

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-04882-8 - *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene*: Volume 2
Roger of Hoveden Edited by William Stubbs
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE LIBRARY COLLECTION

Books of enduring scholarly value

Rolls Series

Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptorum, 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.

Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene

Roger of Hoveden's *Chronica* was begun around 1192 and covers English history from 732 to 1201, when it is assumed he died. The work is largely an annotated compilation of various other chronicles, including the *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi Benedicti Abbatis* (also reissued in this series). This was formerly attributed to Benedict of Peterborough, which was the view taken by William Stubbs (1825–1901) when he edited this work for the Rolls Series in 1868–71. Since the twentieth century, however, Hoveden has been recognised as the author. As a clerk to Henry II until 1189, and later as a diplomat during the Third Crusade, he was ideally placed to gain first-hand knowledge and also documents, which he provides here in full. In Volume 2 (1148–89), Hoveden edits and amalgamates other chronicles, including his own *Gesta*, adding further annotations and a collection of letters relating to the Becket controversy.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-04882-8 - Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene: Volume 2

Roger of Hoveden Edited by William Stubbs

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

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.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-04882-8 - Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene: Volume 2
Roger of Hoveden Edited by William Stubbs
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene

VOLUME 2

ROGER OF HOVEDEN
EDITED BY WILLIAM STUBBS



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-04882-8 - Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene: Volume 2
Roger of Hoveden Edited by William Stubbs
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town,
Singapore, São Paulo, 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/9781108048828

© in this compilation Cambridge University Press 2012

This edition first published 1869
This digitally printed version 2012

ISBN 978-1-108-04882-8 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.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-04882-8 - Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene: Volume 2
Roger of Hoveden Edited by William Stubbs
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

RERUM BRITANNICARUM MEDII ÆVI
SCRIPTORES,

OR

CHRONICLES AND MEMORIALS OF GREAT BRITAIN
AND IRELAND

DURING

THE MIDDLE AGES.

22148.

2

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-04882-8 - Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene: Volume 2

Roger of Hoveden Edited by William Stubbs

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

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.

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.*

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-04882-8 - Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene: Volume 2
Roger of Hoveden Edited by William Stubbs
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CHRONICA

MAGISTRI ROGERI DE
HOUEDENE.

EDITED

BY

WILLIAM STUBBS, M.A.,

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF MODERN HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,
FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE, AND SOMETIME LIBRARIAN
TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

VOL. II.

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

LONDON:
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

—
1869.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-04882-8 - Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene: Volume 2

Roger of Hoveden Edited by William Stubbs

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Printed by
Eyre and Spottiswoode, Her Majesty's Printers,
For Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-04882-8 - Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene: Volume 2
 Roger of Hoveden Edited by William Stubbs
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CONTENTS.

	Page
PREFACE - - - - -	ii
APPENDIX TO PREFACE - - - - -	ci
LAWS OF THE CONQUEROR - - - - -	ci
ASSIZE OF CLARENDON - - - - -	cii
ASSIZE OF ESSOINERS - - - - -	cv
CHRONICA ROGERI DE HOUEDENE - - - - -	1

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-04882-8 - Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene: Volume 2

Roger of Hoveden Edited by William Stubbs

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-04882-8 - Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene: Volume 2

Roger of Hoveden Edited by William Stubbs

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

P R E F A C E.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-04882-8 - Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene: Volume 2

Roger of Hoveden Edited by William Stubbs

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

P R E F A C E.



THE present volume contains that portion of the compilation of Roger of Hoveden which corresponds with the "Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi," commonly known under the name of Benedict of Peterborough, down to the death of Henry. It is the first and larger half of the third division of the entire Chronicle, which I have described in the preface to the first volume as partly an abridgement, partly an expansion, of the "Gesta" or "Benedict."

Contents of
the present
volume.

Although in preparation for editing the more ancient of the two books I had to inform myself thoroughly, by collating them both in print and in manuscript, of their structure and mutual relations; and again, in drawing up the preface to the first volume of the present work, I had to go over again with even greater minuteness the same ground, starting as it were from the opposite terminus, yet it was almost a necessity that, in the process of editing and seeing through the press that portion of Hoveden which had been most immediately the subject of those researches, some new light should be thrown upon the matter.

