

## THE AUTHOR OF THE BAYEUX EMBROIDERY.<sup>1</sup>

By W. TAVERNIER, Ph.D.

No study of the Bayeux embroidery that has yet appeared enters deeply enough into the artistic importance of this wonderful work; nor has the extraordinary artistic discrimination of the composition ever been sufficiently appreciated.<sup>2</sup> It must be the creation of a master mind, the inspired work of an impressionable artist.

In the following pages, when we speak of the 'author' or 'artist' of the embroidery, we have in mind the man<sup>3</sup> who, influenced by literary motives and sources, and profiting by a few artistic models,<sup>4</sup> made and carried out the design of this work of art which is so full of plan. Whether, as may well be, he drew the outlines of the figures himself, or whether he had them drawn by a more skilful hand than his own, is only of secondary importance, and may remain unsettled.

I will anticipate matters by saying at once that I identify the intellectual author of the embroidery<sup>5</sup> as

<sup>1</sup> Owing to the political situation it has not been possible to submit this paper to the author for revision [Ed.].

<sup>2</sup> "Lc plan de la tapisserie est parfaitement conçu, conduit avec une merveilleuse adresse." So wrote J. Laffetay, *Notice historique et descriptive sur la tapisserie dite de la reine Mathilde*, 3rd ed. (Bayeux, 1880), p. 43. The embroidery must, of course, be imagined as complete, finally leading up to William seated on the very throne occupied in the first scene by Edward the Confessor.

<sup>3</sup> H-F. Delaunay, *Origine de la tapisserie de Bayeux, prouvée par elle-même* (Caen, 1834), p. 84, rightly claims it to be the work of a man. Certain of the details, especially in the border, lack a feminine touch, and the weight and the closeness of the whole composition are essentially masculine. Moreover we know of none among the noted women of the time to whom we could ascribe the necessary power. "Dans l'esprit de composition qui regne d'un bout à l'autre de l'ouvrage, on sent la pensée d'un homme, bien plus que celle d'une femme." Jules Comte, *La tapisserie de Bayeux* (Paris, 1878), p. 19.

<sup>4</sup> With the literary and artistic foundations of the embroidery I hope to deal later elsewhere.

<sup>5</sup> Needless to say, the author should not be confused with the person or persons by whose order the work was carried out. Although the identity of the latter is not here under consideration, it may be observed that had he been bishop Odo of Bayeux, as some have thought, the materials employed would certainly have been more costly. We may compare, *mutatis mutandis*, the arguments of an expert in the matter. "Coarse white linen and common worsted would never have been the materials which any queen would have chosen for such a work." D. Rock, *Textile Fabrics* (London, 1870), p. 7.

Again, we need not discuss at any length the question whether bishop Odo was the author of the tapestry, or whether he selected the scenes to be represented. Though the half-brother of the Conqueror had many qualities of mind and will, there is no reason to think that he had the artistic capacity required by such a task (cf. *Zeitschrift f. franz. Sprache u. Literatur*, xxxvii<sup>1</sup> (1910), p. 122.

Tuold, chaplain of William II,<sup>1</sup> who in after years composed the *Chanson de Roland*.<sup>2</sup>

It has often been thought that the author of the embroidery might have immortalised himself on his work either by a monogram or by some similar means, and it would indeed be strange had he forgotten to represent himself while depicting so many obscure persons in his "bulletin brodé de la grande-armée normande :"<sup>3</sup> such modesty would have appeared unnatural in that age. Tuold does sign his name in the *Chanson de Roland*,<sup>4</sup> but with so much discretion that the fact has been overlooked. We shall see that he leaves his signature with equal discretion upon the embroidery, and with a like result.

The probability of finding evidence of the authorship would justify research, and such research has not been wanting. Lancelot,<sup>5</sup> the first, and by no means the least important, commentator on the embroidery, who was prompted to look for the artist's portrait in the tapestry, ascribed the work to Matilda the wife of the Conqueror, whose modesty, he thought, compelled her to use the adopted name of Aelfgyva (Fowke, pl. xviii).<sup>6</sup>

The conjectures of Agnes Strickland seem to be nearer the truth. In her opinion the embroidery "appears to have been, in part at least, designed for Matilda by

<sup>1</sup> I have collected the documents of William II attested by Tuold in *Zeitschrift f. romanische Philologie*, xxxviii (1914), p. 100 f. I propose to publish elsewhere further documents bearing his name.

<sup>2</sup> The *Chanson de Roland* is explicitly stated to be by a certain "Tuoldus," and the fact is repeatedly confirmed by internal evidence. I have endeavoured to prove this in *Zeitschrift f. franz. Spr. u. Lit.* xxxvii<sup>2</sup> (1910), p. 133 f; xxxviii<sup>1</sup> (1911), p. 117 f; xxxix<sup>1</sup> (1912), p. 133 f; xli<sup>1</sup> (1913), p. 96 f. A further discussion of the point will appear in *Zeitschrift f. romanische Phil.*

<sup>3</sup> So described by Pezet, *Bull. de la Société de l'agric. sciences, arts, et belles-lettres de Bayeux*, 1852-1855, p. 274.

<sup>4</sup> Verse 4002: "Ci fält la geste que Tuoldus declinet." (Here ends the story that Tuold worked over.) In this sentence truth and modesty are combined. Although Tuold made use of a Latin poem (*de*

*Prodicionē Guenonis*), it is he who gave to the song all its beauty and splendour.

<sup>5</sup> "Je croirois volontiers que par Aelfgyva . . . on a eu dessein de designer Mathilde elle-meme, qui n'a pas voulu avoir autre nom dans un ouvrage qu'elle travaillait de ses mains. Il est effectivement etonnant qu'elle ne se trouve nommee expressement dans aucun endroit de cette tapisserie. On doit attribuer ce silence à sa propre modestie. Elle s'y trouveroit cependant indiquée indirectement si ma conjecture a lieu : " *Suite de l'explication d'un monument de Guillaume le Conquerant*, in *Mem. de l'Acad. royale des inscr. et belles-lettres*, viii (Paris, 1733), p. 613.

