

CAMBRIDGE LIBRARY COLLECTION

Books of enduring scholarly value

Rolls Series

Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores, or The Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages, usually referred to as the 'Rolls Series', was an ambitious project first proposed to the British Treasury in 1857 by Sir John Romilly, the Master of the Rolls, and quickly approved for public funding. Its purpose was to publish historical source material covering the period from the arrival of the Romans to the reign of Henry VIII, 'without mutilation or abridgement', starting with the 'most scarce and valuable' texts. A 'correct text' of each work would be established by collating 'the best manuscripts', and information was to be included in every case about the manuscripts used, the life and times of the author, and the work's 'historical credibility', but there would be no additional annotation. The first books were published in 1858, and by the time it was completed in 1896 the series contained 99 titles and 255 volumes. Although many of the works have since been re-edited by modern scholars, the enterprise as a whole stands as a testament to the Victorian revival of interest in the middle ages.

Eulogium: Chronicon ab Orbe Condito Usque ad Annum Domini M.CCC.LXVI

The *Eulogium* is a world history from the Creation to 1366. The majority of the work is taken from earlier writers, many of whom are named. For the period 1356–66 the writer, probably Thomas, a monk of Malmesbury, provides an insight into the attitudes and opinions of his own time, and also into the historical sources available to a member of a large religious house. The work was obviously well regarded, as it survives in several manuscripts, two of which were continued by unknown authors, one to 1413 and one to 1490; these continuations are also included in this three-volume edition by Frank Scott Haydon (1822–87). Volume 2, published in 1860, contains Book 4 and half of Book 5. The former outlines world geography while the latter deals with early British history, from the first settlement to King Arthur and the Saxon migrations.



Cambridge University Press has long been a pioneer in the reissuing of out-of-print titles from its own backlist, producing digital reprints of books that are still sought after by scholars and students but could not be reprinted economically using traditional technology. The Cambridge Library Collection extends this activity to a wider range of books which are still of importance to researchers and professionals, either for the source material they contain, or as landmarks in the history of their academic discipline.

Drawing from the world-renowned collections in the Cambridge University Library and other partner libraries, and guided by the advice of experts in each subject area, Cambridge University Press is using state-of-the-art scanning machines in its own Printing House to capture the content of each book selected for inclusion. The files are processed to give a consistently clear, crisp image, and the books finished to the high quality standard for which the Press is recognised around the world. The latest print-on-demand technology ensures that the books will remain available indefinitely, and that orders for single or multiple copies can quickly be supplied.

The Cambridge Library Collection brings back to life books of enduring scholarly value (including out-of-copyright works originally issued by other publishers) across a wide range of disciplines in the humanities and social sciences and in science and technology.



Eulogium

Chronicon ab Orbe Condito Usque ad Annum Domini M.CCC.LXVI

A Monacho Quodam Malmesburiensi Exaratum

VOLUME 2

EDITED BY F.S. HAYDON





CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paolo, Delhi, Mexico City

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108042598

© in this compilation Cambridge University Press 2012

This edition first published 1860 This digitally printed version 2012

ISBN 978-1-108-04259-8 Paperback

This book reproduces the text of the original edition. The content and language reflect the beliefs, practices and terminology of their time, and have not been updated.

Cambridge University Press wishes to make clear that the book, unless originally published by Cambridge, is not being republished by, in association or collaboration with, or with the endorsement or approval of, the original publisher or its successors in title.



RERUM BRITANNICARUM MEDII ÆVI SCRIPTORES,

OR

CHRONICLES AND MEMORIALS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

DURING

THE MIDDLE AGES.





THE CHRONICLES AND MEMORIALS

OF

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND DURING THE MIDDLE AGES.

PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHORITY OF HER MAJESTY'S TREASURY, UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS.

On the 26th of January 1857, the Master of the Rolls submitted to the Treasury a proposal for the publication of materials for the History of this Country from the Invasion of the Romans to the Reign of Henry VIII.

The Master of the Rolls suggested that these materials should be selected for publication under competent editors without reference to periodical or chronological arrangement, without mutilation or abridgment, preference being given, in the first instance, to such materials as were most scarce and valuable.

He proposed that each chronicle or historical document to be edited should be treated in the same way as if the editor were engaged on an Editio Princeps; and for this purpose the most correct text should be formed from an accurate collation of the best MSS.

To render the work more generally useful, the Master of the Rolls suggested that the editor should give an account of the MSS. employed by him, of their age and their peculiarities; that he should add to the work a brief account of the life and times of the author, and any remarks necessary to explain the chronology; but no other note or comment was to be allowed, except what might be necessary to establish the correctness of the text.



4

The works to be published in octavo, separately, as they were finished; the whole responsibility of the task resting upon the editors, who were to be chosen by the Master of the Rolls with the sanction of the Treasury.

