but he said that a superioris commands could not be reversed by an inferior's. They left him and went to prepare for their crime, for they had come unarmed, "with great din and shouting", another detail that is new. So far the account has been merely the story of a disinterested recorder, but at this point the use of nfacinus and "satelites diaboli" shows at least sympathy for the archbishop as also do "nequissimi" and "crudelissime" at the same place. Becket's dying words are not recorded, nor even the fact that vespers were abandoned. The knights fled to the north of England. The report of so great a sacrifice soon spread over the Latin world and dishonoured the illustrious king of England, for everyone believed that it had been done by his instigation. And when Henry heard what his men had done he was overwhelmed with grief for he understood how it would be interpreted and how it would hurt his own reputation, and he was unable to eat for sereral days. He did not know whether to spare these exceedingly wicked men or not, knowing that men would be inclined to think evil of him. He decided to spare them.

They were ordered by the pope to come to Rome for the purpose of undertaking a solemn penance. So at the urge of conscience they set out for Rome where the pope ordered them to perform a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Here they spent several years in expiation of theirerime and, as has been said, not slowly all finished their lives there. "But that was afterwards." This last remark is a further proof that the account was not written at the time. Henry sent envoys to the pope, but everyone cursed the English king so much that they could scarcely gain admission. When they had gained an audience of the pope they swore that Henry had not given either his command or consent to the committing of so great a crime. The pope sent two legates to the French territories of the English king to make enquiries. These two cardinals held a council at Avranches. Here ecclesiastics, nobles and chiefs all affirmed steadily that he had neither wished it nor ordered it, that the report lay heavy on him and that they would undertake a solemn purgation in order that he might no longer be afrlected by it. He did not deny that the murderers had seized on words of his blurted out in anger when he had beard the news of the suspension of the bishops, and being angered beyond reason he had spoken incautiously. "And on account of this", said he, "I will not flee from Christian discipline; decree what is pleasing, I will
embrace and carry out the decree." Then he cast aside his clothes and submitted to the discipline of the Church and performed public penance. Evidently there were great minglings of tears of joy and of sorrow and the council dissolved.

Newburgh devotes a chapter to Henry's invasion of Ireland, and we note with interest the absence of any reference to the papal bull Landabiliter. However this is even weaker than negative evidence usually is, for Newburgh rarely quotes direct from documents and has included no single bull. He gives in full the general epistle of Gregory VIII concerning the affairs of the kingdom of Jerusalem in 1187. Copies of this would in all probability be sent to all cathedrals and abbeys. Again he quotes ${ }^{2}$ verbatim the statutes of regulations for the crusaders as ordained by the pope in 1188 with the consent of a council composed of the kings of France and England with their archbishops, bishops and barons. This also would most likely be circulated through the agency of the churches for the information of those proposing to go to Palestine, and in the second case for the further reason that it authorised the collection of the Saladin tithe from all

1. Ibid. i. 267.
2. Ibid. i. 273.
who did not tale the cross. These then would most naturally be known to Mewburgh and copies would be available. The only one that cannot be accounted for in this way is a letter from Pope Lucius III to King Henry II in 1184 . Gven this may be explained in much the same way for though it is in the form of a private letter it concerns the mission of Heraclius patriarch of Jerusalem who came to England for help.

The contrast between Newburgh and Diceto is partio cularly striking. Had Landabiliter been missing from Diceto we would have been justified in assuming that it was a later forgery or at least issued after the event. No such conclusion is justified in the present instance. Diceto places ${ }^{2}$ the bull immediately after this first mention of Ireland and though he does not say that it was the reason for Henry's invasion he does make out that armed with this Henry felt that he could go ahead with his proposed attack. Newburgh gives 3 other reasons. He opens ${ }^{4}$ with a description of the island which shows a very modern Ireland:

1. Ibid. i. 245 to 247 .
2. Diceto i. 300.
3. Newb. i. 167.
4. Ibid. i. 165.

> "Ireland is, as we have heard the second among the islands for size after the greater Britain, but as the venerable Bede says, it is much more excellent for clearness and healthfulness of its climate, especially abounding in grain lands and fisheries, and sufficiently provided with plough lands, if the industry of the good cultivator be not wanting; but it has a people uncultured but barbarous in customs, almost entirely unskilled in laws and aiscipline and lazy in agriculture, and much preferring to live on milk rather than bread. But it has this singular privilege and endowment from nature over all other countries that it produces neither any animal of the chase nor any harmful reptile.

Turning to its history he remarks that Britain has been seized, first by the Romans, then by the Germans, next by the Danes and lastly by the Normans, while Ireland had never suffered capture nor been subject to a foreign authority until the year 1171 .

The manner in which he quotes the year is typical of his style:
".... usque ad annum a partu Virginis millesimum centesimum septuagesimum primum, qui fuit regis Anglorum Henriei secundi octavas decimus."

He adds that when the Britons claim that the island was subject to Arthur it was a pure fable, invented for the purpose of lying boldly and freely.

Ireland was divided into several kingdoms by custom Which were constantly torn by dissensions; and while they
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lnew nothing of foreign wars they made up for it by the mutual slaughter by which they tore out their own vitals miserably.

Now it happened that a certain king of that island ${ }^{\text {I }}$ was being pressed excessively by his neighbours and he was losing strength through desertions, so he formed a plan, and sent his son to England to fetch military men and vigorous youth, inducing them with the hope of abundant pillage. These new arrivals seem to have hesitated at first but finally they changed and attacked the Irish and defeated them. The king rewarded them so liberally that they decided to forget their native land and to settle in Ireland. But the fierce Irish grew so troublesome that they sent to England for reinforcements for their small number, and because they were sheep without a shepherd they sought a leader and found one in the person of the noble and powerful earl Richard (of Pembroke).

King Henry, on hearing of the completeness of Richard's arrangements and of the power of his expedition forbade it, but the earl ignored this and sailed for Dublin. This is a famous seaport and in commerce and provender trade rivals our own London, The earl took it by storm in August, ll7l.

1. Ibia. i. 169.

He entered an alliance with the king and married his daughter. Henry seized his English estates and forbade the sending of supplies. This forced Richard to surrender his conquests to the king, but he evidently stayed in Ireland where he died in 1177. A short time afterwards Henry visited Ireland.

Newburgh now takes up the story of the rebellion of Henry's sons against their father, starting with the younger Henry in 1173 . This was the cause of embroiling him with Louis VII of France in a quarrel that was to grow more bitter and was to culminate in the implacable enmity of Philip Augustus and Henry's submission and death.

He assigns ${ }^{l}$ as the reason for the young king's flight to France, the anger of the prince against his father's refusal to make him joint king in fact. This most likely had an influence on the younger Henry, but Nemburgh either did not know that King Henry had suggested taking part of Anjou from Henry and giving it to Geoffrey, or else the chronicler missed the significance of the proposal in the flight of Henry the son. From the fact that he does try to extract the most he can from the story before him we are inclined to say that the rest is omitted because Newburgh did not know, and not that he did not understand.

1. Ibid., 170 .

Henry the Younger stirmed ${ }^{l}$ up his brothers, with the connivance, it was said, of their mother, and won thern over. These three with Iouis were joined by the count of Flanders who seems to have joined for reasons of Priend ship for Louis rather than enmity for Henry. Then many powerful nobles both in England and on the Continent, stirred up by specious promises defected from the father and joined the son, amongst whom were the earls of Leicester and Chester, Hugh Bigod, Ralph de Fougères and many others. To these was added the ferocious king of Scots. Newburgh follows the campaigns in France and England. In France Henry the Elder found himself attacked at Verneuil, Aumále and Château-Neuf. The Count of flanders withdrew and Henry was able to concentrate his attack on Louis. The French nobles decided to withdraw and the forces of King Henry ocoupied the ground.

Almost immediately rebellion broke out in Brittany and rebels seized the town of DOI. ${ }^{2}$ Henry's forces captured the town and many rebels surrendered. Among these were the Barl of Chester and Ralph de Fougeres. Some of these were killed, others were imprisoned for a time, and the

1. Ibid. i. 171 .
2. Ibid. i. 176.
two named, having given satisfaction for fidelity to the king, earned their freedom.

While such things were going on in France similar things were taking place in England. The Earl of Leicester. who was the first to defect from the king, led others astray by his wicked example. Richard de Lucy, who was in command of England, Drought an army to besiege the town of Leicester. The town was captured and burned but he failed to storm the castie before more urgent matters came up and he abandoned the siege. The King of Scots, taking advantage of Henry's difficulties in Nomandy invaded English territory, laid siege to Carlisle and laid waste the surrounding country. We see William the stylist at this point. He says: ${ }^{\text {I }}$

Porro rex Scottorum, .... cum gentis barbarae et sitientis sanguinem immanissimis copiis Anglorum fines ingressus civitatem Carduliensem obsidione circumdedit, totanque adjacentem provinciam caedibus et rapinis foedavit.

Since he has referred to the army as a barbarous people and thirsting for blood it is difficult to say whether he means huge, unwieldy forces or fierce, "immanissimis" may be either. We have noted already his fondness for characterizing the scots as fierce, bloody or unruly。 However de Lucy
compelled him to raise the si ege and he retired across Northumbria which he laid waste.