<sup>6</sup> This and the following plate-references are to F. R. Fowke, *The Bayeux Tapestry reproduced in autotype plates, with historical notes*, London, 1875. The same plates and numbers appear in the second and smaller edition of the work (London and New York, 1898) published by Messrs. G. Bell and Sons, by whose courtesy I am permitted to reproduce plate xi as plate i of this paper.

Turolde, a dwarf artist, who, moved by a natural desire of claiming his share in the celebrity which he foresaw would attach to the work, has cunningly introduced his own effigies therein with a sly inscription, importing that he was the person who illuminated the canvas with the proper outlines and colours."<sup>1</sup>

I should explain that I was first led to an examination of the embroidery by my study of the *Chanson de Roland*. I was much impressed by the striking inner relation between the two, as much in their smaller details as in their broader effects, and I came to the conclusion, independently of Agnes Strickland, whose suggestion I had not then read, that both works were by the same author.<sup>2</sup>

The legend TVROLD appears on the embroidery over the head of a diminutive figure holding the horses of the Norman ambassadors. This figure is shown in plates I and II, and the first question to be considered is, to whom does this legend refer. The commonly-accepted view is to connect the legend with the small figure beneath it.<sup>3</sup> Many authorities appear to infer from the smallness of this figure that it is intended to represent a dwarf, perhaps a jester.<sup>4</sup> My own opinion is in direct opposition to this. The so-called Turolde is placed at the same level as several other figures, such as the men in the rigging of the ship (Fowke, pl. vi), the men handling a rope (Fowke, pl. xxii), and the people on the roof of the church (Fowke, pl. xxx).

<sup>1</sup> *Lives of the Queens of England* (London, 1840), i, p. 68: 2nd ed. (1841), i, p. 59; new ed. (1869), i, p. 44. E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of the Norman Conquest*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1875), iii, p. 569, unfairly brushes the passage aside as "some amusing remarks."

<sup>2</sup> *Zur Vorgeschichte des altfranzösischen Rolandsliedes* (Berlin, 1903), p. 197; *Zeitschrift f. franz. Spr. u. Lit.* xxxvii<sup>1</sup>, p. 121. I may perhaps here be allowed to observe that the voluminous literature on the Bayeux embroidery can best be studied in the municipal library at Bayeux.

<sup>3</sup> This is the view held by the following writers: Bernard de Montfaucon, *Les monumens de la monarchie française* (Paris, 1729), p. 378; Hudson Gurney, *Archæologia*, xviii, p. 363; C. A. Stothard, *Archæologia*, xix, p. 19; A. Jubinal, *Les*

*anciennes tapisseries historiques* (Paris, 1838): J. C. Bruce, *The Bayeux Tapestry elucidated* (London, 1856), p. 48; Lambert, *Notice historique sur la tapisserie brodée de la reine Matilde* (author's name not given, Bayeux, 1870), p. 7; E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of Norman Conquest* (1871), iv, p. 366; Ella Burton, *The Norman Conquest illustrated by the Bayeux Tapestry* (London, 1878), p. 14.

<sup>4</sup> There is no evidence of the presence of dwarfs at the courts of Normandy and Picardy at this time. De la Rue, Tapin (*Revue de l'art Chrétien*, ix, 1865, p. 21) and Lambert have no justification in attributing to the time of the Conquest a custom that belonged to later centuries. Montfaucon, loc. cit. i, 378, was right in observing that "sa tete ne parolt pas estre d'un nain."

An examination of the tapestry as a whole shows clearly that not only is the artist compelled frequently to reduce the size of his figures, trying to bring the more important personages into prominence and subordinating the minor characters, but that his intention is also to represent background figures, indicating distance by means of perspective.<sup>1</sup> We may apply this supposition to the scene in question. We see an attempt at perspective and a distribution of space perhaps partly intentional, partly involuntary. By reducing the size of the man tending the horses, the artist tries to express the distance between the background figures and the principal ones. Thus we need not regard the man as a real dwarf but, to judge from his dress, as a servant, probably belonging to the count of Ponthieu, and holding the horses of the ambassadors in the back of the scene.

If this interpretation is correct it appears strange that the artist should have signed his name above so insignificant a figure. What personal interest or relationship can the servant of the count of Ponthieu have possessed for him? Any connexion between the figure and the name seems doubtful, and Lancelot, who, in 1724, said "Je croirois volontiers que Turolde est le nom de l'ambassadeur qui tient la parole,"<sup>2</sup> evidently hesitated to assume it. Fowke<sup>3</sup> was more precise in connecting the name Turolde with the ambassador nearest to the smaller figure, and he thought the name had been placed at the ambassador's side for want of space above. Jules Comte<sup>4</sup> was of the same opinion as Fowke, and no less a writer than Horace Round has lately said that "the legend Turolde must refer to the standing warrior."<sup>5</sup>

It is not wise, however, to come to a decision rashly. The inscription is so much closer to the smaller figure that our first impression is to connect the two, but critical

<sup>1</sup> cf. Johannes Steenstrup, *Bayeux Tapetet, in verjledende Beskrivelse* (Copenhagen, 1885), p. 45. Stothard, loc. cit. p. 191, understates the facts in saying that in the tapestry "there is no attempt at . . . perspective," as does Fowke, loc. cit. (1875 ed.), p. 12, who writes that "perspective is wholly disregarded." Steenstrup is more judicious: "Perspektivet er ikke nok iagttaget."

<sup>2</sup> *Explication d'un monument de Guillaume le Conquerant*, in *Mem. de l'Acad. royale des inscr. et belles-lettres*, ii (Paris, 1729), p. 753.

<sup>3</sup> loc. cit. (1875 ed.), p. 25 f.

<sup>4</sup> loc. cit. p. 28.

<sup>5</sup> *Victoria County History of Essex* (1903), i, p. 342. Bolton Corney (after Jubinal, i, p. 30) and J. Steenstrup (p. 12), express no opinion on the subject.

considerations may be more decisive, and it would be well to examine the embroidery as a whole and compare other portraits with legends standing by themselves. The figures marked STIGANT ARCHIEFS (Fowke, pl. XXXIII) and E[USTA]TIUS (Fowke, pl. LXXIII) correspond exactly, and so does the representation of the church at Bosham (ECCLESIA, Fowke, pl. III). In all these instances the legend is immediately above the object represented. And yet there is one remarkable difference: in no other case is the legend placed between horizontal lines, and possibly their presence may have some special meaning.