The Lords of Her Majesty's Treasury, after a careful consideration of the subject, expressed their opinion in a Treasury Minute, dated February 9, 1857, that the plan recommended by the Master of the Rolls "was well calculated for the accomplishment of this important national object, in an effectual and satisfactory manner, within a reasonable time, and provided proper attention be paid to economy, in making the detailed arrangements, without unnecessary expense."

They expressed their approbation of the proposal that each chronicle and historical document should be edited in such a manner as to represent with all possible correctness the text of each writer, derived from a collation of the best MSS., and that no notes should be added, except such as were illustrative of the various readings. They suggested, however, that the preface to each work should contain, in addition to the particulars proposed by the Master of the Rolls, a biographical account of the author, so far as authentic materials existed for that purpose, and an estimate of his historical credibility and value.

Rolls House, December 1857.



EULOGIUM

(HISTORIARUM SIVE TEMPORIS):

CHRONICON AB ORBE CONDITO USQUE AD ANNUM DOMINI M.CCC.LXVI.,

A MONACHO QUODAM MALMESBURIENSI EXARATUM.

ACCEDUNT CONTINUATIONES DUÆ, QUARUM UNA AD ANNUM M.CCCC.XIII.

ALTERA AD ANNUM M.CCCC.XC. PERDUCTA EST.

EDITED

BY

FRANK SCOTT HAYDON, B.A.

PUBLISHED BY THE AUTRORITY OF THE LORDS COMMISSIONERS OF HER MAJESTY'S TREASURY, UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS.

VOL. H.

LONDON:
LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, AND ROBERTS.

1860.



Printed by
EXRE and SPOTTISWOODE, Her Majesty's Printers,
For Her Majesty's Stationery Office.



PREFACE.

THE Volume now published contains the Fourth Book and the first half of the Fifth Book of the Eulogium Historiarum, terminating with the conclusion of the account of the British Kings. The second half of the Fifth Book, ending in A.D. 1366, the Kalendary Chronicle down to A.D. 1364, the Genealogy of the Kings of England, and the original Index, completing the work as it exists in the autograph and in the MS. preserved in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, and in the more ancient portions of the entire MSS. found in the Cotton Collection and the Library of Lincoln's Inn, respectively designated in this edition by the letters A., D., B., and E., together with the Continuation of the Eulogium to A.D. 1413, at present known to exist in the complete Cotton manuscript only, will form the text of the Third Volume of the work.

MANUSCRIPTS AND TEXT OF THE FOURTH AND Ī. FIFTH BOOKS.

THE manuscripts with which the text of the present Manuvolume has been collated, in addition to those already the Fifth described at length in the Preface to the first volume, Book collated with are two in number:

C. The MS. Cotton Cleopatra D. II. This is the graph. concluding fragment of a larger MS., containing the The Cotton fragment. Fifth Book of the Eulogium from the words: "De



iv

PREFACE.

Manuscripts of the Fifth

" Italia jam intendimus" (preceded by the initial D. of the first sentence of the Fifth Book, and a portion Book only of the word immediately before this) to the last entry in A.D. 1346, where it terminates in the middle of a page. It is written on vellum in single columns, and the character of the handwriting and style of floriation of the capitals show it to belong to the early part of the fifteenth century. The text agrees very closely with that of the autograph A. already described in the Preface to the First Volume; so closely, indeed, that only a few pages of its various readings have been published. It is foliated in more modern hands than that of its text, at the foot of the first nine leaves, the first number being 34, and at the top, from f. 2 to 108, and a note at f. 58, in an old hand: "li". 5.

" ca. 50," shows it either to have actually formed, or to have been recognized as having once formed, the Fifth Book of some larger work when this note was written. I have not succeeded in discovering the remainder of this MS., but this is the less to be regretted as the MS. itself has no independent value, differing only from A. to the disadvantage of its own text.

Mr. Hindley's transcript.

H. The MS. Mus. Brit. Additional No. 6,914. is a very legible modern transcript, by the Rev. Haddon Hindley, of part of the Fifth Book of the Eulogium, commencing with the words: "Reges Britonum am-" plius regnare non sunt auditi," at p. 384 of the present Volume, and continuing to the conclusion in A.D. 1366. Mr. Hindley has omitted to state from what MS. the transcript was made. Though the text coincides very closely with that of A., C., and E. (generally, however, deviating with A. from C. and E.), the existence of the marginal note 1 at f. 281 proves

¹ The marginal note refers to the | " habere possunt non video. Ed-

entry for A.D. 1354, in which the Black Prince is called "Edwardus" annum 1460 regnare incepit." "Quartus a Conquestu," and is as To which Mr. Hindley adds the follows: "Quomodo hæc ita se remark: "Ita in Codicis margine."



PREFACE.

that it was not made from either of these MSS., no Manusuch note being found in any of them. In addition scripts of the Fifth to this, the MS. is stated by Mr. Hindley to want Book only. two large portions, all of which are to be found in every one of the MSS. collated for this edition. Very few, indeed, of the variations of H., which are generally very minute and of the lowest degree of importance, and thus, in the absence of the original, cannot be certainly determined to have existed therein, A careful collation of the texts have been published. of these two MSS. establishes the conclusion that they were not transcribed from any of the class of MSS. which furnished the common source of the texts of B. and D., both of them coinciding too closely with A. in all crucial variations to satisfy the conditions necessary to constitute them such transcripts.