News from the South urged the justiciar to retire. We will here follow Newburgh's account :

For the Earl of Leicester with a hostile fleet from Flanders directed his course towards East Anglia with his confederate, Hugh Bigod, a shrewd and powerful man, who came ashore at the same place a short time afterwards, with the army he had brought. Soon this arry under the leadership of Hugo and his ally overman the city of Norwich. They sacked the city and returned with their booty to the camp. They tried to do the same thing at Dunwich, but the inhabitants were better prepared and they were forced to withdraw empty handed. Hugh then declared his intention of marching on Ieicester; he felt great confidence for he had eighty chosen knights and Pour or five thousand footsoldiers. The king?s nobles awaited him at St. Edmund's. Hugh disposed his forces skilfully and joined battle fiercely. Victory lay with the kingis troops. Hugh and his wife, "a woman of very active mind", were taken and almost all the horsemen. Almost all the foot-soldiers perished. The margin gives Fornham st. Geniveve as the site of this battle. This lies about three miles north of Bury St. Edmund's on the road to Norwich.

1. Ibid. i. 178 .

The various accounts of this incident conflict with each other somewhat. Robert de Monte or Torigni speaks ${ }^{\text { }}$ as if the battle occurred on the occasion of Leicester's first rebellious move. He says that Robert of Leicester, wishing to disturb the kingdom, sailed to England with his wife and Hugh of Chateauneuf, his cousin, and also many soldiers, but they were intercepted and captured at Bury, and many Flemish were captured or Killed. Roger of Wendover makes no mention of the earl until after the siege of Leicester. But when he comes to the East Anglian campaign he says ${ }^{2}$ that Ieicester and his wife, being about to return to England set sail and landed at Walton in Suffolk on September 29, 1173. He besieged the castle of that fown but profited by it not at all. Marching thence he laid siege to the castle of Hagenet on the 13 th of October. He captured and burned it and put thirty knights to ransom. Then they decided to turn back to Fremingeham and to proceed towards Leicester. But they met the forces of the king at St . Edmund's, were defeated and captured on October 16.

In passing we note that Wendover mentions Hugh de

1. Chronica, Roberti. R.S. Vol. IV, pp. 260, 261.
2. Wendover. R.S. i. 950

Puiset as helping Willism, king of Scots, and certainly not helping de Lucy at all.

Ralph de Diceto agrees with Wendoveris dates and facts. Miss Norgate accepts this, 2 follows Diceto's account and makes no mention of Norwich. Sir James Ramsay accepts it with reservations, mentioning that Leicester had been present at the Council of Gisors four days previously. Newburgh's date is October 17, which agrees with Dicetots.

The attacks on Harwich and Dunwich are mentioned only in Newburgh. He gives no date for these, and it seems absurd to imagine that Robert would have marched north as far as Morwich, passing Dunwich on his way, then returning to the latter and then heading west towards St. Bdmund's where he knew the king's troops lay. It is not impossible that he should have marched so far north in order to skirt St. Bdmund's; he also had the problem of bringing his army across the marshy valley of the ouse and the fens of Cambridgeshire. But if successful he would then have a direct path to Leicester. Two factors are against the hypothesis-time and the complete silence of all other chroniclers. The only other possible explanation is that he left the party of the Harl of Chester to carry on the

1. Diceto. 1. 377.
2. Norgate England under the Angevin Kings. ii. 149.
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operations against Verneuil and crossed to England. Finding de Lucy too watchful he returned to France, but learning that William of Scots was invading from the northwest, he decided to make another attempt, as he would by now have heard of de Iucy's move against the city of Leicester, and hence, as Wendover says, he returned to England.

William returned and ravaged the North. Here ve Pind Geoffrey, Rosamundis son, bishop-elect of Iincoln, showing himself a true son of Henry and fighting ${ }^{1}$ successfully against the Scots and defecting barons. We are given a "purple patch" in the description of Scottish atrocities in Northumbria. Then the king sat down to watch Alnwick. The Yorkshire barons, with some difficulty, assembled forces to meet him and advanced on Alnwick. They were hampered by $\boldsymbol{T o g}$ and were discussing retirement when Bernardde Baliol, a noble and high minded man, spoke up. Mitharew," said he, "whoever wishes, but as forme I will go forward, even if no one follows, and I will not be branded with a perpetual stain." With that they advaneed, and, the fog suddenly lifting, they found themselves at close quarters with the enemy. In the ensuing fight the English were victorious; Willian was captured and taken to

1. Newb. i. 182.

Richmond as already recorded.
King Henry crossed from Normandy and went straight to Canterbury to do penance, then sent his army against Hugh Bigod. Perhaps it was the good news from Alnwick that induced him later to deal leniently with this traitor. It was a mistake, and one cannot help feeling as we read this and of Henry's dealings with his own rebellious sons that there was a strain, however slight, of weakness in this wonderful character.

While Henry was in England Louis and the Count of Flanders with the young Henry made a joint attack on Rouen. The city was naturally strong so that though as great an army as had been seen in Europe for very many years was brought against it, yet they could only employ a third part of it in the siege, and a bridge across the river gave ready access to and iron the surrounding country, so that the defenders were able to bring in abundant supplies of everything needful. The attackers divided their forces into reliefs so as to allow the defenders no respite from attack by day or by night. The defenders adopted similar tactics and were able to hold out. On August 10th, 1174, Louis declared a truce in honour of the feast of st. Lawrence. The citizens enjoyed the rest as happily as possible. Young and old, boys and girls, joined in making
the city ring with song. A band of soldiers held a tournement on the bank of the river outside the city. Their conversation is given ${ }^{7}$ in direct speech. He suggested that, while these people mere enjoying themselves inside and outside the city, the French soldiers should quietly take their arms, suddenly plant scaling ladders against the walls and seize everything of value. But the king said, "Be it far Prom me to blacken a fair kingdom with this stain. You must know that $I$ have this day granted a respite in honour of the most holy Lawrence. then to all his nobles who were present, lingering about and chatting, Whether by guile or virtue, who would enquire in the case of an enemy?", he at length consented. This quotation from Aeneid Book II is the second classical quotation he uses in describing this incident, the previous one being Irom Horace's second Epistle.

Some priests, who were keeping watch, gave an alarm. Everyone rushed to the defence with surprising speed.
"Conflictus super murum acerrimus geritur jaculis racantibus, arma et corpora colliduntur multis utrinque sanguis effunditur."

If one thought that the line from Vergil was culled from
I. Ibid. i. 192.
another chronicle, the above quotation should assure us that Newburgh had read the poem for himself. Night put an end to the fighting and the enemy, having suffered heavy Iosses, returned to camp. The king, good sport: put the blame on the Flemish count.

Henry crushed the rebellion in central England and returned to Normandy with great forces, including some Welsh troops. He arrived two days after the treacherous attack. The French were amazed at his sudden and triumphant return of the king and at the number and distinction of his captives. He entered Rouen with solemn procession, and two days later the siege was abandoned.

A month later peace was concluded with Louis, Henry was reconciled to his two sons and the English rebel barons were released, their goods and honours being restored. Only, the King of Seots was held, and he was released with careful arrangements for hostages shortly aiter. Parly in the new year, 1175, a gathering of all the nobles was held at York. The most important agendum was the submission ${ }^{1}$ of King William, which is thus reported:

Ipse quoque rex scottorum coram universa multitudine nobilium utriusque regni regem Anglorum modis sollemnibus dominum suum, seque hominem

1. Ibie. i. 198.
et fidelem ejus declaravit; eique tria praecipua regni sui munimina, scilicet Rolesburg, Berewic, Castellumpuellarum, $10 c o$ obsidum tradidit...e.et rex Anglorum tantorum operum atque successuum titulis clarus nominatus est usque ad fines terrae.

One wonders why Edinburgh was called Castellumpuellarum.
The king of scots himself in the presence of the whole crowd of the nobles of both kingdoms in solemn fashion declared the king of England to be his lord and he himself his man and of his fealty. and in place of hostages he surrendered the three chief fortresses of his kingdom, namely, Roxburgh, Berwick and Eainburgh.

We have treated this part of the chronicle fairly fully because the records for the years 1154 to 1174 are poorex than for any other period through the Anjevin age and it happens that Newburgh is very full at this point, giving details of several events that are not to be found even in Benedict.

The next important event that he notes concerns the Empire. With no prefatory account of the battle of Legnano he opens a chapter on the reconciliation of pope and emperor, again as a stylist:

In the year of the delivery of the Virgin, 1177 , and the eighteenth year of the pontificate of our lord pope Alexander the long standing rage of the emperor Frederick against the venerable pontife sank to rest......For our Blessed Eord Who touches the mountains and they smoke overthrew the persistent one and softened the hara.

1. Ibid. i. 2050

So far Newburgh has been impartial simply reporting events and never betraying his own sympathies even when using flowery phrases. Here however he reveals clearly his sympathy towards Al exander, for he refers to the

> "schismatists, to wit octovian, (Victor IV) who first invaded the papacy, Guy of Cremona (Paschal III), his successor, who made himself prominent in madness, and John Strumensis (Calixtus III), who third continued the error, these being swallowed ap by the judgent of God, at length, the emperor, being brought to reason through wise and noble men began to treat for peace."