In his essay on the Bayeux tapestry,<sup>1</sup> which, in spite of its shortness, seems to possess more permanent value than any other written during the last quarter of a century, Mr. Charles Dawson draws attention to the numerous alterations which the embroidery has suffered by "restoration" since it has become an object of scientific study. The most drastic restoration took place in 1842, and if we desire to contemplate the work from a critical point of view, we must examine its earlier reproductions. No more conscientious and careful reproduction has ever been executed than that made by Charles Stothard for the Society of Antiquaries of London,<sup>2</sup> and a comparison of his drawing (plate II) with the embroidery in its present state (plate I) is most interesting. Originally the two horizontal lines above and beneath the word Turolð did not touch the reins of the horses on the right-hand side as they do now. Both lines were formerly separated by an obvious space from the reins, and consequently from the group of waiting horses to which the small figure belongs. The accuracy of Stothard's reproduction in this respect is confirmed by the earlier engraving of Ambroise Tardieu,<sup>3</sup> and by the oldest existing representation published by Father Montfaucon in 1792.<sup>4</sup>

On the left, however, as we see from Stothard and

<sup>1</sup> *The Restoration of the Bayeux Tapestry*, by Charles Dawson, in *The Antiquary* for 1907.

<sup>2</sup> *Vetusta Monumenta*, II (London, 1821-1823), from which, by permission of the Society of Antiquaries of London, I am permitted to reproduce pl. II of this paper.

<sup>3</sup> Plate I in the atlas of the *Histoire de la conquête de l'Angleterre par les Normands*, by A. Thierry, 5th ed. Paris, 1839.

<sup>4</sup> *Monumens*, I, pl. 48. See also the splendid representation by Victor Sanzonetti, pl. IV in Jubinal's work (1838), where the separation is still more clear.

Sansonetti, the lower line was carried right up to the ambassador's sword, which, in the drawings of Montfaucon and Tardieu, it almost touches. Stothard, Montfaucon and Sansonetti show a certain distance between the upper line and the body of the ambassador, yet Stothard makes the space on the left smaller than that on the right,<sup>1</sup> and Sansonetti shows this still more clearly.

A comparison of Stothard's representation with the others drawn before 1842 indicates the intention of the artist to connect the name to the figure of the ambassador by leaving the lines open on the right. This is the reason for the employment of lines, lines used in this special instance only. As Fowke points out, there was no room for the legend above the ambassador's head; the inscription referring to the whole scene stood there, and consequently recourse was had to placing the name at the side of the figure. We can understand why Lambert, in restoring the embroidery, extended these lines. He, too, wrongly connected the legend with the small figure, as we see from his own commentary,<sup>2</sup> and this opinion influenced the work of restoration. Not only did he close up the small space separating the upper line from the ambassador's body, but he also joined both lines to the reins on the right, so that the legend, now enclosed in a rectangular field, appears more distinctly above the small figure and seems to have reference to it. The very existence of these lines, and the testimony of the older reproductions shows that Fowke and Round were right in opposing most other interpretations. The ambassador is called Tuold, and the *serjan* with the horses remains without a name.

We may therefore proceed to a further question. Who was the Tuold immortalised by the embroidery? He is entrusted with a delicate and important mission; as may be noted, he is staying at the court of William when the

<sup>1</sup> In Montfaucon the distance to either side is nearly the same. In Tardieu the upper line extends to the left as much as it does to-day. Notwithstanding all the resources of modern technics, and the most minute examination of the embroidery, it is impossible to be certain whether in the course of centuries a piece of worsted had

already disappeared before 1729. Possibly the designer thought it sufficient only to hint at the continuation of the lower line, possibly the embroideress saved a few stitches.

<sup>2</sup> cf. *Notice historique sur la tapisserie brodée de la reine Mathilde* (Bayeux, 1870).



DUKE WILLIAM'S MESSENGERS.  
From F. R. Fowke, *The Bayeux Tapestry*.

[By permission of Messrs. George Bell & Sons.



DUKE WILLIAM'S MESSENGERS.

Stothard's drawing, from *Vetusta Monumenta*, vi, plate iii.

[By permission of the Society of Antiquaries.



news arrives that Harold is a prisoner;<sup>1</sup> his arms show him to be a lay baron, a *miles*, and it is therefore among the barons, the courtiers of the future conqueror, that we must look for him. As the scene is laid in the year 1064,<sup>2</sup> it is not difficult to decide the question. The man must be the 'hostiarius' of duke William, the Turol of Rochester of after years.<sup>3</sup> His existence at the court of William at this date is well authenticated, and as no one else has done so, let us put together a few facts about him.

I. In three documents we meet with a Tuoldus at the court of duke Robert. In a charter which Robert gave to the abbey of Saint-Wandrille<sup>4</sup> about 1031, we find among the 'signa fidelium' that of 'Toroldi militis.' The attestation of Turol occurs likewise in a further document of Robert relating to the same monastery (1032 - 1035).<sup>5</sup> This Turol is identical with the

<sup>1</sup> Here, too, Fowke is right in opposing other interpreters. The three scenes, "Hic venit nuntius ad Wilgelmum ducem," "Nuntii Willelmi," and "Ubi nuntii Willelmi ducis venerunt ad Widonem," forming the closely united group of William's embassy to Wido, are represented on the embroidery in a succession opposite to the historical events. We shall find the same case with the three scenes, "Hic Eadwardus rex in lecto alloquitur fideles," "Et hic defunctus est," and "Hic portatur corpus Eadwardi regis ad ecclesiam Sancti Petri apostoli" (Fowke, pl. xxx-xxxii).