There is an extensive series of additions to be Additions found in one of the complete MSS., only briefly to B. in the form of alluded to in the preceding volume, which demands a nearly conmore detailed discussion. In the Cotton MS. B., temporary foot-notes. described in the Preface to the preceding Volume, the two last Books of the Eulogium, besides containing numerous marginal notes in modern hands, which have, of course, been uniformly omitted from the printed footnotes, are very copiously annotated in three different,

page is stated by Mr. Hindley to be blank: "In hoc Codice iterum hic " deficit pene pagina propria." As it is quite clear that both these documents have been added by the author to the autograph A. subsequently to the context, blanks having been originally left for them, it is very likely that the MS. which Mr. Hindley followed was a very early transcript of A. made before the blanks had been filled, perhaps under the author's own eye.

YOL. II.

¹ The first omission that occurs is [at f. 202, and is of the letter sent by Balliol to Edward I., p. 151 of vol. iii. of this edition. Mr. Hindley's note is: "In hoc Codice hic " desunt iii. paginæ linearum pro-" priarum 39, i.e. totarum 117." The enumeration of the lines in each page appears to show that the pages in the original MS. are blank and not wanting. The second omission occurs at f. 204, and is of the homage of Balliol at Newcastle. Nearly a



vi PREFACE.

Additions to MS. B.

but nearly contemporaneous, hands of the fifteenth century, denoted in this edition by the letters α , β , and γ . The majority of these notes are written at the foot of the pages of the MS., and consist of additions to the text of the Eulogium, collected from many different sources, often contemporary with the events described, and generally chosen with care and judgment. becomes a question of some interest to determine whether these additions were in whole or in part transcribed from the text of some original of the Eulogium posterior to the autograph, or are, as they at first sight appear to be, independent notes made to the text of B. by three different readers of that MS. My own opinion is that the latter supposition is the more probable one, and on the following grounds: The additions are divisible into two classes: those which consist of long passages of continuous narrative, and those which are merely short entries for different years in the Chronicle. The first, from the great difficulty of fitting them into the text of the Eulogium as it at present exists, so as to form a new text of decent continuity which might have probably belonged to a second and enlarged "edition" of the work, must, I think, be considered as independent annotations, taken directly from the sources from which they profess to have been taken, and never at any time forming an integral part of the text of the Chronicle; but the second, forming no part of a continuous whole, might, at least on this ground, as well have belonged to the text of such an edition, as to a series of amplifications independent of any original MS. of the work. It seems probable, however, that, if they had been actually copied from a fuller MS. of the Eulogium, some intimation, by way of marks of reference, or in some other manner, would have been given by the scribes that they belonged to the text, in the same way that the original scribe of B.



PREFACE.

vii

and the corrector of E. have given notice to their Additions readers of the proper position of passages omitted from to MS. B. the text of those MSS. Such marks occur, however, only in a very few instances, and their presence may be well explained in those instances by other suppositions, so that the balance of probability remains slightly in favour of the independence of the second class of annotations of any text of our author's Chronicle.

The great majority of these additions are inserted Inserted in in the text of the present edition. They have been the text of the present printed in small type in order that they may be dis-edition in tinguished more clearly and readily from the original small type. text of the Eulogium. There are, no doubt, many objections to this method of dealing with later additions to the text of a manuscript, but I think fewer (when the precautions here employed are adopted) than can be brought against the only other methods of treating them ;-that of placing them in the footnotes among the various readings, or that of putting them out of sight in an Appendix. Their great length, and the restriction of the contents of the foot-notes to various readings, which it has been just shown that these additions most probably are not, effectually precluded the possibility of adopting the first of these plans, while the second was inconsistent with the convenience of the reader. As they now stand, in the form of clearly distinguishable supplements to particular sections of the original work, there is no danger of confounding them with the text of any one of the existing manuscripts, while they are at the same time easily accessible.

With regard to the relative dates of the three sets of annotations there are very few facts from which any conclusion can be drawn. It appears that a note in the hand (a) has been written below a note in the hand (γ) , (p. 263, note 8), that a note in the hand (β) has been continued below a note in the same



> viii PREFACE.

hand (γ) , (p. 373, note 5), and that a note in the hand (α), (p. 243, note 1), has been written below a note in the hand (β) in the preceding page. But that a note in the hand (7) has been written below a note in the hand (β) (p. 307), we might perhaps take these three isolated facts as indications of a general conclusion, and infer that the notes were written in the order (γ) , (β) , (α) . It seems, however, more probable that the three annotators made their respective additions to the MS. simultaneously, or nearly so.