A conference was held and peace established on July 24. We are not told that it took place at Venice. This is strong Ianguage to use in describing two deaths which were as natural and peaceful as that of Adrian IV, and as for Calixtus he considered himself pope for a full year longer and resigned in August, 1178 , to die quietly later. The peace was celebrated by the calling of the Third Lateran council, which met in March, 1179. Newburgh quotes ${ }^{2}$ its decrees in rull, and as we have already referred. to these we will pass on with the single remark on the first decree. This declared that a two thirds majority of the sacred college would henceforth be required to

1. Tout, Empire and Papacy, p. 263.
2. Newb. 1. 206 to 223.
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elect a pope; this obviously being the outcome of the events following on the appointment of Alezander III who was elected by a small majority.

Newburgh shows great faimess and almost total lack of bias in his account of Roger, archbishon of York, whose death in 1181 he records. He praises him as a scholar and a careful administrator of the temporalities. He mentions Rogerts hatred of monks and preference for secular clergy, but we miss the venom of the acid pen of Hugh of Irunant. He contents himsele by closing his report of the seizure of Rogerts treasure by King Henry with a moralizing reflection:

Thus the judgment of God was fulfilled, that others may be deterred by his example, and may learn from the hoarder that their treasures are in heaven where no thief may seize it nor break in for plunder.

His opinion of the conduct of the king's sons is clearly expressed. In the report of the death of the younger Henry he says: ${ }^{2}$

He defiled his youth by an inexpiable stain, that is to say, by an imitation of the most wicked Absalom, as has been set out above.

Jealousy because of the creation of Richard as Duke of
I. Ibia. i. 225.
2. Ibid. i. 233.

Aquitaine $i s$ given as the cause or prince Henrys rebellion. With his mention of the death of Richand of Canterbury, and the translation of Walter of Coutances from Iincoln to Rouen he has brought English affairs up to 1186. As he has an important event to recond for that year in Ireland he returns to 1172 where he broke off his narrative and devotes a chapter to certain events in Ireland. Here we observe the results of his planning, and we can see that he has a view of history. He builds by chronology, either because with his reading of the chronicles of others he does it as second nature or because he sees that it is impossible to cut wholly adrift from it, but he plans to give an integrated picture of a man or an incident and he carries out his plan. He opensl with a brief resumé of his previous report and picks up the threads with Henry's return to Engl and in 1172.

John de Courcy, one of the commanders left behind, decided to invade Ulster. The people were urged to resist him by Cardinal Vivian, the legate to Scotland, a man of good standing among the scots, who ha ppened to be spending some time at Downpatrick. The Irish resisted de Courcy fiercely but the town was captured. Vivian moved to

1. Ibid. I. 238.

Dublin where he called a general council at which he denounced the English and urged resistance. This took place in March, 1177. de Courcy and his officers gave him the choice of leaving the country or of fighting for Irish gold "for which he thirsted greatly". This last clavse expresses much the same opinion of the papal legates as Diceto gives us. He chose to return to Scotiand. de Courcy then stormed Armagh, where there is said to be the chief seat in honour of st. Patrick and other indigent saints whose sacred relics rest there, and he subdued the Whole of that province.

The most eminent of the English chiefs in Ireland was Hugh de Lacy. ${ }^{1}$ On the death of Earl Richard de Clare the king made Hugh commander of his possessions and administrator of his dominions with fullest powers. He so increased his boundaries, his wealth and number of men that he became a source of fear not only to the enemy but also to his allies the other nobles. He seemed to be more than equal to the king of England in Ireland and he was said to have prepared to seize the crown for himseli. When these things were reported to Henry, the king recalled
him but he ignored the command. On July 25, 1186, he took a stroll in the fields outside the fortifications, far from his attendants. A youth belonging to the Irish allies, a man skilled in treachery, rejoiced to find the longsought opportunity, threw a two-edged stone which struck his head and killed him. His attendants rushed up to take vengeance, but in vain, the youth escaped into the neighboring woods. And when this was announced to the king, there was great joy through all the land. Shortly after this Irish affairs assumed the more cautious tenour of the ir ways.

Newburgh furnishes considerable information concerning the Crusades and events in the Holy Iand. We have a very compressed account of the First Crusade and the capture of Jerusalem, and a fuller account ${ }^{2}$ of the second crusade. Here he makes one of the mistakes in accuracy which may be compared for seriousness with his confusion of the two invasions of East Anglia already referred to, in assigning as the cause of the fall of Edessa the betrayal of the city to the Saracens by a citizen to avenge his aaughter on Jocelyn. The story of this crusade is carried on

1. Ibid. 1. 25.
2. Ibia. i. 57 to 60 .
somewhat later ${ }^{1}$ with an account of the deeds of King Louis and the Emperor Conrad in 1147, with some information concerning Manuel Comenus, Raymond of Antioch and Baldin, king of Jerusalem。

The visit of Heraclius, patriarch of Jerusalem to England in 1184 causes a much more detailed account ${ }^{2}$ of affairs. The patriarch's mission was a failure in spite of his own eloquence and a letter from Pope Lucius III. The king pleaded his inability to leave his dominions and promised a sum of money instead, a promise which he fulfilled.

One point in his treatment of the Second Crusade we will mention before returning to the affairs of Henry. The year 1187 was a dark one for Christian Palestine. Newburgh pauses in his narrative to remark on the capture of Jerusalem. He places ${ }^{3}$ the blame for this on the sinfulness of the Christians and couples action and consequence in the whole history of the reception and rejection of the Crusaders by the Sacred Soil. And while his atyle

1. Ibid. i. 65 to 68 .
2. Ibid. 240 to 247 and 249 to 274.
3. Ibid. i. 249 to 255 .
partakes largely of the nature of a jeremiad, and though we today would perhaps interpret things on a more physical or at least non-spiritual basis, it remains that we here see a chronicler pausing in narrative to analyze and interpret the events of which he is a spectator. Recording has taken a step forward towards eritical history.

That Henry's fears were well grounded is shown by the fact that Presh trouble broke out ${ }^{l}$ between him and his inveterate enemy Philip Augustus before Heraclius left England. The French invaded Henry's territory and Henry immedately crossed ${ }^{2}$ to France. A parley failed to secure peace and during the negotiations Richard deserted his father and, with many of the nobles and Prince John, joined Philip. Newburgh recounts, ${ }^{3}$ with considerable dramatic effect and very impressive style, the capture and burning of Le ifans, the storming of Tours and the sudden death of the king at Climon. While this account lacks the intimate detail of Hoveden, yet there is a note of pathos in the mention of his death, and a great nobility and dignity in his description of the burial in the beautiful monastery of Fontevrand, there to await in his place of repose his final resurrection.

1. Ibid. 1. 247.
2. Ibid. i. 276.
3. Ibia. i. 278.

There is no tenom or acid in the pen with which he sketches Henry's character. ${ }^{1}$ He graced the throne and honoured the kingdom. Of his morals Newburgh speais very briefly and lays alnost all the blame on his grandfather, Henry $I$, but he may mean William $I$, his great grandfather. Certainly there is not the note of condemnation that one might have expected from one who praised ${ }^{2}$ the chastity of Halcolm IV of Scotland so highly. The forest laws he regards as harsh but gives Henry II credit for having made them milder than those of his grandfather. Again, he is not severe in speaking of Henry's treatment of the Jews. He favoured them more than was right." But for a Christian monk, speaking of the Jews in the thirteenth century, "justus, gens perfida, Christianis inimica" are not hard words when he spoke of the forest laws as "ferae". It may be that a man, who had experienced Longchamp's exactions on behalf of Richard I, would hence regara Henry's taxation as light, but Newburgh is extremely favourable to the latter when he says that Henry was a Iittle immoderate in his demands for money and that after all he can be justified. However he is not excused so
I. Ibia. i. 77 and 78 .
2. Ibid. i. 280 to 283 。
freely forhis confiscation of the revenues of vacent sees.

The unhappy relations of Henry with his sons is attributed to his having married Eleanor, the divorced wife of Louis VII of France and his other misfortunes in part at least to his not having repented sufficientIy for his most unfortunate severity to archbishop Thomas.

He was most zealous for public peace, brought culprits to punishment, he was the defender of the Church and the preserver of her privileges. He had special care for the orphans, the widows and the poor, and spent lavishly on noted charitable institutions. He stopped the ancient and inhuman custom of wrecking ships. He never imposed heavy taxes either in England or on the Continent until the time of the Saladin tithe. He hated bloody disputes and killings of men and spent money Ireely to secure peace. The wicked reviled him but unhappy experiences Iater made his memory excellent.

With a Literary flourish Newburgh introduces Richard mentioning the joyful reception tendered him by nobles and commons. He only of the chroniclers here treated mentions the nature of the day chosen for the coronation. This Was Sunday, September 3, a "dies Aegyptiacus, pronounced

1. Ibid. 1.294.
by those of former times to be a day of ill omen, when every important matter of business should be postponed. It is tantalising to neflect that Newburgh possibly knew the reason for the choice when he was penning the words, or at least had heard public discussi on of it, but tells us nothing. Was it carelessness, or deliberate choice? Haste it was not, for Richard had been in England for some time, postponing his coronation, while his mother carried out what we would call today a little propaganda.