It is not, as some believed, a mistake of the embroideresses, nor in the second group of the above-mentioned scene had the artist the intention attributed to him by Fowke (1875 ed. p. 46). On the contrary, the artist is influenced by epic technique, where it is quite usual to bring on later events that have taken place before. Virgil, the epic model of Turol, sometimes interrupted the sequence "um Vergangenes, sozusagen in einer Anmerkung, nachzuholen" (Richard Heinze, *Virgils epische Technik*, 2nd ed. Leipzig and Berlin, 1908), p. 381.

In the epic of Roland we find a typical example in the *Laisses*, p. 191-192 (numbering after *Das altfranzösische Rolandslied*, E. Stengel, i, Leipzig, 1900). The facts related there had occurred before the action described up to l. 190. It is only later on that the poet gives the reason why the auxiliary army from the east suddenly arrives on the Ebro, at the time of greatest distress.

In the same recapitulating manner Turol in the embroidery explains later on the events preceding the embassy to Guy of Ponthieu, and the funeral of king Edward.

<sup>2</sup> This excludes, firstly, "Tuoldus teneri ducis paedagogus," since William's tutor had already been dead for years (William of Jumieges, *Historia Normannorum*, vii, 2, in Migne, *Patrologia latina*, 149 (1882), col. 847; Ordericus Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica*, i, 24 [ed. Le Prevost, i (Paris, 1838), p. 180]; secondly, "Tuoldus capellanus," who, being mentioned in documents of William II, is certainly identical with the 'hostiarius' at the court of Robert II, and with the bishop Tuoldus of later years: cf. p. 172, note 2. This Turol was only a boy in 1064.

<sup>3</sup> Freeman (*Norman Conquest*, iv [1871], 366) had already made this conjecture, and Fowke, without being aware of it, was not far wrong: also Hasted, *History of Kent*, ed. H. Drake, i (London, 1886), p. xiv: "Turol, presumably a conspicuous figure on the Bayeux tapestry, held Rochester castle."

<sup>4</sup> In the cartulary of Saint-Wandrille (Archives de la Seine-Inferieure), printed by Ferdinand Lot, *Etudes critiques sur l'abbaye de Saint-Wandrille* (Paris, 1913), p. 52 f. no. 13; abstracted by J. Horace Round, *Calendar of Documents Preserved in France*, i (London, 1899) p. 526, no. 1422.

<sup>5</sup> Original lost; printed in Lot, *Etudes*, p. 54 f. no. 14: see also *ibid.* for the extant copies and former prints.

'Tuoldus constabilus' who witnessed a document of Robert relating to Mont-Saint-Michel between 1028 and 1034.<sup>1</sup> This is the much-quoted document examined by Fowke,<sup>2</sup> but unfortunately with insufficient care, for it contains no mention of a constable of *Bayeux*, and although the attestation-marks of William and Tuold are on the same parchment, they belong to two different documents. Tuold is a witness of Robert's donation (Round, no. 705), but he has nothing to do with William's modification (no. 706).<sup>3</sup>

II. With a second series of documents we approach more closely the date of the events depicted in the first part of the Bayeux embroidery. Here, undoubtedly, we are dealing with the Tuold who, as the embroidery shows, was sent by duke William to the count of Ponthieu. In six of the duke's documents we find Tuold among his followers.

(a) One of 1043 for the abbey of the Holy Trinity at Rouen<sup>4</sup> ('Signum Tuoldi de Drincourt').

(b) One of 1053 for the abbey of the Holy Trinity at Rouen<sup>5</sup> ('Signum Tuoldi hostiarii').

(c) One of about 1055 for the abbey of the Holy Trinity at Rouen<sup>6</sup> ('Signum . . . Tuoldi filii Osberni de Frexhenes').

(d) One of 1030-1060 for Notre-Dame-de-Saint-Désir (Lisieux)<sup>7</sup> ('S[ignum] Tuoldi' . . .).

<sup>1</sup> Original in the Archives de la Manche (Fonds Saint-Michel), abstracted by Round, *Calendar*, p. 251, no. 705. The cartulary of Mont-Saint-Michel omits the last three witnesses for Robert's donation, among them our 'Tuoldus constabilus.' Since there are no reasons for an additional insertion into the document of Saint-Lo, one must suppose a slip by the copyist.

<sup>2</sup> 1875 ed. p. 26: "Through the kindness of Monsieur Dubosc, the learned archivist of St. Lo, I saw a charter bearing the ✕ marks of duke William and of Tuold, *Constable of Bayeux*. To identify him with the Tuold of the tapestry offers, I think, the most satisfactory solution of this difficult point that has been as yet suggested."

<sup>3</sup> Fowke's mistake, meanwhile, has influenced and has been taken up by others; thus by Alfred S. Ellis ("On the land-

holders of Gloucestershire, named in Domesday Book," in *Trans. Bristol and Glouc. Archaeol. Soc.* iv, 1879-80, p. 160).

<sup>4</sup> Cartulary of Sainte-Trinite near Rouen, in the Archives de la Seine-Inferieure, printed in the Cartulaire de l'abbaye de la Sainte-Trinite du Mont de Rouen, A. Deville, in *Collection des cartulaires de France*, iii (Paris, 1840), p. 448, no. 51.

<sup>5</sup> *ibid.* p. 441, no. 37.

<sup>6</sup> *ibid.* p. 435, no. 27: calendared by Round, *Calendar*, p. 20, no. 71.

<sup>7</sup> The original is with the Benedictine nuns of Notre-Dame-du-Pre in Lisieux; printed copies in the Archives du Calvados calendared by Lechaude d'Anisy, *Catalogue des archives departementales du Calvados in Memoires de la Societe des antiquaires de Normandie*, vii (1834), p. 246 ff. and in Round, *Calendar*, p. 201, no. 575.

(e) One of about 1060 for the abbey of the Holy Trinity at Rouen<sup>1</sup> ('Signum Ricardi de Drincourt, signum Turoldei fratris ejus').