Before proceeding to an investigation of the sources of that portion of the Eulogium which is comprised in the present volume, it seems desirable to discuss the evidence which determines the period at which the work was written.

II. DATE OF COMPOSITION OF THE EULOGIUM.

Internal evidence proving the Book to have been written contemporaneously with the rated.

this evi-

dence.

THE internal evidence, which proves the author of the Eulogium to have been contemporary with the latter part events narrated in the latter portion of the Fifth Book, is unusually copious, and establishes the important conclusion that the latter part of the Chronicle of the reign of Edward the Third was not only the work of a person who had lived in the reign, but was actually events nar- written in the reign, and most probably while the events which are narrated were taking place.

This evidence may be conveniently divided into Division of two parts, that which depends upon the existence of certain peculiarities in the autograph of the work, and that which is afforded by the work itself, independently of any particular manuscript of it.

I. The former class of evidence consists in the very depends on striking and frequent variations of the ink and chaliarities of racter of the MS. A. in the latter part of the Fifth



PREFACE. ix

Book, commencing about A.D. 1364. I cannot better the auto describe the appearance of this part of the MS. than graph. by saying that it looks exactly like an autograph diary, irregularly kept, in which the entries have been set down sometimes singly, sometimes, but more often, in a number together. The latter entries of the Kalendary Chronicle also, from which it is nearly certain that the portion of the Eulogium which lies between A.D. 1354 and A.D. 1363 was copied, present the same appearance in an even greater degree. These variations will be uniformly noticed in the footnotes to the entries in which they occur, it is therefore only necessary here to give the inferences which may be drawn from them with regard to the relative times at which the different passages seem to have been written. The portion of the Eulogium extending from A.D. 1354 to A.D. 1363 having been copied from the Kalendar presents few of these variations, and the proof of its claim to be considered a contemporary copy, depending on the date at which the parts which succeed it were written, we now proceed to consider the latter question. Commencing with A.D. 1363 (I use the chronology of the MS.), the first two entries of this year appear to have been written at the same time, which must necessarily have been on or after the latest date, that is, September, A.D. 1363, and the slight difference, such as might arise from the lapse of a few months, between the characters of the last entries in A.D. 1362, and the first in A.D. 1363, tends to show that they were not written simultaneously. The next three entries and the two first words, "Eodem anno," of the sixth are in the same hand and ink, and must have been written after 9th March, A.D. 1363 (or A.D. 1364, if we employ the ordinary reckoning by historical years), but the rest is clearly a correction made at some subsequent period and simultaneously with the last entry of the year and the two first of A.D. 1364. The two next entries



 \mathbf{x}

PREFACE.

appear to have been written simultaneously and subsequently to the last. The next, belonging to the historical year A.D. 1365, seems to have been written subsequently. The next two entries, both belonging to the historical year A.D. 1364, were written at the same time and subsequently to the last. Afterwards the birth of Edward, son of Edward the Black Prince, belonging to the historical year A.D. 1365, appears to have been recorded. Then, as the ink and character clearly show, the marriage of the princess Isabel. At a subsequent period, perhaps, the mission of Edmund Langley and others to Flanders was set down. About the same time nearly the account of the battle near Adrianople; after which the earthquake at Rhodes, which partly precedes and partly follows it, was inserted. The first entry in A.D. 1366 was written subsequently to this last account, the latter part of it having been corrected apparently about the same time that the death of Simon de Islep was recorded. some subsequent time it is clear that the death and funeral of William de Edingdon were entered, possibly when the erased paragraph which follows was written The two next entries appear to have been written simultaneously, but at a different time to the two which follow them. The two last were perhaps written down together.

The later entries made at many different periods.

The different short entries of which the latter part of the Chronicle consists thus appear to have been written down, one or more at a time, in a manner quite distinct from the earlier chapters of the Fifth Book, and, indeed, of the work itself, much larger portions of which, consisting of several pages, were evidently written by the same pen. There are not many explanations1 of this difference, and by far the most

That in the earlier parts of the write large portions of his work at work the author had more leisure a sitting—that he found a difficulty and was therefore better able to



PREFACE.

probable of all is certainly the supposition, which will be found to explain all the other facts, that while the author was compiling in the former parts of his work from previous authorities, in the latter he was recording events with which he was closely contemporary, perhaps even putting them down very nearly in the order in which he heard of them. This is partially true also of a portion of the Eulogium which precedes A.D. 1364; for it is probably a copy from the Kalendary Chronicle, which, from A.D. 1354 to A.D. 1364, may be proved in nearly the same manner to have been written down in small portions at a time.