Hewburgh gives a long and detailed account of the attack on the Jews in Lond on. Strangely enough he does not ascribe it to the choice of an unlucky date. on the contrary it is a prophetic sign that Richard is to bear the cross against the enemies of chnist. The king was angry, and annoyed that he could not punish so great a crowd, especially as it numbered among it members of almost all the noble families who had cone to attend his coronation. He sent Ranule de Glanville to quell it but in vain. Newburgh does not tell us how Richard got out of his dilemma. Diceto, who does not draw attention to the problem, mentions that the king got out of it by punishing some Jews on the charge of damaging Christian property. There is no sign that either king or chronicler

1. Ibid. i. 294 to 299.
saw the seriousness of the incident or its probeble consequences, or considered it either humanly or eternally wrong.

Newburgh does see, ${ }^{\prime}$ however, that Richardts overgenerous treatment of John led to the latterts entertaining treacherous designs. It was a pity that the king could not treat his half-brother, Geoffrey, as generously. Henry's dying wish was to see his only faithful son installed in Yonk. This was camied out, not because oi the fatherts wish, but because Richard saw in Geoffrey an almost bottomless purse and he started their joint careers as he finished them by extracting payment for the honour.

Ranulf de Glanville resigned the justiciorship in order to go on a crusade and in September, 1189, Hugh de Euiset was appointed ${ }^{2}$ in his place. This appointment was not to Newburgh's liling, and he has much to say about people choosing to serve God and Mammon. Then Richard proceeded to sell honours and offices, and offered ${ }^{3}$ Lond on for sale if he could finda purchaser. on December I. 1189, he quitted England for Normendy on the iimst stage of that strange and romantic journey, that was to cost his people dear, but was to write his name lange on the

1. Ibid. i. 302.
2. Ibid. 1.303.
3. Ibid. I. 306.
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pages of Time.
Once aga in Newburgh bewails the wickedness of de Puiset. This time it is because he bought the earidom of Northumberland. He quotes Isaiah 5.8. Woe unto them that join house to house that lay field to field: even so they that join earldom to bishopric." As he does not attack Richard along this line, one can only suppose that either Richardss benefactions to abbeys, or the fact that he was not a churchman saved him from such, of, what is much more $1 \mathrm{k} e 1 \mathrm{y}$, that the abbey of Newburgh being within the jurisdiction of York, William lelt very strongly on any course of action followed by Durham.

Newburgh is remarkably free from nefer ences to natural phenomena and the miraculous. He makes mention of the aurora borealis ${ }^{\text { }}$ which we have noted in other authors. He refers to the appearance of sun dogs ${ }^{2}$ on June 16,1196 . This he observed himself and gives their number as two. Hoveden gave it as foux. We believe that two is the only authentic number; we ourselves have observed two. He regards it as an 111 onen. Strangely enough the abrupt ending of his chronicle ${ }^{3}$ in 1198 consists of a reference

1. Ibid. i. 401.
2. Ibid. ii. 482 .
3. Ibid. ii. 500 .
to a shower of blood at Andely on May 7. This he says was vouched for by "certain not ignoble people who were present on that occasion". King Richard was present directing some building operations, when this ra in mixed with blood fell and spattered his garments. The others took it as a bad omen, but the king did not show Lear, lest he should be the cause of stopping the work, "on which he had set his heart so much that, unless I am deceived, even if an angel from heaven should try to stop him he would have cursed. The words with which he describes the observers of the sun dogs echo very closely those telling of the crucifix seen at Dunstable on August 9, II88. Perhaps he had admired his own writing and hence used it again. And truly there is a Vergilian picturesqueness about it. One would say that he was a man who would often sit at his cell window, or better still go to the cloister if permissible to contemplate the quiet of the night sky above those broad Yorkshire moors and reflect on human life and God's ways with men. For truly William was not a Diceto, a man of practical affairs in a cosmopolitan centre. He was a quiet, contemplative, philosophical spectator of the arama of life. This crucifix took the form of the Dominican standard, shining white as milk, and joined to
4. Ibid. i. 307.
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the crucifix the form of a man of the same sort as it is cust onary to paint in churches in memory of our Lordis passion. Some said that it was a portent "but as for me I am a simple narrator, not an interpreter of omens, let each interpret the wonderful sign how he wills, I do not know what God wished to signify by it."

Other references that he makes to the supernatural are all grouped together in the fifth book. These relate entirely to the appearing of corpses from their graves. We Will take this up later.

Newburgh now devotes a large section to afeairs of the Jews starting with the massacre of Jews at Lyme Regis in January, 1190, through those at Stamford and Iincoln, and culminating in the destruction of York castle in March and Longchamp's punitive expedition in May. We are told that foreign traders or intending crusaders were prominent in leadership, but that the motive of the attack was either plunder by the impecunious or that the nobles might get even with them for their usury. We know from other sources that ledgers and promissory notes were seized and burned. Although the story of York is told at great Iength littIe new matter is added, except the remark about
I. Ibid. i. 308 to 324 .
the warden. It appears the the had left the castle on business. On his return the Jews feared to admit him. He misunderstood their motives and through him the sherife called on the mob to attack the castle, only to find too late that they could not control the mob.

Newburgh thinks ${ }^{1}$ that the Jews ought to be allowed to Live among the Christians for as they crucified Christ they should be compelled to go on living, like the Wandering Jew, to do penance by serving the Christians, He is very fair to the Jews and remarks ${ }^{2}$ that the c onduet of the people of York was inexeusable and execrable, that mankind has not the right to spill blood in such a way. He lists three other reasons why such conduct is to be condemned. But the interesting point here is that on these two occasions he pauses to appraise the conduct of the actors. to treat of the pro and con, to question whether it was Wise or justifiable behaviour. Thus the writer of the North, which as we remarked produced some of the earliest chroniclers, reveals himself as one of the earliest historians.

We are now asked to follow the fortunes of Richard and Philip as they journey towards Acre, and of Frederick

1. Ibid. I. 316.
2. Ibid. i. 322 .

Barbarossa on his journey overland through the Byzantine Empire. One point develops here. Richard was refused admittance to Messina ${ }^{\perp}$ and he took it by storm. Frederick also was refused permission to cross Byzantine terri tory by the emperor, Isaac Angelus. One would expect that if any direct words of either monarch were given they would be those of Richard. But we find that only Richardis actions are described, while Barbarossa's address ${ }^{2}$ to his men is reported in direct speech. It is unlikely that Newburgh's informant was German, rather than Pnglish or French, hence we conclude that where he reports the exact words of his actors, it is probably only a literary device. This would be entirely negative evidence, which is always weak unless corroborated, were it not for the many signs that William always keeps his style in mind as he writes. The Germans decided to force the passage. They invaded the hostile territory, captured Thessalonica ${ }^{3}$ and wintered in the neighbouring province. In the spring of 1190 they forced Isaac to agree to terms and the crusaders crossed into Asia. Then comes the sudden climax. Thile

1. Ibid. 1. 324.
2. Ibid. i. 326,327 .
3. Ibid. i. 327. A footnote says this is an error. His son tool Demotica and they wintered at Adrianople. This is given on the authority of the Itinerary, p. 47 .
riding along he became anxious to see and talk to his son. ${ }^{1}$ This entailed crossing a small river. His counts tried to disuade him from erossing an unexamined torrent thoughtlessly. But driven by fate he would not listen and forgetting his own importanco he spurred his horse forward and Ieapt into the river. In a moment he had perished before anyone could come to his help. But others say that thanks to a jug of wine when he had rashly gone down into the river, the waters ignorant of his imperial importance sucked him under. ${ }^{2}$
"But whether this is true or that it is agreed that in that small stream the waters penetrated to his very soul."

The expedition continued and Barbarossa was buried at Tyre. We now take up the pursuit of affairs in England and the story of Longchamp is unfolded. Hugh de Puiset had been appointed justicier, and here we are told that Longchamp was given the administration of the kingdom. Whether Richard divided the duties between them or arranged it territorially we are not told. The outcome would lead us to believe that he did both. This may have been cunning but we are of opinion that it was simply due to his lack of administrative ability. No new Iight is shed on his

1. Frederick, Duke of Swabia.
2. Ibid. i. 331.
career but we will remark on Newburgh's attitude. We might heve expected him to favour Longchamp for his opposition to Puiset, but Iongchamp acted in too arbitrary a fashion and his attitude towards ceofrrey of lomk with the seizure of the temporalities of the see ${ }^{1}$ definitely threw Newburgh against him. His astuteness, arrogance and tyranny, his pride and ambition and his heavy ezactions are all scored. We are told that he feared no man except John, evidently because Iongchamp expected that so laborious and dangerous an undertaking as a crusade might cause the death of Richard and that John would succeed to the throne. He tried to meet this eventuality by means of two treaties with the king of Scotland in favour of Prince Arthur, but John's military successes and the expiry of Iongchamp's Iegatine powers on the death of Pope dement forced him to make peace with John.