(f) One of 4th August, 1060, granting land at Courdemanche, near Dreux, to the abbey of Saint-Père of Chartres<sup>2</sup> ('Auctorizavit autem hoc donum gloriosus comes . . . Willelmus . . . coram obtimatibus suis, quorum nomina sunt haec . . . Tuoldus . . .').<sup>3</sup>

### III. In the third place we find a Tuold at Rochester

<sup>1</sup> *Cartul. de la Sainte-Trinite*, p. 444. no. 43; Round, *Calendar*, p. 23, no. 83. In two further documents of the same cartulary we find Tuold's name together with that of the future Conqueror. Both times he signs ex parte of the abbey of la Sainte-Trinite: p. 446, no. 46 " . . . Signum Willelmi, comitis Normanniae. . . . Ex nostris . . . Signum Ricardi de Drincourt. Signum Turoldei, fratris ejus: " p. 447, no. 49 (about 1060; Round, *Calendar*, p. 24, no. 85); " . . . Signum Willelmi comitis. . . . Testes ex nostra parte: Ricardus de Drincourt; Tuoldus, frater eius. . . . "

<sup>2</sup> In the Cartulary *Aganon vetus* of Saint-Père in Chartres, in the town library at Chartres; printed in Guérard, *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Père de Chartres*, i (Paris, 1850), p. 152 ff. translated for the greater part by Round, *Calendar*, p. 446.

<sup>3</sup> The list of documents of group II presents a first attempt to limit the identity of Tuold. In a subsequent paper we hope to give the exact reasons for the choice made, and to establish the identity of "Tuoldus hostiarius" with "Tuoldus de Drincourt" and "Tuoldus filius Osberni de Freschenes," and to deal with the lineage of Tuold of Rochester. A few points may, however, be anticipated: Two of Tuold's sons, Hugh and Tuold, are found to be landholders near Dieppe, after the father's death, as we find both of them in Puisenval, not far from Envermeu (*Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Michel du Treport*, P. Laffleur de Kermaingant, Paris, 1880, p. 48, no. 19); besides a "Robertus filius Turoldei" in Guilmecourt near Envermeu (*ibid.* p. 34, no. 9). In some peculiar features, the language of the *Chanson de Roland* betrays the poet Tuold, son of Tuold, to have spent part of his youth near the frontier of Picardy (cf. *Zeitschrift f. franz. Spr. u. Lit.* xxxvii, p. 105).

Moreover Fresne, now part of the parish

of Saint-Pierre-en-Val, is not far from Envermeu (*Cart. du Treport*, p. 4, 361), and it is the same with Drincourt, the modern Neufchatel (cf. Wace, *Roman de Rou*, edited by Hugo Andresen, vol. ii, [Heilbronn, 1879], p. 742). Richard of Drincourt, Tuold's brother, in Domesday, (Nottingham, fo. 280) is called Ricardus Fresne (cf. Etienne Dupont, *Recherches sur les compagnons de Guillaume le Conquerant*, ii, Saint-Servan, p. 11). So there is no doubt that our identification of "Tuoldus, frater Ricardi de Drincourt" with "Tuoldus filius Osberni de Freschenes" is justified.

We have to consider another point. If the future Tuold of Rochester had his estates in and near Envermeu and Drincourt, he was, in a high degree, the man fit for an embassy to the count of Ponthieu, whose possessions were not far away from those of Tuold.

If we may be allowed to put forward a conjecture within reach of possibility, we might imagine as follows: On his way to duke William, beyond the border of Ponthieu, the messenger of the captive Harold first comes to Drincourt (on the Bethune), and Richard, the squire of Drincourt, escorts him to William's court. In Fowke, pl. xi of the embroidery, the knight behind Tuold points with his finger to the messenger as if he wanted to say to the duke, "I have got hold of this Englishman (or he has come to me), and with regard to his important message, I have escorted him to you." The duke then sends the two brothers Richard and Tuold (who may then already have been at court as a 'hostiarius') as ambassadors to Guy of Ponthieu. If this conjecture is right, we should see in the three scenes, 'Hic venit nuntius' . . . , 'Nuntii Willelmi,' 'Ubi nuntii Willelmi ducis venerunt ad Widone[m],' a portrait of the artist's uncle at the side of that of his father.

after the Conquest, a vassal of Odo, earl of Kent. In Domesday his name is preserved for posterity, stained by illegal seizures of property not his own,<sup>1</sup> and yet probably he was compelled thereto by the command of his feudal lord.<sup>2</sup> But it is not from Domesday alone that we hear of such seizures, we read of them also in bishop Ernulf's "Collectanea de rebus ecclesiae Roffensis."<sup>3</sup> In the Scirgemot of Pennenden Heath<sup>4</sup> (1076) "diratiocinavit . . . Lanfrancus archiepiscopus plures terras quas tunc tenuerunt homines ipsius episcopi [Odo], viz. . . . Turolfus de Hrovecestria . . . et alii plures de hominibus suis." Turolf had to give up the land he occupied contrary to law, but the facts as represented by Ernulf fix the guilt on Odo.

This is not the place for a close examination of the older Turolf's encroachments or of his possessions. Indeed there is little that can be said with certainty, for he was dead when the Domesday survey was compiled, and he is only mentioned in it with reference to his seizures. But the survey gives us particulars of his sons. One at least of the elder surviving sons, Gilbert, must have received

<sup>1</sup> "In Essex, as in other counties, the survey teems with proofs of this grasping prelate's encroachments on the land of others. His example in this respect was followed by one of his great under-tenants, the extent of whose holdings in Essex is somewhat obscured in Domesday: Ralf, 'the son of Turolf' held of him at Vange, Barstable, Ingrave, . . . Thorrington, and in the Hanningfields. . . . He was the son of Turolf 'of Rochester,' by whose lawless aggression much of this land had been acquired. At Thorrington Turolf had seized upon the manor . . . , in the Hanningfields he had ousted no fewer than twenty-two freemen; at Mucking he had encroached on the lands of Barking Abbey, and at Fobbing of Count Eustace" (Round in *Victoria Hist. of Essex*, i, 342; cf. ibid. 448, 459, 460, 567). "Thorrington, Barstable, and Ingrave paid to Rochester for castle-guard" (J. H. Round, *Castle Guard* in *Archaeol. Journ.* lix (1902), p. 152, n. 1: cf. p. 154).