II. The internal evidence, which is independent of That which particular MSS., may now be discussed; it consists of dent of the the following passages and expressions found in the autograph. Fifth Book of the Eulogium:

1. The assertion at the end of the Proem that the Asserted work was concluded in A.D. 1362: "Terminatum est date of conclusion. " hoc opusculum in anno Domini MCCCLXII. sub rege " Edwardo a Conquæstu Tertio." 1 These words, which of course refer at furthest to that portion of the Eulogium which concludes with the entry for the year A.D. 1362, may be held to prove that in A.D. 1362 the author completed the Eulogium as it originally stood; but it by no means follows from this passage alone that the work originally concluded with an entry for A.D. 1362; it might have terminated with an earlier

ter part of the Chronicle, and had to jot down one piece from one predecessor and another from another -and so forth, are conjectural suppositions by which the difference might be explained. But, on carefully weighing probabilities pro and con., I see no conclusion which is not infinitely inferior in likelihood to that which I have adopted in the text. Obviously the most natural explanation of frequent variations in the ink and character of a Chronicle of events, known on other grounds to have been written very near the period of the events narrated, would be that the entries of events were made as the author became acquainted with them. That other explanations are conceivable only proves that we are dealing with probable and not with necessary matter.

1 All MSS, which have the Proem concur in this reading.



xii PREFACE.

date. Thus much, however, is clear from the preceding part of the Proem, that what is now the Fifth Book was, or was intended to be, the last division of the work when the Proem was written, and therefore that the work must have terminated with some entry in that division, in spite of the conclusion induced by a curious passage 1 in the autograph, imperfectly corrected, that a portion at least of the Fifth Book was written before that division of the work which is now called the Third Book.

The peculiar manner in which the words "Edwardo" and "Tertio" are written in the autograph will afford us no assistance towards determining the original extent of the work; the only inference which we are compelled to draw from the addition of these two words subsequently to the remainder of the Proem being that already stated in the Preface to the First Volume, that the Proem must have been written before the work was finished, unless we would suppose the author to have been ignorant of the name of the king of England under whom he wrote it.

Thus there appears to be no evidence contained in the Proem to show with what entry the Fifth Book originally terminated. On grounds of general probability, indeed, it is more likely than not that the author would bring his Annals down to his own times, and even to the very date at which he was writing; and this general likelihood will be confirmed in the sequel, where it will be shown that the entry for A.D. 1362 was most probably written in that year itself, and that therefore that entry was most probably the original termination of the Eulogium.

With regard to that portion of the work which extends beyond A.D. 1362, it will appear that the

¹ This passage is in the Fifth Book, and describes the collection of Legends at the end of the Third " tertio revelandæ sunt."



PREFACE.

xiii

latest portion of it was most probably written before A.D. 1367, so far as the species of evidence with which we are now dealing carries us.

2. The occasional employment of the present tense by The the author in speaking of certain events in the latter author's use of the part of the Chronicle. The following are the instances: present

α. In his attack on the costume which he asserts tense:—
was worn by the English in the years A.D. 1361 and ence to the A.D. 1362, the separate articles of dress are spoken costume of A.D. 1361 of in the present tense in all the MSS. which con- and A.D. tain the passage,1 no intimation being given that the 1362. author is writing at a date subsequent to A.D. 1362. Thus: "Quædam sunt longa usque ad talum," "Potius " mulieres quam mares judicantur," "Habent etiam " capucia," "Habent etiam aliud indumentum," "Habent " etiam caligas," "Populus lasciviat," are among the expressions employed by him on this occasion. Now the phrase with which he commences, "Eodem anno et " in anno præcedenti," would have intimated, had he been writing at a later date, that the fashions were confined to those two years only;2 for if he had been desirous of stating merely the date at which they commenced, the mention of one year would have sufficed to fix it. But had he been writing subsequently, while the costume was still in fashion, he would have

employed some such phrases as "etiam nunc habent,"

verbatim, no doubt from the Eulo-

¹ This passage is quoted by Camden in his Remaines (London, 1629, p. 196). Philipot, in some of his editions of the work, adds a reference to an MS. Bodl. Laud., which might thus have been supposed to be a fifth MS. of the Eulogium. Through the kindness of Dr. Bandinel, which I have much pleasure in taking this opportunity of acknowledging, I am enabled to assert that this is not the case. The MS. contains a Chronicle into which this passage has been copied nearly

² That the duration of fashions in dress was very short we have evidence in a curious passage of the Brute Chronicle attributed to Douglas of Glastonbury (MS. Publ. Libr. Hamburg): "And in this tyme" [15 Edw. III.] "englisshe men so myche " haunted and cleved to be woodness " and foly of be straungers bat " bey ordeyned and chaunged hem "every 3eer diverse shappes and "desgisynges of clothyng "



xiv

PREFACE.