The rest of his account up to its serio-comic conclusion on the beach at Dover follows Hoveden's account in brief.

We note one error in his facts in Newburgh's account of Eleanor's journey to meet her son. The marriage of Richard and Berengaria is stated ${ }^{2}$ as taking place in
I. Ibid. 1. 333.
2. Ibid. i. 347 .

Sicily, whereas we know it took place in Cyprus. There is a full account of the attack on Cyprus, including the shackling of Isaac Comnenus. We are told Richard.s words. ${ }^{l}$ Isaac had begged that he might not be put in irons. To which the king replied:

> He has spoken well, " said he, "and because he is noble and we do not wish him to die, that he may live harmlessly he shall be fastened in chains of silver."

Newburgh gives a good introduction to the course of the actual erusade in Palestine by bringing out Philipis jealousy of Richard over the conquest of Cyprus and the repercussions of the dissension between Conrad of Montferrat and Guy of Lusignen on the relations of the two sings. In his account of the war he follows Hoveden very closely, one is almost prepared to say that both must have listened to a rerbal account by the same man. IVewburgh also tells ${ }^{2}$ the story of the 01d Man of the Mountain, and fastens the murder of Conrad on two of his followers, thus relieving Richard of Philip's charges.

The Third Crusade has reached an impasse. Philip is back in France, plotting as ever against the House of Anjou. Dissensions are rife among both Christians and Saracens.

1. Ibid. 1. 351.
2. Ibid. i. 365 .

Richard becomes 111, and Saladin out of admiration offers ${ }^{1}$ a three years! truce. Richard accepts and on october 9 , 1192, leaves the Holy Land Iorever. And once again our author tuins ${ }^{2}$ to think over in the quiet of the cloister, the events of this great expedition and their significance. William is now nearing the close of his book and possibly feels that he is drawing near to the close of his life and he reflects more than ever on the significance of things. Of course it is natural that he should be more affected by a crusade than by the perifdy of Henryis sons. But it is remarkable that more than any other chronicler does he try to trace cause and result, and to form something like a philosophy of history.

His account of the captivity of Richard resembles those of the other writers. He brings out the reason for the delay in releasing him somewhat bettex. ${ }^{3}$. The death of the bishop of Iiege, and the election of the cousin of the Duke of Louvain complicated matters and imperilled Richard For some time.

John had been acting in a high handed manner and the nobles were now up in arms against him. At last they

1. Ibia. i. 377 .
2. Ibid. 1. 379 to 381.
3. Ibid. I. 396 to 398.
besieged him in Windsor Castle which surcendered in April 1193 and John sailed for Prance to join Philip in an attack on Normandy. Richard was at last released on January 17 , 1194, and landed ${ }^{2}$ at Sandwich on March 13. There were great rejoicings on his return and the castles were soon all in his harids. He held a great council at Northampton and a ceremonial crowning ${ }^{3}$ was held at Winchester on April 17.

The fifth book deals wi th events between 1194 and 1198. It is as carefully divided into chapters as the other four, and shows little trace of his advanced age or hastening end.

After his coronation Richard seized into his hands much of the land which he had granted before going to the Holy Land. Among those who lost by the kingts return was Hugh de Puiset, the king depriving him of his earldom, o ver which Newburgh sheds no tears. We are not told if he deprived John of his counties and honours, but since these had been given in such a way that they made no returns to the royal exchequer and had been taken by the king in

1. Ibid. i. 391.
2. Ibid. i. 405 .
3. Ibid. i. 408.
4. Newb. ii. 416 。
military operations, we presume that it was taken for granted that John had Lost them. Richard put the baronage and the clergy under a land tax, borrowed money through the Cistercians, and "imposed unaccustomed poverty on the most famous monasteries." Then putting the archbishop, Hubert of Canterbury in charge of England, he set sail on May 12 , 1194, with his army, for France for he had heard that Philip was invading Normandy. As the words were penned before Richardis death there is no flourish on the part of our author such as might have been expected had he realized that our knight-emrant was leaving his English doma ins forever.

Desultory warfare went on for a short time when a truce was arranged, evidently for lack of funds. Each king turned to the Church for money which causes Newburgh to tell ${ }^{1}$ a story about their respective reputations. Jonn, archbishop of Lyons, had been in London and hearing some discussi on he broke in "Don't talk thus," he said, "for I tell you that your king in comparison with the king of the French is a hermit. "

Richard left no elley unexplored that might lead to money, and so we read that he reintroduced tournaments ${ }^{2}$ in

1. Ibid. ii. 421 .
2. Ibid. ii. 422.
spite of the papal ban. It is true, as he says, that they were used to teach the art and practice of war, but their main purpose was the raising of revenue. The truce was ended ${ }^{1}$ in July, 1195 , and Richard and Philip took the field again. The fighting lasted till December, several castles changing hands including Issoudun. ${ }^{2}$ Richard won and lost Gisors and Iailed to retake it. It was during these last operations that he, one night, gave the password ${ }^{3}$ for the day "Dieu et Mon Droit". Peace was made in January, 1196. This 1asted about six months when war broke out afresh, 4 which also developed into an interchanging of castles. During this period Hichard made peace ${ }^{5}$ with the count of Toulouse-a war had been going on there since about 1158 -and with the Bretons. He was now able to give undivided attention to Philip, which made the war fiercer and added to the horrors of a famine which had been raging for five years. Richard bought over the Count of Planders and thus reinforced he soon compelled Philip to sue for peace. A truce was arranged for sixteen months,
I. Ibid. ii. 455.
3. Ibid. 11. 461.
4. See Appendix.
5. Newb. 11.483.
6. Ibid. ii. 491.
destined never to be broken and here our author Ieaves him. The siege of Chaluz as already narrated had no connection With Philip.

Hewburgh tells, ${ }^{1}$ with much detail, of the release of Richard's hostages. Fire, flood, drought and pestilence gave warning of the impending death of the Duke of Austria. In December, 1194, he was thrown from his horse; his foot was so crushed that it had to be amputated. Mortification set in and he died. He had been cursed by the pope for seizing Richard, so on his death bed he released the hostages and received absolution, The Crusade appears to have stirred interest in far off lands and especially those of the Mediterranean. So here we find much interesting material concerning Sicily ${ }^{2}$ from the time of Robert Guiscard, about 1080 till its seizure by the emperor Henry VI in 1194. This feat should save him from being merely the son of Frederick I and father of Frederick IT. An even more interesting narrative 3 concerns the invasion of Spain by the Saracens from Africa in 1195. This leads him on to discuss the rise and spread of Islam

1. Ibia. ii. 432 to 434 .
2. Ibid. ii. 445 to 447.
3. Ibia. ii. 447 to 455 .
from 611 to 1195. His opinion of them is summarized in the sentence:

There descended from the remnants of the Ishmaelites a people correctly called Saracens but more truly Agareni, a more voracious plague of whom indeed it was written (Joel 1.4) The locust shall devour the rest of the plant.'

Huch of the account is given to Mahomet and Saladin, but he traces the advance up to the invasion of Gaul. No mention is made of the battle of Tours. He assigns asthe reason ${ }^{1}$ for the retreat that God had said, "Thus far shalt thou come and no further."

Newburgh gives ${ }^{2}$ the text of the letter from the old Man of the Mountain, the sheikh of Alamoot concerning the death of Conrad. It is addressed from himself to the chiefs and all those of the Christian religion He gives as his reason for writing that he is unwiling thet any innocent person should labour under a charge innocently When it was caused by his men. It is noticeable that no specific details of the murder are given. He confines himself to the remark that nby our wish and command he was justly killed".

The latinized form of the subjects of the Sheik-alJabal is given as Hansesisii, scarcely recognizable as the

1. Ibid. ii. 455.
2. Ibid. ii. 457. See also Diceto il. I27.
modern English Assassins. The whole affair is very vague. If Richard had known the truth, which may fairly be doubted, he might have asked for such a letter; if granted, which would be extremely doubtful it would probably have been sent to him, even if adaressed to Christendom. Then, as remarked, the senex Montanus would almost certainly have stated the real facts. The only points that we can see against these are, that the last might have been withheld as revealing something of Assassin procedure which as is vell known was a very closely guarded secret; that once Richard was exculpated by the emperor he lost interest in the matter. The only one directly interested was Philip who at that very time was seeking the hand of Johanna, Richards sister and widow of Hillian II of Sicily. This all points to its being a forgery by Philip. Newburgh relates ${ }^{I}$ how he knows, as usual not giving his informant's na me, a nd how the letter became public:

Now this letter was written in Hebrew, Greek and Latin, and it was written, not with ink, but with a substance most unusual called purple shell fish, like blood as it shows itself. This indeed a man worthy of trust affirmed to me that he had both seen and read when it was presented in most solemn form to the King of the French at Paris.
I. Ibid. ii. 457.