<sup>2</sup> "Illis diebus in comitatu illo quisquam non erat qui tantae fortitudinis viro resistere

posset, propter magnam quam habuit potestatem."

<sup>3</sup> In John Thorpe, *Registrum Roffense* (London, 1769), p. 27 ff. cf. Eadmerus, *Historia novorum in Anglia*, i, ed. Martin Rule (London, 1884), p. 17, besides Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, iv, p. 364, etc.

<sup>4</sup> Freeman seems to err in giving the date 1072. According to Stubbs, *Registrum sacrum anglicanum*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1897), p. 39, Ernest was not bishop of Rochester until 1076; according to N. E. S. A. Hamilton, in his edition of William of Malmesbury, *de Gestis pontificum Anglorum*, lib. i, §72 (London, 1870), p. 136, only from 1076 to 1077; Freeman himself (p. 369) for Ernest gives the date 1076. 'Ernestus episcopus de Hrovecestria,' however, is expressly reported to have taken part in the 'placitum' of Pennenden Heath, moreover the fact that king William was on the continent in the same year also agrees with the date 1076 (H. W. C. Davis, *Regesta regum anglo-normannorum*, i (Oxford, 1913), p. xxii. That the same thing was the case also at the time of the 'plait' of Pennenden Heath may at least be gathered from Ernulf's representation.

his share of the plunder of 1066, capturing it perhaps with his own sword.<sup>1</sup>

The property of the younger sons, too, may not have been inherited in its entirety from their father, yet from the wide extent of the estates of the sons, in England as well as in Normandy, we may infer that Turolde, the father, must have been an extremely wealthy landowner, a fact of no small importance to the subject we are discussing.

There is no proof of Turolde's presence in William's train in the years which followed the Conquest, and this may be explained by several possible causes: the acquisition of the new property, its administration and development, advancing years, or the responsible nature of the post allotted to him at Rochester.<sup>2</sup> His name is missing from the royal documents that have come down to us, and it is improbable that he could have survived the Conquest by more than a decade. By 1066 he was no longer in the fighting ranks. Had he joined in William's expedition the artist of the embroidery would surely have treated him as he did Wadard and Vitalis, and given him a place in the record of this glorious campaign. So it is that the embassy and the events leading up to the Conquest afford him his only rôle, and his features in the embroidery are sufficient evidence that in 1064 Turolde was no longer a young man. It is only in the borders, which we may almost look upon as foot-notes, that the artist contrived to indicate that the "wise man,"<sup>3</sup> whose political mission is immortalised in the embroidery, was in his youth a strong and brave man.<sup>4</sup>

Some of his sons, however, must have taken part in

<sup>1</sup> Ellis, *Landholders*, 160.

<sup>2</sup> That Turolde was entrusted with castle-guard is not expressly proved, so far as we can see, but it may be thought certain. Essex manors held by him are subsequently found paying for castle-guard at Rochester (Round, in *Vict. Hist. of Essex*, i, 342, cf. p. 180, note 1 above). Hasted (i, p. xiv) therefore is right, simply in saying that "Turolde, presumably a conspicuous figure on the Bayeux Tapestry, held Rochester Castle." As to the importance of Rochester in old times already from the political as well as from other points of view, cf. *Report of the Royal Commission*

on *Historical Manuscripts*, ix (London, 1883), app. i, p. 285. As to the military importance of Rochester, cf. William of Malmesbury, *Gesta pont.* lib. i, §72, p. 133. It is well known what part "Roffense castrum" played in 1088, during Odo's revolt, cf. Florence of Worcester, *Chronicon ex chronicis*, under date 1088, ed. Benjamin Thorpe, ii (London, 1849), p. 22; Ordericus Vitalis, *Hist. eccl.* lib. viii, 2nd ed. Le Prevost, iii (1845), p. 272 ff.

<sup>3</sup> "Mais saives hom il deit faire message," thus, in his epic, the artist of the embroidery makes Roland speak (315).

<sup>4</sup> cf. p. 185 below.

the campaign of 1066, certainly Roger, and probably Gilbert. The former was "in eadem navigatione morte preventus."<sup>1</sup> At the time of Domesday Gilbert, 'filius Turol di,' already had a son-in-law holding lands in fee from him,<sup>2</sup> so Gilbert must have been at least 40 years of age, and must have been born no later than 1026. From the survey in like manner we may infer the year 1086 to be the 'terminus post quem non' of Turol d's death, for none of the father's possessions are registered in it, but only those of his sons.<sup>3</sup>

Having collected the materials, we may now consider whether the notes we have gathered all refer to the same person, to a Turol d who was born about 1020 or earlier, and who died about 1080. We may no doubt connect our two groups of documents marked II and III. After 1066 we have a wealthy baron who, though not appearing at court himself, nevertheless sends his sons there, and one of his sons becomes 'hostiarius' to duke Robert. It would be strange indeed if we could not trace this Turol d in documents dating before the Conquest. In group II the signatures of witnesses agree with the suppositions we have made, and in the document of 1053 the 'signum Turol di hostiarii' is especially significant. On the other hand, it is obvious that a man descended from a courtier's family who held office at court in 1053 and possibly in succeeding years, and was entrusted with a special mission about 1064, would not altogether disappear from sight.<sup>4</sup>

With the two other documents of group I the circumstances are different. In point of date it is not impossible that the younger Turol d of Rochester signed both. Still in the second he figures as a 'constabilis,' and Turol d of

<sup>1</sup> *Cartulaire de la Sainte-Trinite du Mont*, p. 443, no. 63, Round, *Calendar*, p. 21, no. 74.

<sup>2</sup> Ellis, *Landholders*, 160.

<sup>3</sup> The Turol d who, at the time of Domesday, was a landholder in Surrey, Sussex, Essex, etc. cannot be identical with Turol d of Rochester. This may be gathered from the proportion of his property to that of the sons of Turol d who are mentioned

in Domesday. Even if we consider examples of 'forisfiliatio,' Turol d's property ought to be much larger, were he the father and not the son, as in fact he is. That Turol d does not appear in Domesday at all, while only his sons are cited, and frequently cited there, can be explained only by the fact that the father was no longer alive in 1086.