This has certainly been the case in many minute points, some few of which, being otherwise interesting, I shall return to by and by. But as to the main question, I am glad to say that in every case the result has been to confirm the theory of the structure and relation of the two Chronicles which I have already advanced in the prefaces. To attempt therefore to detail

The examination of the present volume confirms the views given in the preface to the first volume.

here the minutiae of additional proof is unnecessary. Such a detail would consist of little more than a recapitulation of arguments which I have already twice stated, accompanied by a series of illustrations less obvious and less strong as proofs than those already given, and which being of the nature of circumstantial or confirmatory, and not direct evidence, might by themselves be regarded as weakening rather than strengthening the case. I have on all occasions called attention, in the notes to the present volume, to the particulars which have struck me as illustrating or elucidating the connexion of the books, and it is very possible that a careful student will be able to increase the number. But I think I may confidently say that there is no single instance to be adduced which does not fall in with the conclusions I have already drawn.

New edition of Simeon of Durham.

As regards the earlier portion of Hoveden's work, where the question of his use of the "Gesta" does not come in, I may be allowed to mention that, since the first volume was published, the Surtees Society have put forth a new edition of the Chronicle of Simeon of Durham, edited with great critical and antiquarian acuteness by Mr. Hodgson Hinde.¹ The value of this edition is not merely literary: the editor has brought to the work a remarkable local knowledge of Northumbria, and a thorough acquaintance with the historical productions of the Northumbrian school; and the result is a careful anatomy of the work on which the successive Durham historians founded their compilations, and which is finally reproduced in the first part of Roger of Hoveden. Mr. Hodgson Hinde's researches, although begun from a different starting point, and running into questions which did not immediately concern the task which I had set myself, have brought him to the same conclusions to which my own,

¹ Symeonis Dunelmensis Opera et Collectanea; vol. i., *Durham*, 1868.

PREFACE.

ix

mainly literary ones, had brought me. As these investigations were carried on by us quite independently, and even unknown to one another, and as the books were in fact passing through the press at the same time, I venture to think that the force of the evidence in the two cases is mutually strengthened, and that the questions which we have treated in common may henceforth be considered as settled.

How far it illustrates the work of Hoveden.

But there are other questions, touching the relation of the manuscripts of Hoveden with one another, and with the text of Savile's edition, which call for some short discussion in this place, and I am not sorry to have the opportunity of adding to what I said in the preface to the first volume such further illustrations on these points as the process of editing has brought out. Some little repetition on this head is, I fear, unavoidable.

I must premise that the division of the work which appears in the present volume is made to close with the death of Henry II. by a mere arbitrary arrangement, for the sake of convenience. It would have been impossible to get into a single volume the whole division that coincides with the "Gesta," and which runs on to the year 1192; and in default of this the best arrangement seemed to be to carry it no further than the end of the reign. This result does not accord either with the natural division arising from the structure of the work, which would have made 1177, 1180, or 1192 the limit,¹ nor with any of the divisions created by the almost accidental condition of particular manuscripts; but it is hoped that it will be found an advantage in the practical use of the book.

Present volume closes with the death of Henry II.

And I must repeat, once for all, that the text of the volume up to the close of 1180, and the Appendix of

¹ The original manuscript of Benedict ends in 1177; the first volume of Hoveden in 1180; and the second manuscript of Benedict in 1192.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-04882-8 - Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene: Volume 2

Roger of Hoveden Edited by William Stubbs

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

x

PREFACE.

Source of the text of this volume.