The best account of the popular discontent in 1196 is found ${ }^{1}$ in Newburgh. This was chiefly experienced by London. Both Hoveden and Diceto furnish information but neither treats the movement as fully. Newburgh says ${ }^{2}$ he got his information from a truthful man who was present at some of the gatherings. The leader was a man named William Fitz Osbert known as Longbeard. He was a member of the council of the commune, now 1196 , in its fifth year, ${ }^{3}$ was a man "of sharp wits, moderate learning and eloquent beyond the ordinary. He maintained that the taxes, largely due to Richard's extravagance, were unjustly heavy on the poor. A conjuratio was started by him to resist this injustice. Strange that Newburgh should use the word current on the Continent for a commune but never once used of that of London. Evidently the commune was anything but democratic. In one of his harangues, quoted in part, he says "I will divide the humble and faithful people from the proud and faithless." He enrolled fifty two thousand followers who were prepared to start looting. They proceeded to resist the "noble people". Then he crossed to France to see Richard and to beg for reforms. Richard, probably because

1. Newb. ii. 466 to 471.
2. Ibid. ii. 469.
3. Round Commune of London. p. 224 .
he knew that Hubert Walter could be relied on sent Longbeard home satisfied, On his return he continued the speeches. Summoned to appear before the council he came with a bodyguard. Two men with an amed guard were deputed to watch and seize him. He killed one man but was dragged off from sanctuary at Bow Church. The Curia Regis tried him and condemned him, with nine others, to be dragged along by horses then hanged. There is just a suggestion of sympathy on Newburgh's part for the movement and its leaders.

We have mentioned above the famine in France. This With a plague raged in England also. Aga in it is to Newburgh ${ }^{1}$ that we are indebted for the fullest account. Nilliam has saved his most highly coloured Latin for this occasion. So many died, mostly of plague, that the customary type of burial ceased and the bodies were put in trenches. It passed as mysteriously as it had come.

One other gruesome topic is dealt with, the emergence of corpses from their giaves. The first story ${ }^{2}$ we are to $1 d$ he 1 earned from Stephen, archdeacon of Buckingham. A certain man died and was buried. Apparently there was nothing wicked about him, but he refused to stay interred and haunted first his wife then his brothers then the village.
I. Newb. 11. 484,485 .
2. Ibid. ii. 474,475 .

He was a very noisy ghost and revelled wildly. He was seen by many people, singly, in twos and in groups. At last when the people were terrified beyond measure they decided to seel counsel of the Church whither they went on their mourniul mission. Stephen took the matter to Hugh Bishop of Lincoln. He, wise and practical man, wrote out a cartulary containing the corpseis full absolution. The tomb was opened, the parchment affixed to the man's breast, the grave was closed. The ghost was never seen again. And there he lies unto this day to witness if I Iie. Brave St. Hugh. Your canonisation is merited. The stories are reported from all sections, none at such length. Usually exhumation and burning sent the lost soul to rest. Generally they were bad characters or had died unshriven. . Perhaps there is a moral, it is not stated and Newburgh ha's revealed no subtlety so far. They are all told very simply, directly and are evidently to be accepted in all fulness as they were by the narrator as true. The only sigh that he had belief rather than mere credulity is a short passagel with which he prefaces the story of the ghost of a priest of Melrose. He says in substance: I do not know why these corpses reappear, whether to spread terror or calamity, and then return of their own will to the grave. The stories cannot

1. Ibia. ii. 477.
very easily be accepted (here he is referring to such stories found in books, as is shown by a later remark) were it not for the frequent examples available in our own time and the evidence that is abundant.

A more natural phenomenon is dealt with and hended in a surprisingly scientific manner, considering the knowledge of and attitude towards chemistry in the tweleth century. This is the matter of a sphyxiation by the carbonic gases generated in burning Iimestone. Some monks at Malton had prepared lime by burning and had taken all precautions. A brother, hurrying past in the darkness, slipped and Iell in. The others, when he did not get up immediately, asked if he were hurt, to which he replied, "I have perished". A second man went to his help and was likewise engulfed in silence. A third one, evidently using a ladder, went more cautiously and presently called out "I am dying, pull me out". He was brought out dishevelled and foaming at the mouth and was ill for some time. Later they recovered the two bodies and marvelled that there were no signs of hurt on then except in their eyes. A somewhat similar experience is reported in the cleaning out of an old disused well in East Anglia. Then our author tackles ${ }^{1}$ the problem and

1. Ibid. ii. 499.
solves it:
But this is not atall to be wondered at and probably the explanation could be made like this. It may chance that the bottom of the well had hidden in it either quick silver or some other harmful poison, which, when it wes touched and uncovered by the workmen, gave off dread and poisonous gas and which overcoming all their senses, in a moment deprived the diggers of life. Hewburgh notes ${ }^{1}$ the death of Longchamp when on a mission to the pope. So now he is gone, not to plead the cause of the king of the English (regis Anglorum), but to plead for himselfat the bar of the King of Angels (Regis Angelorum). Newburgh has shown himself throughout very fair. with no bias, rarely does he criticize and then never with bitterness. In two cases only does he use animated language, towards Puiset and Longchamp. He accuses him of intolerable haughtiness and of being more soldier than prelate. Yet he Is fair and mentions Longchamp's hard work on behalf of captive kichard. He reveals no feeling over Richardis reinstatement of the chancellor, but closes his account with the strongest words he has used. There was general rejoicing in England at his death and no tears were shed at the removal of such a scourge. Yet all that Longchamp had done was to carry out the king's commands and it was the king and not his ministers who carried off the gold and silver from the abbeys and churches.
[^6]But Newburgh is as intense an admirer of Richard as were the other writers and nothing but good can be said of him. Strange how this stubborn, Iickle, wayward troubadour appealed to the fancy of his own generation six centuries before Sir Walter scott made him the hero of every school boy. Sincere crusader, valiant fighter, honourable foe, the best of a very poor body of generals romantic and idealistic he was, but administrator he was not. Only the momentum of his tather's energy staved off a return of stephen's anarchy. His friends and foes hailed him during his lifetime and conceded him a crown and on his death gave him a halo at least of romance. And though we have deprived him of his Blondel, we cannot do less than salute him with his greeting to Robin Hood--King of Outlaws and Prince of Good fellows. He is and ever will be, with all it connotes or suggests--Richard Coeur de Iion.

Newburgh's chronicle closes abruptly in May, 1198. The last portion shows a quality differing from the earlier, suggesting that the witer was closer in time to the events he was describing. It is generolly sapposed that he hurried its writing as he felt death coming on him, and that he died shortiy after its completion. If so, he died as he would have wished, at hiswriting table. A few scattered notes show that he was assembling the next material. He
was not a great man, possibly not a clever man, but he was something almost as good, a man of sound common sense. He omitted all the usual outline of world history and confined himself to his own more immediate period. He tells a tale faithfully but with a considerable literary atmosphere. And he does it not to pass time or as a pious work but as he says himself, "for the observation and warning of posterity". He hes instituted himself almost the guardian seint of every subsequent English historian from Raleigh to Macaulay and Trevelyan.
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General Survey and Criticism of Their Work.

We have travelled a long way since we set out under the urbane Ralph de Diceto to explore the life of the period of the Third Crusade. Many countri es have we visited, many famous personages have we listened to, many incidents well known in history have we watched, being reenacted before our eyés, and occasionally we have heard noises off stage that told of the turmoil of the life of the common people.

Diceto is the cosmopolite, the metropolite he belongs to the secular clergy and hence moves more in the world of men than a monk would. He is very close to Longchamp and hence is very well-informed if somewhat biassed. He is a careful, painstaking collector of facts. He shows great care in having his chronicle accurate and in arranging for its preservation. He displays energy, intelligence and observation. The historical value of the Imagines is inestimable; well illustrated as the reigns of Henry II and Richard I are, without Diceto one side of their character would be imperfectly known and some of the crises of their politics would be almost inexplicable. It is no wonder that from the moment of their composition the Imagines became a work of authority。

Hoveden is a North Country man who also noved among men and events and was also the intimate of a great man of the period, the warrior-bishop of Dushan, Hugh de Puiset. To the student who wishes to trace the actual connection between cause and effect as well as to follow the broader features of national development Hoveden's must always be one of the most interesting in our annals. His work was, for centuries after English history began to be studied carefully, the great store of facts for these reigns, on which both in mediaeval and modern times historians have chiefly drawn. Even after the existence of the earlier work Known as Benedict was ascertained, Hoveden was so much more accessible, and so much better worked, that as a matter of fact he continued to be the authority.

Wendover suffered in one way in comparison with the two we have just mentioned, he was a monk, Hence he was rather unfavorably placed for observing men and events, and matters ecclesiastical are given a prominence out of proportion to their importance. Nor is this wholly the faut of his circumstances but is at least partly due to the man, he lacked perspective. We have noted that he views a battle more from a military than from a political angle. Other faults have been noted in their place and must be taken account of in estimating his place and worth. But these
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shortcomings are atoned for in two ways that announce his importance, his fearless eriticism of high born and lowly, which set a precedent for all future writers; and he prepared the way for, and inspired the works of matthew of Paris. Though limited in view and inadequate in detail he is fathrul according to his light. His honesty, frankness, sincerity and consistency together with his pioneer work entitle him to rank among the Founders.