The author's use of the present tense;—

or "in nostris diebus habent," or "hucusque populus " lasciviat," which would have precisely marked his remoteness from the date of which he was writing; while, if the fashion had been discontinued, a past tense would have been certainly used. It follows therefore that he was writing at a date not later than A.D. 1362, and while the costume which he describes was still in fashion. The evidence afforded by the autograph, though not quite conclusive, is still confirmatory of, or at the least not inconsistent with, the supposition that this curious passage was actually written in A.D. 1362; for though the ink in which it is written is of almost exactly the same colour as that of the five succeeding entries, a close comparison of the concluding lines of the passage with the first lines of the first entry in A.D. 1363 reveals an appreciable difference in the general appearance of the handwriting of these two portions of the MS., while the forms of some of the letters are decidedly discrepant. The character at the end of the first passage is cramped and stiff, and the letters are longer than usual, while at the commencement of the second the character is free, the letters shorter and more widely separated. In short, there is just such a difference as might have arisen from the lapse of a short interval between the execution of the first passage and that of the second, though it is certainly not a difference which would obtrude itself on the eye of a careless reader of the MS. the entry for A.D. 1362 were written during that year, it might have been set down as late as 24th March, A.D. 1363, according to the ordinary historical computation; while the two next entries, which appear to have been written at once, and, for similar reasons to those given above, before the following three, cannot have been written before the date of the later, September, A.D. 1363. This interval of a few months would satisfactorily account for the asserted difference between the characters of the two contiguous portions of the MS.



PREFACE.

xv

β. In describing the impressment of workmen in The A.D. 1364, for the works at Windsor Castle, the author author's use of the says that they were hired also to carry on the works present of another castle called "Schephey" which the king was building when he wrote: "Tum propter illud tum ference to " propter aliud castellum quod de novo ædificat 1 quod the works " dicitur Schephey."

The first inference to be drawn from this word " ædificat," which is perfectly legible, uncontracted, and neither written upon an erasure nor in any way altered or tampered with, is that it is morally certain that this passage in which it occurs was written during the reign of Edward the Third, since it is that king who is asserted to have been building the castle; but as the castle here mentioned was that which was afterwards known by the name of the Castle of Queenborough, it is further clear that the entry must have been written while that castle was in course of erection, and most probably before the creation of the borough in A.D. 1368, while it was still known as "castrum de Schepheye." Hasted, in his History of Kent, asserts, on the authority of Leland, that Sheppey Castle was commenced about A.D. 1361,2 and adds that it was finished about six years afterwards, when the king made a visit to it; but he gives no authority for the latter assertion. The first constable of Sheppey Castle was John Foxley who was appointed on the 1st October, A.D. 1365; 3 it appears also that the

¹ This the reading of the earlier MSS. A., E., and of H.; the later MSS. B. and D. read "ædificabat." The phrase "de novo ædificare" is opposed to "reparare" by our author in the Kalendary Chronicle.

² The first surveyors and comptroller of works and men "circa " constructionem castri quod infra " insulam de Shepeye de novo fieri " ordinavimus operantes et opera-"turos" were appointed by Patent

dated at Westminster 2 April, 35 Edw. III., i.e. 2 April, A.D. 1361. See Pat. 35 Edw. III. p. 1, m. 3. The first appointment to impress workmen for the construction of the castle is dated 5 May, 35 Edw. III. See Pat. 35 Edw. III. p. 2, m. 25. On same roll, m. 18, " castrum " nostrum quod in insula de Shepeye " jam de novo construi incepimus is mentioned under 21 June.

³ See Pat. 39 Edw. III. p. 2, m. 11.

xvi

PREFACE.

The author's use of the present tense:—

king was at "his castle of Shepeye" in the month of May, A.D. 1366, and tested several instruments there, the borough of Queenborough being created by charter 10th May, 42 Edw. III.²

A continuous series of accounts of the expenses of the works at the Castle and Vill of Queenborough is to be found from 36 Edw. III. to 41 Edw. III., both included, on the Great Rolls of the Pipe, and from 42 Edw. III. onwards on the Rolls of Foreign Account of the Court of Exchequer preserved in the Record Office; and among the Miscellanea of the King's Remembrancer of the Court of Exchequer in the same Department a few of the original accounts are still to be found. Like all early accounts of fabric expenses, these last are extremely curious and minute, but unfortunately their number is very small. The former accounts, from their greater compendiousness, are comparatively useless for the determination of the actual date of completion of the castle. We can trace in them, year by year, the gradual progress of the works, the gradual increase in the staff of officials resident in the castle, the gradual diminution of the expenditure on the works, but there appears to be nothing in them which tends to show that the assertion of Hasted is true. In the few original accounts there is much which might be employed to prove that the fortifications were not actually completed until late in the reign of Edw. III.3 There are no accounts of expenses

¹ See Pat. 40 Edw.III. p. 1, m.8,&c.

² See Cart. 42 Edw. III. No. 8.