1. The Royal MS.

2. The Laud MS.

Laws which follows, is taken from the Royal Manuscript in the British Museum, Reg. 14. C. 2 ; and from the year 1181 onwards from the Laudian Manuscript 582, in the Bodleian Library. It is not necessary to reiterate the arguments which have convinced me that the Royal Manuscript is, as far as it goes, the most ancient and genuine version of Hoveden's compilation,¹ and that the Laudian Manuscript, for the portion that it contains, is even nearer to the original. The Royal Manuscript is, down to 1180, a fair copy of (probably) the original draught : the Laudian Manuscript partakes of both characters ; it is primarily a fair copy, but gradually runs into the form of an original draught. Beginning in the same fair round hand, and with the same number of lines to the page, as the Royal Manuscript, as it goes on it changes penmanship more than once, and loses the uniformity of lineation. The changes of hand are however, all strictly contemporaneous ; and there is no opening for the supposition, which indeed would be completely silenced by other evidence, that the portions written by the various scribes were additions to or alterations of the work as it was left by its compiler.²

¹ See preface to vol. i. pp. lxxiv—lxxx.

² Some of these changes of hand occur at the end of the annals of the several years. The manuscript is written on a lavish scale, and at the end of each year there is a blank leaf, or part of one, left for additions. It will be found that several of Hoveden's additions to Benedict are on these extra leaves ; see for example the agreement between archbishop Roger and Bishop Hugh, at p. 70, at the end of 1174 ; —the acts of the council of Lombers at p. 105, at the end of 1176 :—both these occur in the Royal manu-

script. In the Laud MS., in which more care has been given to begin each year at the head of a new leaf, the fact of the addition is even more obvious. The story of Eustace of Flay's servant, at p. 272, at the end of 1182, is one case ; the epistle of Pharamella at p. 297, at the end of 1184, is another ; the account of Alfonso, king of Portugal, at the end of 1187, at p. 333, is a third, and this is added in a different hand ; and the description of the death of Henry II., with which the volume ends, is the fourth. But all these appear in all the manuscripts, and the change of hand does not coin-

PREFACE.

xi

Although the similarity of hand and uniformity of page exhibited in the two manuscripts are evidence sufficient to prove that they were closely allied in origin and probably intended to be companion volumes, I believe they very early parted company. I have already stated that Walter of Coventry, who transcribed the latter of the two divisions, knew it alone as the work of Roger of Hoveden. The relation of Manuscript B. (Arundel 69),¹ which was described in the preface to the first volume, is not the same to both; a fact which looks in the same direction.

This beautiful volume is, down to the end of the Laws of Edward the Confessor, which form the second part of the legal Appendix to 1180, a very exact transcript of the Royal Manuscript. It agrees with it in every point except where an occasional mis-spelling of a common word has been corrected.² It follows even the very capricious spelling of the original in the case of proper names. But it does not with equal servility correspond with the Laudian Manuscript from 1181 downwards; and we are therefore obliged to suppose either that it may have been transcribed from a fairer copy of the second part, which may once have accompanied the Royal Manuscript,³ or that it may have been

The two MSS. early separated.

Relation of MS. Arundel 69 to the Royal and Laud MSS.

cide with any of the omissions in MSS. B. and I. mentioned below. MS. B. must have been transcribed before 1213, and it contains all these. A reference to p. 195, note 3, will show that the Royal MS. was not considered by its writer beyond the possibility of being augmented with new matter.

¹ See vol. i., pref., p. lxxx.

² In one or two places in the Laws, MS. B. supplies a better reading than A.: but MS. A. is occasionally unintelligible, and the correction probably conjectural. See below, p. 218, note 3.

³ It would appear from what is stated at p. 241, that MS. B. was written before 1213. Thus;—at the end of the pedigree of the kings the original scribe of the Royal MS. has brought down the line to the reign of John. A later hand has added *annis xiiii.* to the word *regnavit* as the length of John's reign. Now as John reigned several years longer, this addition cannot have been made later than the fourteenth year of his reign, 1213, and the penmanship suits the date. But MS. B. does not contain the *annis xiiii.*:—therefore it was written before the addi-

The Arundel MS. perhaps a revision of the Laud.

a revision, by the faithful copyist of the Royal Manuscript, of the much rougher text of the Laudian. I am inclined to the second of these suppositions; first, because we have no evidence that a second volume of the Royal Manuscript ever existed, unless that second volume be the Laudian Manuscript; but more especially because of the character of the divergencies of MS. B. from the text of the latter.