<sup>4</sup> As a matter of fact Turol d still had some considerable expectation of life in 1066.

Rochester would have been rather young for such a post in 1034. Moreover it is difficult to believe that this 'constabilus' would have become a 'hostiarius' later on, for we should expect advancement in rank to take place in the opposite direction.

It is far more likely that the man referred to in these two documents should be the future 'paedagogus' of William I, who was murdered about 1040.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand he might be the 'Tuoldus comitissae Gunnoris camerarius' mentioned in a document dated 1046-1053,<sup>2</sup> who, as we shall see, was probably a relative of the younger Tuold. For these reasons it seems best to disregard the two documents of Robert.

To sum up, on the Bayeux embroidery we find the 'hostiarius Tuoldus' who, from about 1050 onwards, is to be met at the court of William, and after the Conquest had his seat at Rochester and held large possessions in England.<sup>3</sup>

We now come to the question of how he is represented on the embroidery. Hitherto we have disregarded the fact that, not counting his appearances on the lower border, he is portrayed no less than four times, in all almost as often as the chief characters, William, Harold and Odo. In Fowke, pl. XIII, we see him standing before his prince; then (Fowke, pl. XII, XIII) by the road-side on horseback; later on standing erect before the count of Ponthieu (Fowke, pl. XI); a fourth time, at the meeting with Wido, mounted once more, he is pulling up his horse behind the duke<sup>4</sup> (Fowke, pl. xv, xvi). But apart from

<sup>1</sup> cf. p. 177, note 2 above.

<sup>2</sup> *Cart. de la Sainte-Trinité du Mont*, p. 424, no. 4: "... Willelmus et frater ejus Osbernus, annuente matre eorum Emma, pro anima patris sui Osberni . . . totam terram quam Herchambaldus vicecomes et Tuoldus comitissae Gunnoris [1031] camerarius de illis tenebant, sanctae . . . Trinitati Rotomagensi, abbate Isemberto [d. about 1053] . . . tradiderunt."

<sup>3</sup> Our Tuold of Rochester is not to be confounded with the sheriff Tuold of Lincolnshire, who occurs in documents of William I and William II (Davis, nos. 283, 333, 335, 430, 443), in Domesday (Linc. 346 b), and elsewhere (cf. J. H. Round, *Feudal England* [London, 1895], p. 329).

That this sheriff should have died before 1086, as Round suggests, seems to be confuted by no. 26 in the *Eynsbam Cartulary*, ed. H. E. Salter, i (Oxford, 1907), p. 48 (Davis, no. 335), according to which Tuold must have been still alive in 1091-92. At that time, however, Tuold of Rochester can no longer have been in existence.

<sup>4</sup> As to Tuold also, an observation by Stothard (*Observations*, 190) can be adapted: "A single character in some parts of the Tapestry is . . . often repeated, almost in the same place." The artist took good care that we should recognise Tuold without any doubt. A certain endeavour to obtain a likely portrait is not to be overlooked. Concerning the chief



this frequent representation, it is worth observing with what gusto and vigour he is drawn. By the side of his name his portrait is especially large (Fowke, pl. xi). We see him in profile first from the right and then from the left. Sword, spear and shield are faithfully preserved for us, and particularly his horse, which we may admire standing, pacing and trotting. Once we see it without its rider, and here it is no less tall and stately than the war-horse of duke William.<sup>1</sup>

On the embroidery William's embassy to Guy of Ponthieu becomes an episode of peculiar vivacity and expressiveness.<sup>2</sup> In the lower border, too, the *ἀριστεία* of Turolde appears as an interlude of the most personal kind, standing quite by itself. Alongside this episode scenes of rural life are unfolded in fields and woods. Like a breeze, these memories of home accompany the repre-

persons one may compare Gurney, *Archaeologia*, xviii, 361: "With all the rudeness of its execution, the likeness of the individual appeared to me to be preserved throughout the piece;" Bruce, 23: "A general likeness is preserved throughout the Tapestry, both in the case of William and Harold." Thus also Turolde's determined features seem to have been drawn from life, especially in the two first places, where we meet him in the embroidery (Fowke, pl. xi, xii, xiii) we find something of likeness in the reproduction. It is true, however, that it would not suffice for identification, and therefore the artist makes use of other means. Three of the four representations show Turolde distinguished by his golden hair. And that we cannot recognise the same colour in the fourth scene, "Nuntii Willelmi" (Fowke, pl. xi, xii) may be due to the fact that the hair is waving in the wind in long strands, and that, through the representation of the lively movement, the colour was neglected. In all the four cases Turolde wears the same red, which is certainly not a mere accident.

Turolde's horse is represented three times, twice in light blue, once (Fowke, pl. xv, xvi) in dark.

His shield is shown three times. The cognisance is the same each time: a winged dragon with a curled tail, twice in dark blue, once in a lighter shade. The edging of the shield, in the first and second case, is yellow, which probably means golden colour. In the third instance the colour

is missing (Fowke, pl. xv, xvi), probably by an oversight.

As the artist makes no special effort to be exact in details, and applies the colours from the point of view of an artist, and allowing for careless embroidering in such secondary points as for instance in giving the shades of the same or similar colours, from all the coincidents just given one may clearly infer the artist's intention of making a person he thought important recognisable in every place.

<sup>1</sup> The two horses of the ambassadors and that of William are the single *destrier* which, on the embroidery, are drawn by themselves without their riders. In Fowke, pl. xlix, besides, we see a *palefreid*, probably that of Wadard. These are the horses that, more than the others, interested the artist, both for their own sake and for that of their masters.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Bruce, 50: "All this is cleverly designed in order to show the deep interest which William took in the welfare of his captain friend." Yet it was an interest much more personal that caused the artist to picture the embassy so full of life and charm as few other scenes of the embroidery afford. Freeman also, in regard to our "Nuntii Willelmi," correctly observes that "The speed at which they ride is beyond anything of the kind represented in the whole story, except in the very thick of the battle" (*Norman Conquest*, iii, p. 225, n. 2.)



sensation of this political mission.<sup>1</sup> The plough is driven across the autumnal earth; with an effort the sower throws his seed broadcast; the harrow follows in his footsteps; and a lad throws sling-stones at the birds intent upon the grain. This boy stands immediately below the legend Turolde, and we may readily guess whose portrait this is meant to be. Further on we have scenes from the life of a baron. Sword in hand he encounters a bear,<sup>2</sup> and at the sound of the horn men follow the dogs who bring the deer to bay.