Newburgh also suffers from having been a monk, yet does not appear to have been so much cut off from the world as Wendover. Iike Roger he is inaccurate in details. He serves to supplement the more detailed chronicles, and if he is not always in possession of the facts at least he knows the results of which they are the invisible components. He gives us broad, general impressions of the times, and is the only contemporary authority for the period from 1154 to 1170. He shows strong common sense, discrimination and judgment. He has a righteous spirit, an eloquent pen and ideas in advance of his age.

We have searched many books for evidence of the use of these writers in modern compilations. Often we have found an inciaent recorded in such fashion that we felt sure of the source but no reference or bibliography had been giten. We found that Bishop Stubbs, H. W. C. Davis and Kate Norgate
in their various works on English history have leaned heavily on these amons others, and almost invariably referrins to the Rolls Series. J. H. Round in the Commane of London and Feudel England acknowledges these as sources, as also does the Very Rev. W. R. W. Stephens, Dean of Winchester, in his History of the English Church from 1066 to 1272 . (We found one very small slip in Davis, and a more important one in Miss Nongate's John Lackland.) We examined Keightley's History of fngland. This was done closely in view of the date and a remark of Ir. E. A. Ereeman to be dealt with soon. In the section dealing with Henry II and Richard I he quotes as his authorities among others the chronicles of Hoveden, Diceto and Newburgh. As far as we checked we found him accurate. Owing to the difference of paging between his editions and the Rolls Series it was slow work, but sufficient evidence was found to show his accuracy.

Professor E. A. Freeman in his Historical Essays gives an essay ${ }^{2}$ on st. Thomas of Canterbury and his Biographers. He quotes original sources and builds on them. This essay first appeared in the National Review for April 1860, and caused much controversy. Yet between 1860 and 1872 he made

1. Keightiey, Thos., H. of Eng. 3 vol. Lond on, Whittaker and Co., 1839.
2. Freeman, E.A., Hist. Essays, Lond on, Macmillan \& Co., 1871.
no attempt to review it. In a footnote on page 68 he complains that no really good edition of the whole literature on the subject has yet a ppeared in the Rolls Series. He thinks the Master of the Rolls should bestir himself. Yet his own failure to avail himself of material, obtainable in 1839 is shown by failing to examine any chronicle other than a volume dealing wholly and solely with Becket.

Henry Hallam's History of England during the Midale Ages, 1 the second volume of a three volume book quotes his authorities, among them Hoveden. He is careful and exact.

Professor Maitland in his Lectures on Constitutional History ${ }^{2}$ refers constently to stubbes sel ect Charters and to Pollock and Maitiand's History of English Law. Both of these latter make use of and refer to Diceto, Hoveden and Newburgh, and are, as might be expected, unimpeachable. Bishop Stubbs in his Constitutional History of England refers constantly to all our four writers and to every other mediaeval chronicler that one can name. He must have been a prodigious worker anā a careful one. Mr. J. H. Round

1. Hallam, Henry, Hist. 0 Eng. during MiddIe Ages, Vol. II. New York, Colonial Press, 1899.
2. MaitIand, F., Lectures on Constitutiona I History.
challenges' the accuracy of his synthesis and interpretation at one point in the account of the struggle between Longchamp and John, treated in the prefact to Hoveden ifi. Apart from this we know of no place where stubbs has made a mistake.

We also checked over parts of Sir Walter Scott's Ivanhoe and the Talisman. Here there are to be found passages which echo the words of Hoveden which fact suggests that scott knew either that writer or the Chronicle of Melrose.

The conclusion we have formed is that several achnowledged leaders in the field have made careful, detailed and accurate study of the chroniclers, and that other writers have been drawing their materials fron these. We believe more progress would be made if more reference were taken direct to the original chronicles. Few con equal Bishop Stubbs, none can excel him. Mistaken interpretations will be corrected by constant reference and comparison.

1. Round Commune of Iondon, Pp. 208 to 216.
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## Appendix (e)

Excerpt from Roger de Hoveden, Vol. 1, Page 127.
Confirmation of the Possessions end Privileges of the Bishop and See of the County Palatine of Durhem by William the Conqueror Nov. 1st, 1072.
.....Et insuper dedit et concessit, et charta sua confirmavit, Deo et Sancto Cuthberto, et priori et monachis ibidem Deo servientibus, in puram et perpetuam eleemosynam, regium manerium suum, videlicet villam de Hemingburh cum omit terra de Brakenholm et cum omnibus terris edjacentibus, cum ecclesia villae praedictae, et cunctis rebus eidem pertinentibus, in bosco et plano, moris ac prato, in sylvis et paludibus, aquis, molendinis et stagnis, cum mere et merc, et sach et sochne, et tol et them et infangentheof, et omnibus rectis divisis ejus, ita bene ac quiete et Iibere, cum rectitudinibus et omnibus consuetudinibus suis, sicut unquam Sanctus Cuthbertus alias terras suas melius et quietius habuit, cum omnibus consuetudinibus regiis et libertatibus, quas ipse rex habuit in ipso, dum illud post victoriam Angliae in manu propria tenuit, et per easdem divisas quibus ipse, sive ante eum Tostius vel Siwardus, ipsum manerium tenuerunt.

Appendix (e)

Thomas, Archbishop of York frees ell churches in the Diocese of York which belong to the Abbey of Durham from payment of all dues payable to the Archbishop.

Roger de Hoveden, Page 138, Vol. 1
Carta Thomae Eboraceusis archiepiscopi senioris de Libertatibus ecclesiarum Sancti Cuthberti.
1083. Thomas, Dei gratia Eboraceusis archiepiscopus, episcopis et abbatibus, per Angliam tam constitutis quam in posterum successuris, et omnibus sibi in Eboraco archiepiscopis successuris in perpetuum, salutem.

Quibus plurimum gavisus, ex praecepto praelati papae et ex imperio domini regis Willelmi, beati Cuthberti amore debito, subscriptas litteras Sancto Cuthberto, et ejus episcopo, et omnibus monachisei servientibus, consensu et permissione capituli Eboraci, et totius synodi confirmatione, dedi, concessi, et praesenti carte confirmavi, et post propria manu super altare sancto Cuthberto obtuli. Sciant igitur tam praesentes quam futuri, quod ego Thomas Hboracensis, archiepiscopus, ex praecepto papae Gregorii septimi, et confirmatione domini regis Willelmi, sub testimonio universalis Anglorum concilii, et concensu fooraceisis capituli, do et concedo Deo, et Sancto Cuthberto, et omnibus ejus episcopis successuris, et omibus monachis ibidem in posterum futuris, ut omes ecclesias quascunque in praesenti in diocensiana parochia mea possident, vel in posterum canonice adquirere poterunt concessione regum, Iargitione fidelium, vel aedificaverint in proprio fundo terrarum, habeant liberas et quietas omino in perpetuum a me, et omnibus successoribus meis, ab omnibus quae ad me vel ad successores meos pertinent. Quare volo et praecipio, ut omnes ecclesias suas in manu sua teneant, et quiete eas possideant, et vicarios suos in eis libere ponant, qui mihi et successoribus meis de cura tantum intendant animarum, ipsis vero de omnibus caeteris eleemosynarum beneficiis. Concedo insuper, confirmo et praecipio, ut tam ipsi quam ipsorum vicarii liberi et quieti in perpetuum sint ab omni redaita synodali, et ab omnibus auxiliis, gravaminibus vel redittibus, exactionibus vel hospitiis, tam a me quam a decanis, archidiaconis, vel omium nostrorum vicariis et ministris; sub anathemate etiam prohibeo, ne aliquis ultra, ipsos, vel eorum clericos, aliqua sub occasione fatiget,
vel ad synoda vel capitula ire, nisi velint sponte, compellant. Sed si quis erga eos vel suos oliquam querelem habuerit, ad curiam Sancti Cuthberti Dunelmum veniat, ut ibi, qualem debuerit, rectitudinem percipiat. Omnes enim libertates et dignitates, quas ego vel mei sequeces in ecclesiis propriis vel terris nostris possederimus, ipsis et Sancto Cuthberto in omnibus ecclesiis, et terris suis Iibere in perpetum concedimus, et absque tergiversatione sive calumnia a me meisque successoribus, liberas et quietas confirmamus.
(The original continues to specify privileges, and ends with the attestation of witnesses.)

Appendix

Hoveden, Vol. iii, Page 13.
Grant of Sadberge to the see of Dumam.