Omissions of Letters in the Arundel MS.

These divergencies are of the exact character which would belong to a revision; slight improvements in the spelling of words, both common and proper. With these corrections it is a close copy of the original, except in one great point. It omits several letters of the Scottish series, touching the disputed election to the bishoprick of S. Andrews, and some of the astrological calculations and prophecies, which occupy so large a portion of the Chronicle for the year 1184. Two theories may be adduced to account for the omission of these documents: either they were left out as tedious and irrelevant, or they were, when the transcript was made, not yet introduced into the original volume. The former supposition is the only possible one, for the omitted letters occur, for the most part, not at the end of their respective years, where they might have been inserted later than the rest of the text on the liberal interleaves of the magnificent manuscript, but are imbedded in the text, which on both sides of them has been carefully copied by the later scribe.

These do not agree with the variations of Benedict.

The further question is now raised: seeing that the insertion and omission of letters is one of the great features in which Hoveden's Chronicle departs from that of Benedict, do the letters omitted in MS. B. correspond with those which are not found in the Manuscript of Benedict? It is not a very important question, for, as I have shown in the preface to the latter chro-

tion was made, as it is a servile | before 1213; and the penmanship
 copy in all other respects: therefore | agrees with the date.

nicle,¹ the manuscript to which alone we are indebted for Benedict's History from the year 1177 downwards, was not transcribed until after Hoveden had chronicled the same period, and there may be some uncertainty as to which of the writers or copyists drew the letters from the other. But in point of fact there is no correspondence between MS. B. and the existing text of Benedict in this matter. The former omits the five letters of Clement III. given by Benedict and Hoveden under the year 1188,² and the letter of the monk Anselm of Worcester, with the long poem which it contains,³ which is common to the two works. It contains the astrological consolation of Pharamella,⁴ which is in Hoveden and not in Benedict; and it omits the epistle of William the astrologer in 1184,⁵ the Scottish letters of 1182 and 1186,⁶ and a short letter of pope Gregory VIII. in 1187,⁷ which are given by Hoveden and are not in Benedict. No argument can be drawn from such an arbitrary treatment of the originals, except that these omitted documents were omitted as being tedious, or superfluous or irrelevant. They are so generally in fact, and the omission in a revised edition is quite excusable. It is possible, and even probable, that the work as it proceeds will disclose greater divergencies on the part of MS. B., as the Laudian Manuscript becomes much rougher towards its close.

Comparison
of the Arundel MS. with
Benedict on
the point of
omission.

¹ Benedict, vol. i., pref., pp. xxvi. and xxvii., and note 3. I will remind the reader here that, as the Vitellius MS. of Benedict was evidently written after Hoveden's Chronicle was compiled, some of the common passages may have been incorporated from Hoveden: as for example the lament of Berter of Orleans, about which Hoveden was clearly better informed than his predecessor. But this does not affect the general relation of the two

works, the so called Benedict being both in language and detail uniformly fuller than Hoveden.

² Benedict, ii. 42, 57, 64. Hoveden, ii. 347, &c.

³ Benedict, i. 325, &c. Hoveden, ii. 293, &c.

⁴ Hoveden, ii. 297, &c.

⁵ Hoveden, ii. 292.

⁶ Hoveden, ii. 268, 271, 311, 312-314.

⁷ Hoveden, ii. 332.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-04882-8 - Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene: Volume 2

Roger of Hoveden Edited by William Stubbs

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Uselessness
of MS.
Arundel 150
as affecting
the sound-
ness of the
text.

Further experience of the use of MS. C. (the Arundel MS. 150),¹ has gone far to convince me of its absolute worthlessness as affecting the text of Hoveden. It is so carelessly written,² there are so many omissions, and so many apparently wanton liberties taken with the order of the narration, that it can only be regarded as a comprehensive epitome of the domestic history and leading foreign episodes of the original work. It does however still, as in the earlier portion, supply once or twice a sound reading for a corrupt one,³ and give the true version of an original document which has been misrepresented and disfigured in the whole of the other copies. It is possible that it may have been drawn up with the assistance of other books besides that from which it is mainly abridged. And this possibility has induced me to continue the collation of it throughout this volume, although I have given the various readings in the notes only where they were illustrative of some point of comparative importance. I do not regard it as a version of the text of Hoveden, or as having any authority of its own.