³ In proof of this in the "Par-"ticulæ compoti" of Bernard Cokkes, which run from 11 Jan. 41 to 11 Aug. 42 Edw. III., i. e., from 11 Jan. to 11 Aug. A.D. 1368, we find a sum paid "pro ly et "dimidia perticatis j pede & j "quarterio j pedis muri dicti castri vocati Barbican faciendo et per-

[&]quot;ficiendo;" in the "Particulæ com"poti" of Thomas Stapulle, which
run from 7 Nov. 44 to 29 Nov. 45
Edw. III., i. e., from 7 Nov. A.D.
1370 to 29 Nov. A.D. 1371, there is

a sum paid "pro iiij. iiij. peciis

" petrarum vocatarum bordure pro
" caminio supra magnam portam
" Barbicani castri prædicti emp" tis"



PREFACE.

xvii

of works at Queenborough to be found on the Foreign The au-Account Rolls for the first six years of the reign of ther's use Richard II. Thus our safest conclusion appears to be, present that the passage must have been written "regnante " Edwardo Tertio." If Hasted, however, be supposed to have had good reason for his apparently unsupported assertion, and if the king's visit to Sheppey Castle in May, A.D. 1366 be supposed to be that which he mentions, the inference that the passage was written before that date becomes justifiable. It is tolerably certain that, if not written before, it could not have been written very long after the date of the charter, for if it had, our author would, in all probability, not have spoken of Queenborough Castle as the castle " quod dicitur Schephey," but as the "castrum de " Quenesburgh."

y. In condemning the number of the episcopal With rechanges which took place about the time of the death ference to of Ralph de Salopia in A.D. 1363, he says: "Vix episcopal " ullus de suo beneficio placatus, et sic quasi more A.D. 1363. " mercimonii dignitates obtinent dicentes illud " cedere in papæ eleemosinam cum tamen symoniam " colunt," evidently describing something which was going on when he wrote, and which as evidently, from the commencement of the entry, was the practice to which he is objecting. Had he been writing long after the events, he would assuredly have used a past tense.

8. In mentioning the presence of Louis, whom he With reerroneously calls John, king of Hungary at the battle ference to Louis king near Adrianople in A.D. 1364, he says of him: "Parem of Hun " in toto mundo bonitatis non h3," the last con-gary. traction undoubtedly standing for "habet," his usual abbreviation for "habuit" being "huit." This pas-

This is the reading of A., D., E., and H.; B. reads "habuit," from which we may perhaps conclude the character of the handwriting.



xviii

PREFACE.

The author's use of the present tense:

sage therefore must have been written before the death of Louis, which took place in A.D. 1382. The limit of date here given is much wider than that assigned by the entries hitherto quoted, but if the passage had been the only one of the kind in the Eulogium, it would have been held and justly to have established the contemporaneousness of the author with the period of which he writes.

His use of common report.

- 3. On several occasions he refers to common report as the source of certain information which he gives. He does not begin to employ this source until the year A.D. 1364, and as he no doubt had recourse to it, because no other source was open to him, it becomes an important question if there is anything in the nature of the information itself which would lead to a conclusion as to the kind of report which he follows; if it were tradition or contemporary oral narrative. Now he always introduces these reports with the words "dicebatur," "dictum erat," "dictum fuit," in one instance using "tradunt homines," and in one in "vulgo "ignotum est." It is therefore reports contemporary with the events to which they refer which he uses and to most of which he refers as past. But the form of this reference would be imposed by the grammatical form of the narrative, which describes generally all events as past; while on the other hand the information supplied by the reports might very well have been furnished by better sources if the author had been writing some time after the events. The following are instances of this use of common report.
- a. In the notice of the long frost in A.D. 1364-5 he says, "dicebatur in populo quod hoc fuit invisum" ad centum annos elapsos."
- β. In the account of the marriage of the princess Isabel with Ingelram de Courcy in A.D. 1365 he calls the bridegroom "cuidam magnati . . . dictus do-"minus de Cursi," and adds, "in vulgo nomen aliud



PREFACE.

xix

" ignotum est," i. e. "his other name is not known His use of " among the people." This seems to be the very common report. phrase which a contemporary would use who wrote immediately after the event, and employed the best source at his command, Had he written some time afterwards, it seems very unlikely that the full style and title of the husband of a daughter of Edward III. should have been still unknown even "in vulgo," or that some more authoritative source should not have been open to the chronicler which would have furnished him with the information.

- y. In the account of the frauds of the Lombard merchants he says, "dictum erat in populo quod de-" fraudabant regem de tribus milibus librarum argenti " quolibet anno."
- 8. In the account of the proceedings with regard to the marriage between Prince Edmund and Margaret, Duchess of Burgundy, he says, in reference to the Parliament of 20th January, A.D. 1365: "Ea de causa " tradunt homines parliamentum mense Januario con-
- 4. The account of the death and funeral in A.D. 1366 of Account William of Edingdon, bishop of Winchester, was of course death of written after the funeral and most probably before the William of Edingdon, author had heard the name of the bishop's successor, written for he adds to the account the words "cui successit," before the and leaves a blank after them for the name. When, ment of however, he wrote the last two sentences of the work, his successors. which must have been after November, A.D. 1366, it is clear that he had learned the name, for in the last but one he mentions the election of William of Wykeham to the see of Winchester as having taken place "in "fine hujus anni," that is of A.D. 1366; it received the royal assent on 24th October in that year. He adds Popular in the last sentence that it was commonly reported talk of the probability that John Barnet was (or ought) to be translated of the ("deberet transferri") to the see of Ely. Now if he translation of John



 $\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}$

PREFACE.