Richardus Dei gratia rex Angliae, dux Homanniae et Aquitanniae, comes Andegaviae, archiepiscopis, episcopis, baronibus, vicecomitibus, et omnibus ballivis et ministris totius Angliae, saluter. Sciatis nos dedisse et concessisse, et praesenti carta confimasse, Deo, et beato Cuthberto, et ecelesiae Dunelmensi, et Hugoni Dunelmensi episcopo, caro consaguineo nostro, et successoribus ejus, in puram et perpetuam eleemosynam, pro anima patris, nostri et antecessorum nostrorum, et pro salute nostra et haereaun nostrorum, et pro stabilitate et incremento regni nostri; manerium nostrum de Sadberge, cum wapentac ad idem manerium pertinente, et cum omibus aliis rebus ad illud pertinentibus, tam in hominibus, quem in terris cultis et incultis, in viis et semitis, in pratis et pasturis, in stagnis et molendinis, in aquis et piscariis; et servitium Petri Caron et heeredum suorum de feodo unius militis de Setune et de Ovetune; et servitium Thomae de Amundevile et haeredum suorum de feodo unius militis de Cottona et de Treiford; et servitium filii Godefridi Baard et de Mideltun, et de Herteburne; quas terras de nobis tenebant inter Tinam et Teisam; cum omibus aliis rebus ad praedicta feoda pertinentibus; in escambium pro servitio feodi trium militum, quod Philippus de Kimba de ipso episcopo in Lincolnesire tenebet, et pro feodo unius militis, quod Balawinus Wac, et filius Rogeri de osevile 面bidem de eodem tenebant. Quare volumus et praecipimus, quod praedictus Hugo Dunelmensis episcopus, et successores sui, preedicta duo feoda militum, et duas partes feodi unius militis, cum praedioto manerio de Sadberge et wepentacco, sicut praedictum eat, teneant, habeant et possideant inbere et quiete et honorifice, cum omibus rebus ad ea pextinentibus in bosco et plano, cum socca et sacce, et tol et them et infengenthef, et ctum omnibus aliis Iibertatibus et liberis consuetudinibus, et cum placitis ad coronam pertinentibus, sicut nos ipsi in propria menu nostra habebamus, et sicut ipse episcopus habet et tenet elias terras suas, et feoda militum in episcopatu suo, et ut tam ipse ipiscopus quam successores sui disponant de hominibus et terris ad idem menerium pertinentibus, ad libitum suum et voluntatem, sicut de aliis
hominibus et terris suis in eodum episcopatu suo peciunt. His testibus: (Here follow the signatures of the archbishops, bishops, of John, and of all the earls. We note that William Mershall signs as Earl of Essex.)

Datum anno primo regni nostri XVITIO die Septembris. apud Gatingtun per manum Willelmi de Longo-campo, cancellarii nostri.

Praeterea idem episcopus hedit praenominato regi ( ) marcas argenti pro comitatu Northumbriae habendo in vita sua, cum castellis et aliis pertinentiis suis.
(As remarked before in the text Hugh is stated by Richard of Devizes to have paid 10,000 marks.)

## Appendix

Hoveden, Vol, i1i, Page 25.
Charter of Release to William. King of Scots

Richardus Dei gratia rex Angliae, dux Nommaniae et Aquitanniae, et comes Andegeviae, archiepiscopis, episcopis, abbatibus, comitibus et baronibus, justitiis et vicercomitibus, et omibus ministris et fidelibus suis totius Angliae, salutem. Sciatis nos carissimo consanguineo nostro Willelmo, egdem gratia regi Scottorum, reddidisse castella sua Rokesburh et Berewic, tanquam ejus propria, jure heereditario ab eo et haeredibus suis in perpetuam possidenda. Praeterea quietavimus ei omnes conventiones et pactiones, quas bonae memoriae pater noster Henricus rex Angliae per novas caetas et per captionem suam extorsit, ita videlicet ut nobis faciat integre et plenarie quod rex Scottorum Malcolm us, Irater ejus, antecessoribus nostris de jure fecit, et de jure facere debuit; et nos faciamus ei quicquid antecessores nostri praedicto Malcolmo de jure fecerunt et facere debuerunt, scilicet in conductu veniendo ad curiam, et redeundo a curia, et in morando in curia, et in procurationibus, et in omibus libertatibus et dignitat-. ibus et hononibus eidem jure debitis, secundum quod recognoscetur a quatuor proceribus nóstris ab ipso Willelmo rege electis, et a quatuor proceribus illius a nobis electis. Si antem fines sive marcias regni Scotiae aliquis nostrorum hominum, postquam praedictus Willelmus a patre nostro captus fuit, usurpaverit absque juaicio, volumus ut integre restituantur, et ad eum statum reducantur quo exant ante ojus captionem. Praeterea de terris suis quas habet in Anglia, seu dominicis, seu feodis, scilicet in comitatu Huntendoniae et in omnibus aliis, in ea libertate et plenitudine possideat, et haeredes ejus in perpetuum, que Malcolmus possedit vel possidere debuit, nisi praedictus Malcolmus vel haeredes sui aliquid postea infeodaverint: ite tamen quod si que postea infeodata sunt, ipsorum feodorum servitia ad eun vel haeredes ejus pertineant. It si quid pater noster praedicto Willelmo regi Scotiae donaverit, ratum et firmum habere volumus: reddiaimus etiam ei Iigantias hominum suorum, et omes cartas quas dominus pater noster de eo habuit per captionem suam. It si aliquae aliae forte per oblivionem retentae ant inventae fuerint, eas penitus viribus carere praecipimus. Ipse
autem ligius homo noster devenit de omibus teris de quibus antecessores sui ligii homines antecessomum nostromm fuerunt. Et fidelitatem juravit nobis et haeredibus nostris. Testibus his: (Then follow signatures of the archbishops, bishops, Eleanor and John.)

Append ix.

The Beginning of the Year in the Midale Ages.
There were several dates made use of during the Midale Ages for the commencement of the year. These had various causes, civil, military and religious. Julius Caesar had established January 1 as the first day of the year, and this was used through many parts of the old empire well into the seveath century. This met with objection by Christian writers on the grounds that it was a pagan festival. Many English chroniclers began to use Christmas Day as the first of the year.

A priest Dionysius in the seventh century had worked out a table for finding the date of Easter. as he used the words ab incarnatione in course of time March 25 came to be favoured in place of December 25 in reckoning the number of years and hence the beginning of the year. The style of Lady Day possibly started in Burgundy but it became known as the Stylus Florentinus. It was adopted in England in the late twelfth century and continued as the official usage until 1752.

This style made its way but slowly in Erance and we find Henry I of Engl and ot Tours in January using the Lady Day style, and at Angers the following March using Christmas style. Philip Augustus made more confusing by dating from Easter. Gervase of Canterbury about 1200 mentions the Easter style as among one of the recognised methods. By 1215 Easter was the established rule in the French chancery. Bearing in mind the intimate relations between France, Fngland and the Anjevin lends and remembering that Baster Day was movable and Narch 25 fixed, it is easy to see the conIusion that would arise.

In Imperial territories the old Roman style was. naturally retained. In France Easter became accepted. on the frontiers local variations between the two methods were found.

Further the rise of any one style to the position of official or customary use varies from place to place. Thus France was employing Raster Day in 1215 While in Auvergne Lady Day was still current in 1478. In the Dauphiné in 1343 Lady Day was still the rule
while Avignon was reckoning from Christmes. Further north dynastic changes affect the reckoning, so that in the Iow Countries we must take into account not only the history and geography of a locality but also its allegiance before we can calculate the year correctly. Sometimes we even find two dates in one locality, one called court style and the other popular style. During the fourteenth century opposition gradually arose, with a swing back in favour of January ist.

On February 24, $1581 / 2$ Pope Gregory XII issued a bull proclaimins January 1 st as the beginning of the year, yet it did not come into universal use in Vestern Burope until 1797.

Enough has been said to show that caution is required in referring to dates.

Materials from article by $R$. L. Poole in Proceedings of British Academy, Vol. X, 1921-23, Pp. 113 to 137.

Appendix.

A Ietter from Longchamp to Diceto encloses copy of one from the old Man of the Mountain to Iimpold, Duke of Austria.

The Assassin chief frees Richard I from all blame for killing Conrad, Marquis of Montrerrat, saying that he was killed by the Assassins in vengeance for the killing of a member of their band who was travelling on a ship from Satalia towards his own home. This man was taken ashore at Tyre and murdered by some followers of Conrad with the object of robbery.

He states most definitely that Richard had no part in this whatever.

## Appendix.

How Richard gained the name Cor Leonis.
This is talcen from the Chronicle of Henry Knighton or Cnitthon, a canon of Leicester Abbey in the later fourteenth century. He acknowledges Higden as the source of much of his account of Richard I, but not of the following story. The incident took place as Cnitthon tells us while Richard was a prisoner of the Emperor and John was working with Philip against Richerd.

At the time when Richard was thus in prison a fierce and famished lion was loosed upon him, to the end it is believed that meakened by hunger he would devour the lring, as if through the negligence of the lion's guard. But the king, full of boldness and bravery, breathing a prayer to God, seeing the lion rushing upon him with open jews and siercely, seized his own cloak and winding it round his arm, and thrust his hand and arm into the lion's throat, and closing up his fist he drew out the heart of the lion with the supporting parts and devoured it still hot and bleeding. From this fact there arose the name by which he is called, Richard the Iion-hearted.
I. Knighton, Chron. i. 167.

## MPS

1. Last Journey of Henry II. His meeting with Philip at Colombieres and death at Chinon.
2. Richard's dispositions in England before going on the Crusade. John's possessions are underlined in red. See of Durham in green.
3. Longchamp's flight from Windsor to London and the "battle" of Hounslow.
4. Richard's journeyings during his captivity from his landing at Ragusa to his liberations at Swine.

HENRY'S LAST JOURNEY
from Le Mans to Chino and meeting with Philip
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North Cloister walk North wall arcade
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