MS. Claud.
B. vii.

MS. D.,⁴ the ancient part of the Cottonian manuscript Claudius B. vii., from the year 1187⁵ onwards agrees in all important points, such as omissions and the spelling of words, with MS. B. And the same is true of MS. I.,⁶ which begins a few pages earlier, and for the use of which for the present edition I have to render my respectful thanks to the Master and Fellows of Trinity College, Cambridge. It is a very fine fragment,

MS. Trin.
Coll. Camb.

¹ See vol. i., pref., p. lxxxii.

² See especially p. 137, note 5; p. 167, note 3; p. 190, note 2; p. 215, note 1; p. 264, note 3, &c.

³ See especially, p. 164, note 2; p. 176, note 3: where the word *incurrat* is a better reading than *amitat*, and is in fact found in the cor-

responding passage in Gervase of Canterbury, and in other copies of the Acts of the Lateran Council, in the canons of which it occurs.

⁴ See vol. i., pref., p. lxxxii.

⁵ See p. 324, note 1, below.

⁶ See vol. i., pref., p. lxxxiv.

PREFACE.

xv

extending from the year 1187¹ to the end of the work, written in double columns on a quarto page, forty-nine lines to the page, and contains eighty folios. The hand is of the first half of the thirteenth century, but it is not so old as MS. D. This manuscript belonged to Gale, and is marked in the Trinity Catalogue O. 9. 23. It is rubricated throughout in the same hand as the text, and has a few marginal notes of various dates, but of no importance whatever.

Account of
the Trinity
MS.

The only other manuscript which calls for any mention is MS. G., the Harleian 3602.² This is, so far as the work has proceeded, a careful transcript of the Laudian manuscript; it is probably the second volume of a pair, of which the first is lost; or it may be like Walter of Coventry's copy,³ made from the second volume by one ignorant of the existence of the first. It is the only copy which, up to the death of Henry II., contains every document and every statement which is found in the Laudian manuscript.

MS. Harl.
3602 agree-
ing with the
Laud MS.

These remarks must be considered for the present to refer to the contents of the present volume only. Further use of the manuscripts may disclose further peculiarities: at present they fall into three classes; the first and fullest represented by A. and G.; the second, less full and possibly more finished, represented by B., D., and I.; the third, least full and least accurate, represented by C.

The text of Savile's edition does not agree exactly with any one of the manuscripts which have been within my reach for the purpose of collation. It is possible that another manuscript may yet be discovered with which it will be found to agree; but as at present informed, I am inclined to consider it an eclectic if not a critical version. It contains all the matter which has hitherto come under my revision in the Royal and

Relation of
Savile's text
to the MS.

¹ See p. 321, note 1, below.

² See vol. i., pref., p. lxxxiii.

³ See vol. i., pref., p. lxxii.

Savile's text
 probably
 eclectic: its
 omissions.

Laudian manuscripts, with the following not very important exceptions:—

1. Savile omits the list, in French, of the Crusaders who took part in the siege of Nicea in 1098,¹ and in the First Crusade. This list is found in all the manuscripts of Hoveden, but does not occur in the Durham compilation (MSS. S. John's, Oxford, 97, and Reg. 13 A. 6), on which the first part of his work was founded.