Barnet to Ely noticed.

had written these two passages after having heard of the translation of Barnet, who was postulated to Ely by a Papal Bull, dated 15th December, A.D. 1366, the temporalities being restored to him 24th April, A.D. 1367, it is extremely improbable that he would have preferred chronicling the mere popular talk of the likelihood or desirableness of the translation to stating the fact of the translation itself; it would be a very minute Chronicler indeed who, writing some time after the events, would include in the history of a period the mere report of the probability of an episcopal promotion, which afterwards actually took place, for its own sake only, and accordingly in no other chronicle of the period which mentions the translation is the report in question noticed. It is therefore all but certain that these last entries were written before our author had heard of the election of Barnet, that is, we may fairly assume, before the middle of the year 1367, on the most disadvantageous computation. There is only one fact which appears to weigh against this conclusion, and that is that just after the notice of the election of Wykeham an account of his consecration is promised in a future page ("quomodo consecratus "imposterum plenius explicetur"), as if the author had been aware that it had already taken place. Now as this consecration was not celebrated until 10th October, A.D. 1367, it seems morally certain that if he had heard of it he must also have heard of the election of Barnet. It is far more likely that when the account of the consecration was promised, our author, with many others, expected that it would follow the election very closely, according to custom, and made no allowance for the unusual delay in this instance of the Papal confirmation.

Silence of the author as to important facts 5. The absence of facts from the Chronicle of sufficient importance to have been mentioned, if the author had been writing after they had taken place, affords



PREFACE.

xxi

presumptive negative proof that he was writing before noticed by that period. Two remarkable instances are:—

a. The absence of any reference to the early death, of the in A.D. 1371, of Edward, son of the Black Prince, after period. the record of his birth in A.D. 1365. The Continuator of Murimuth notices this in mentioning the birth, in which he has been followed by Walsingham and others.

β. The absence of any allusion to the subsequent marriage, on 19th June, A.D. 1369, of Margaret of Flanders to the duke of Burgundy after the narrative of the negotiations in A.D. 1364 for a marriage between her and Edmund, earl of Cambridge. This subsequent alliance is mentioned at the same time as the negotiations by the Continuator of Murimuth and others.

6. The references to eye-witnesses as his authorities His refefor certain facts are made in such a manner as to the testiafford in one instance a high probability, and in an-mony of other as conclusive proof, as the matter is capable of, nesses, of his contemporaneousness with the facts.

a. He says of the account of the earthquake at Rhodes in A.D. 1364, that it was given by word of mouth of an eyewitness to "uni de commonachis " Malmesburiæ," which very probably means "one of " my fellow-monks of Malmesbury," one of the monks resident there with him.

 β . He says of the meteor which appeared in October A.D. 1366, that it was actually described to him by two of his brother monks - "ostensum est nobis per "duos fratres nostros monachos" - who saw it on a iourney.1

¹ The proof is of course not perfect in either of these cases, even omitting all supposition of falsehood, error, etc. on the part of the | "chus" might be applied to a monk VOL. II.

| author and assuming both assertions to be strictly true; for it is possible in the first case that "commona-



xxii

PREFACE.

Character of the hand-writing of the autograph.

7. Last of all, the character of the autograph belongs undoubtedly to the latter half of the fourteenth century, that is, to the portion of it after A.D. 1350, very probably, indeed, to the reign of Edward the Third, that is, to the portion of it before A.D. 1377, and with sufficient likelihood to the period included between A.D. 1350 and A.D. 1370.

III. AUTHORITIES EMPLOYED IN THE FOURTH BOOK.

THE sources from which the Fourth Book has been compiled are very various, the Polichronicon still furnishing a few particulars, though by no means so many as it contributed to the former books.

This book commences with a short introduction, which is almost verbally identical with the introduction to the First Book of the Polichronicon, varying from that work as represented by the MS. Harl. No. 655, in the addition of the number of famous mountains and celebrated cities in the world. The Polichronicon is still closely followed in the first, second, and third chapters, when it is relinquished for the Thirteenth Book of the Etymologiæ of Isidorus. The first chapter is referred in

of the same monastery as the author, who had died before he was born; and in the second that the two "brother monks" saw the meteor before he was born and communicated the fact to him after that event. In neither case would he be strictly contemporary with the events described. But if the passage quoted above, which proves the author to have written an entry in the Eulogium in the reign of Edward III. be used, the case is somewhat altered. The events communicated having happened respectively in

A.D. 1364 and A.D. 1366 and Edward III. dying in A.D. 1377, the author must be assumed to have been born before either of the events happened, unless we would suppose him writing an historical work at the request of his Prior at an earlier age than thirteen. When it is further remembered that he finished the work in A.D. 1362 it is proved (not to demonstration) that he was contemporary with both events. Assuming him to have been 30 years of age in A.D. 1362 he might have lived into the fifteenth century.