These pictures of field and woodland were not drawn to show the time of year in which the embassy took place;<sup>3</sup> they were intended to acquaint us with the home and manner of life of the ambassador, and their loving care and the abundant detail are due to the fact that the home of the ambassador Turolde is the home of the artist, that the artist himself had shared in the pursuits which we see represented. The landowner and the hunter of the bear is none other than Turolde's father. Possibly, with a touch of ambiguity,<sup>4</sup> the legend Turolde may denote both the father in the scene above and the son who stands immediately below it in the border.

That in this episode we are dealing with something personal and peculiar is plainly hinted at. In the scene "Nuntii Willelmi" (Fowke, pl. xiii), at the top on the right, we see a boy<sup>5</sup> gazing after the departing horsemen. All explanations hitherto given have been unsatisfactory: it would be of little use to post a watchman to follow the ambassadors with his eyes. Such a figure would hardly express the importance of the embassy,<sup>6</sup> and in any case

<sup>1</sup> "In some portions of the tapestry the border has an evident reference to the main subject of the piece" (Bruce, 19). Though not noticed by everybody, there exists a secret relation between the main representation and the lower border, for instance, in Fowke, pl. xxxiv (Harold), where above Harold tells his dream, on the border below we can see what he dreamed.

<sup>2</sup> The bear appears to be tied to a tree (Bruce, 19; Steenstrup, 12). This would afford a strange situation. Perhaps it is a representation, incomplete only, of the bear being trapped by fixed ropes.

<sup>3</sup> This is Fowke's conjecture.

<sup>4</sup> We need hardly point out how great a part was given to symbolical ambiguity in mediaeval art and poetry. Turolde himself, the artist of the embroidery, may clearly

be traced in his epic, as being fond of such ambiguities as the one supposed above; he put into it a series of anagrams, each having a deep double-meaning (cf. *Zeitschrift f. rom. Phil.* xxxviii, p. 228), where some examples are collected.

<sup>5</sup> That it is really the likeness of a boy and not of an adult, may best, and very clearly, be seen in Stothard's reproduction (pl. iii). Montfaucon was right in talking of a 'jeune homme' (i, 379).

<sup>6</sup> e.g. Bruce, 50; Fowke (1875 ed.), p. 28: "The results (of their message) were . . . of considerable importance, and a watchman, who is posted in a tree, looks eagerly forth, shading his eyes with his hand, to retain in sight as long as possible the retreating forms of the messengers."

the task would not be entrusted to a mere boy.<sup>1</sup> The real purpose is quite different and much more natural. One of the horsemen is his father and the boy himself is Turolde, the future artist,<sup>2</sup> gazing after him and perhaps waving a farewell.<sup>3</sup> He has immortalised in a most charming fashion the silent rôle he played in this embassy to Guy, and so in the events that preceded the Conquest. This explains the vivid detail with which the embassy from Rouen to Beaurain was portrayed, above all the affection and the memories of home with which the personality of Turolde is entwined. The artist touches a deep personal note; a child's gratitude here drew the pencil, for this is Turolde, son of Turolde the ambassador.

I take this opportunity of expressing my obligation in the preceding pages to the Lady Superior of the abbey of Notre-dame-du-Pre, in Lisieux, and to M. Paul Le Cacheux, archiviste du département de la Manche at Saint-Lô and to M. R.-N. Sauvage, keeper of the municipal library at Caen, all of whom have rendered me valuable assistance. I have also to thank Miss H. Waldner for her labour in translating my paper.

<sup>1</sup> Especially when William placed any reliance upon the messengers, which indeed should be imagined.

<sup>2</sup> Young Turolde has his father's golden locks (cf. p. 184, note 1). Montfaucon was wrong in supposing the boy to wear a "bonnet élevé selon la forme des bonnets phrygiens." If in the embroidery travelling adults are drawn bareheaded, how much more a child who is climbing a tree. Besides, it is very likely that after such a climb the hair would look somewhat different from its ordinary state; if not, the boy's hair was done in an altogether particular way.

Auburn, i.e. dark golden, is the hair of the lad in the border, scaring the birds (Fowke, pl. xi, xii); it is so also in the boy, perched on high and looking after the riders. And a third time, as we may observe in anticipation, Turolde appears in the embroidery in the guise of "unus clericus" making love to the king's daughter (Fowke, pl. xviii). He has grown older meanwhile. His hair is of still lighter colour. The light green, if this was the artist's intention, may suggest flaxen or ash colour.

There is one more point to be noted in the scene "Nuntii Willelmi." At the side of the boy in the tree we see a cross. We find

another cross at the side of the "Hic" of the inscription: "Hic Willelm dux . . ." (Fowke, pl. xli). Those crosses are intended to be signs of division. In pl. xiii the "Hic" is divided from "Nuntii Willelmi," and the spectator's attention is drawn to the fact that the boy belongs to the preceding scene, while the "hic" belongs to the following one to the right, although it is on the left-hand side of the tree. Thus the cross in pl. xli may be a hint for us not to continue the line "Isti portant armas ad naves et hic" towards the right hand, but to go on in the line below "trahunt carrum."

The question may remain open, however, whether Turolde, so very like his own self, put a secret double meaning into these crosses, into the first of them at least, whether he wanted to give a slight hint to the intelligent spectator. If, in pl. xli, the rider of the yellow horse (below the word "Willelm") represents the duke (a difficult point to decide), we may be sure that it was not without intention that the chief personages, as well as the artist of the embroidery, were marked by crosses.

<sup>3</sup> It is not quite obvious which gesture the artist meant to represent: the little lad may shade his eyes, or he may wave his hand; anyhow, the representation is full of life and charm.