2. Savile abridges, in the documents relating to the betrothal of John the son of Henry II. to the heiress of Maurienne, the long list of the names of the persons² who were appointed sureties for the fulfilment of the negotiation by the count of Maurienne, summing them up briefly in a general way, and on the plan adopted in several places by the writer of MS. C. I mention this the more prominently because Savile's treatment of these names might easily mislead the student in the collation of this work with Benedict, and variations of this sort might be ascribed to Hoveden, which ought with more justice to be attributed to his editor Savile. In this particular case Savile might plead the authority of one of the manuscripts of Benedict, the later one Vitellius E. xvii., which also abridges the list of names in its copy of the same record.³

3. A third case in which apparently Savile's treatment of the manuscripts is unsatisfactory, may be found in his version of the letter of Manuel Comnenus to Henry II.⁴ which contains the history of the battle of Myrioccephalon. This letter is no doubt a somewhat puzzling composition, and reads like a literal translation from the Greek. The use for instance of the form "imperium meum" for the simple "ego" or "nos," and the consequent substitution of the third person of verbs for the first throughout the letter, compels the reader to

¹ Hoveden, i. 152.

² Hoveden, ii. 42, 43. Benedict, i. 37, 38, 39.

³ Benedict, i. 38, note 4.

⁴ Hoveden, ii. 102. Cf. Benedict, i. 128.

think twice before he catches the meaning. This seems to have been felt by our historians. The imperial letter was no doubt handed about the court, and fell into the hands, amongst the rest, of the dean of St. Paul's,¹ Ralph de Diceto, and of the author of the *Gesta*.² The dean contents himself with giving a very succinct abridgement; and the author of the *Gesta* omits all the earlier and more pompous part of the letter, giving the historical details in the words of Manuel. But Hoveden gives the whole letter, and that with such small blunders as show that he did not care to construe it. Savile, or the copyist whose manuscript he used, was not content with this, and has tried by altering the wording in several places to give a better sense. In this he or his authority has acted exactly as in other cases the writer of MS. C. has done.³ In this part of the work MS. C. is imperfect, or it might have been found to authorize Savile's alterations.

Omissions in
Savile's text.

4. But the most unsatisfactory case of all is to be found under the year 1176, in the Acts of the Council of Lomers, against the Albigensian heretics.⁴ Here Savile not only abridges the list of persons present at the Council, but supplies, apparently without authority, the full names of several of the prelates, who in the manuscripts are denoted only by an initial.⁵ These are generally wrong. "P." archbishop of Narbonne appears in Savile's text as Peter instead of Pontius; "G. Lugdo-

¹ R. de Diceto, c. 596.

² Benedict, i. 128.

³ As for instance, p. 337, note 5; and especially in the treatment of the letter of the patriarch of Antioch, p. 340, note 3.

⁴ Hoveden, ii. 105-117.

⁵ Savile has, I am sorry to say, done the same in one other case at least, p. 37; where he turns G. (for Gerard, archbishop of Ravenna,) into Gilleberio. At p. 56 he

has supplied the surname of the bishop of Chichester which the MSS. leave blank, as *Greneforde*; John de Greneforde appears in the lists of the bishops of Chichester, probably on this authority. Yet it is most probable that *Greneforde* is a misreading of *Ozeneforde*, and John of Oxford was not bishop of Chichester, but of Norwich. Of this, however, it is impossible to feel sure.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-04882-8 - Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene: Volume 2

Roger of Hoveden Edited by William Stubbs

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xviii

PREFACE.

Savile's
editing of
the Council
of Lombers.

“vensis,” appears as “Gilebertus Lugdonensis,” instead of Gaucelin bishop of Lodeve. “G. Tolosanus” appears as Gaucelin; the name really is Giraldus. These are the worst instances. Many other names are altogether omitted. As Savile’s text has been regarded as authoritative¹ as to this, the most ancient copy of the Acts of the Council, it is no wonder that the difficulty of fixing its date has been thus unnecessarily complicated. I shall have to return to this subject further on, and notice it here only as an instance, happily rare, of the illustrious editor’s mistaken manipulation of the text. Here again MS. C., which may have been followed by Savile, is imperfect, and it is possible that a manuscript may yet be found which will justify him from the charge of rashness. But even if this should be the case, it is hardly possible to acquit him altogether; for it would appear certain that he had access to the best manuscripts, and yet departed in this point from them. His edition is in all material respects so good, and its usefulness for the last two hundred and seventy years has been so great, that I feel sure no such criticism as this will be interpreted as directed to the depreciation of it. It is even probable that the lists of outlandish names are omitted from an honest desire to escape mistakes, or to avoid mystifying the student with readings of which the editor was in doubt, and which to neither editor nor student were likely to be anything better than a puzzle.

Savile's
emendanda.

Savile, at the end of his Hoveden, has given a list of *emendanda*.² The passages so corrected stand part of the Frankfort text of 1601, which in all other respects is an exact reproduction of Savile. Most of them are unimportant; but one, the extraordinary interpolation in the laws of Edward the Confessor, by

¹ See Labbe and Cossart, *Conc.*,
x. 1470.

² Savile's *Scriptores*, ed. 1596,
f. 471 verso.

PREFACE.

xix

which Charles and Pipin are represented as consulting William the Conqueror on their right to take the title of king,¹ is to say the least curious. It is found only in MS. C. of the existing manuscripts of Hoveden, and the acceptance of it would appear to prove Savile's acquaintance with that or a kindred version. It is impossible to say what led him to insert it among the emendanda, or how the Frankfort editor was so rash as to incorporate it in the text. Perhaps, however, the emendanda were supplied by an underling. This absurd story seems to be peculiar to MS. C.² At all events I have been unable to find it in any other version of the laws, even in those which have been most largely and preposterously interpolated.

Absurd mistake perpetuated in the Frankfort edition.

The only further literary question which it is necessary to discuss in this place, concerns the additions made by Hoveden to his original authority in the history of the years contained in this portion of his work. I shall not recapitulate in minute detail the several cases which I have enlarged on in the preface to the first volume,³ nor is it worth while to do more than call the attention of the reader to the merely casual divergencies which are marked by the difference of type and the marginal references of the present edition. Of three classes of additions, the new letters on the history of Thomas Becket, the sketch of his manner of life, and the amplification from extant authorities of the details of the martyrdom; of the additional documents on the subject of the disputed election to the see of S. Andrews; and of the two new astronomical calculations on the conjunctions of planets in

Hoveden's additions to the earlier chronicler.

¹ See below, p. 226, note 4.

² It is not in Lambarde's version, nor in Wilkins' *Leges Anglo-Saxonicae*, both of which are largely interpolated; nor in the Oriel MS. No. 46, which agrees in substance

with Lambarde, though not in order or form. It contains indeed far from the whole of what is in Lambarde, but I think nearly all the patent interpolations.

³ Vol. i., pref., pp. liii-lxv.

Hoveden's
additions.

1186 no more need be said.¹ On three other additions, the Acts of the Council of Lombers in 1176, the laws of England given under the year 1180, and a variety of small incidental stories somewhat characteristic of their compiler's turn of mind, some little comment is indispensable.

Acts of the
Council of
Lombers.

1. The Acts of the Council of Lombers are introduced by Hoveden at the end of the annals of 1176.² That the council belongs properly to the year 1165 may be considered as proved by the existence of two manuscript copies of the Acts agreeing in all other particulars of importance with Hoveden's text, but distinctly fixing them to the earlier date.³ The names of the persons present are indicated in all the copies by initials, many of which may be interpreted to suit either date;⁴ but the little distinct evidence derivable from them inclines unmistakably to the year 1165, and although, being of a negative character, it is by itself insufficient to prove it, it confirms the authority of the French manu-

¹ I give here, however, a list of the additional *Documents*; for this volume only.

1. p. 7. Letter of Alexander III. to Roger of York and Hugh of Durham.
2. p. 22. William, archbishop of Sens, to Alexander III.
3. p. 36. Charter of Absolution of Henry II.
4. p. 37. Cardinals Albert and Theodinus to the archbishop of Ravenna.
5. p. 70. Agreement between Roger of York and Hugh of Durham.
6. p. 102. Letter of Manuel Comnenus to Henry II.
7. p. 105. Acts of the Council of Lombers.
8. p. 209. Alexander III. to the Scottish bishops.
9. p. 215. The legal Appendices of 1180.
10. p. 268. Lucius III. to the Scottish bishops.
11. p. 271. Rolland and Silvanus to Lucius III.
12. p. 292. Letter of William the astrologer.
13. p. 297. Letter of Pharamella.
14. p. 311. Urban III. to William, king of Scots.
15. p. 312. Urban III. to Jocelin, bishop of Glasgow.
16. p. 332. Gregory VIII. to all prelates.

² Vol. ii. pp. 105, &c.

⁴ Below, pp. 107, 116, 117.

³ Below, p. 106.

scripts. On this council, with the exception of what Hoveden says of it, there is deep silence amongst historians, and the probability is that our author having stumbled on an undated copy of the Acts, and finding the matter of them illustrative of the proceedings carried on by the royal and papal commissioners of 1178 in the neighbouring districts, incorporated them with his chronicle at what he thought was a likely date. It is to be observed, however, that he does not in the text attempt to fix the date. It is to the rubricator that the definite statement, 'Eodem anno damnata est Ariana "hæresis,"¹ is due. Most probably the document reached the chronicler by the same road by which the other letters on the heretics of Toulouse came into the hands of the earlier historian; through the medium perhaps of Reginald Fitz-Jocelin, bishop of Bath, who was one of the commissioners of 1178. Great interest was felt in the transactions of that year in the English church; Gervase of Canterbury² preserves at length the letter of the count of Toulouse to the Cistercian chapter, by which the proceedings against the heretics were originated. Hoveden himself shows his anxiety to be clear on the subject by giving twice over the detailed acts of the commissioners, first in his own words, then in the copies of the letters from which his knowledge was derived. He gives moreover, in the anecdote told of the servant of abbot Eustace of Flay,³ some countenance to the idea that the misfortunes of Henry II. were occasioned by his tolerance of heresy in his dominions at a time when the king of France was burning the "Publicani." Walter Map has preserved some very important memoranda about the Waldenses at the same period.⁴

Acts of the
Council of
Lombers.

Interest felt
in England
about the
heretics.

¹ Below, p. 105.

² In Twysden, c. 1441.

³ p. 272; and see below, pp. lii.-lviii.

⁴ *De Nugis Curialium* (ed. Wright), p. 64. Cf. pp. 60-64

Hoveden's
version of
the Laws of
England.

2. Of far more importance than the Acts of the Council of Lombers, to English history at least, is that version of the Laws of England which is introduced by Hoveden into his Chronicle at the end of the history of the year 1180, in connexion with the appointment of Ranulf Glanvill to the office of Great Justiciar.¹

Contents of
his Appen-
dix to A.D.
1180.

This legal Appendix, in the Royal Manuscript of Hoveden, consists of four sets of documents or abstracts of documents: first, the enactments of William the Conqueror;² secondly, the so called laws of Edward the Confessor with the amendments and confirmation of the Conqueror,³ and the statement of the descent of the kingdom of England and of the duchy of Normandy, with pedigrees to prove it, down to the reign of John; thirdly, the work of Ranulf Glanvill on the laws of England, which for reasons already given⁴ is not included in the present edition; and fourthly, the Assizes of Woodstock and Clarendon,⁵ the two most ancient monuments of Henry II.'s jurisprudence, illustrating the proceedings of the Itinerant Judges and the Jurisdiction of the Forests.

I. Laws of
William the
Conqueror.

The first of these documents corresponds with the third article of the Laws of William the Conqueror in the Collection of Ancient Laws and Institutes of England,⁶ edited by Mr. Benjamin Thorpe for the Record Commission in 1840. In that work it bears the title of "Carta Regis Willelmi Conquistoris de quibusdam statutis," and is printed from the copy existing in the Red Book of the Exchequer;⁷ from which it had been previously printed, with some significant

¹ Below, pp. 215-252.

² Below, pp. 215-218.

³ Below, pp. 219-241: the glossary which follows the pedigrees should not be overlooked.

⁴ Vol. i., pref., p. lxxvii.

⁵ Below, pp. 242-252.

⁶ Ancient Laws and Institutes, folio edition, p. 211.

⁷ Printed from the Exchequer copy, for the first time exactly, I think, in Selden's edition of Eadmer, London, 1623.