

REPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS.

REPORT

PRESENTED TO THE

Cambridge Antiquarian Society,

AT ITS FORTY-SIXTH ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING,

MAY 24, 1886,

WITH AN ABSTRACT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY,
1885—1886.

ALSO

Communications

MADE TO THE SOCIETY.

No. XXVIII.

BEING No. 2 OF THE SIXTH VOLUME.

Cambridge:

DEIGHTON, BELL & CO.; MACMILLAN & BOWES.

LONDON: G. BELL AND SONS,

1888.

Price 5s.

COUNCIL.

May 24, 1886.

President.

Rev. GEORGE FORREST BROWNE, B.D., St Catharine's College.

Vice-Presidents.

GEORGE MURRAY HUMPHRY, Esq., M.D., F.R.S., King's College,
Professor of Surgery.

THOMAS MCKENNY HUGHES, Esq., M.A., F.S.A., Clare College,
Woodwardian Professor of Geology.

CHARLES CARDALE BABINGTON, Esq., M.A., F.R.S., St John's College,
Professor of Botany.

Treasurer.

WILLIAM MILNER FAWCETT, Esq., M.A., F.S.A., Jesus College.

Secretary.

Rev. SAMUEL SAVAGE LEWIS, M.A., F.S.A., Corpus Christi College.

Ordinary Members of Council.

NORMAN CAPPER HARDCASTLE, Esq., M.A., LL.M., Downing College.
Rev. WALTER WILLIAM SKEAT, M.A., Litt. D., Christ's College,
Elington and Bosworth Professor of Anglo-Saxon.

ALEXANDER MACALISTER, Esq., M.A., M.D., F.R.S., St John's College,
Professor of Anatomy.

Rev. HENRY RICHARDS LUARD, D.D., Trinity College, *Registrary.*
E. C. CLARK, Esq., LL.D., F.S.A., St John's College, *Regius Professor of Civil Law.*

JOHN WILLIS CLARK, Esq., M.A., Trinity College, *Superintendent of the Museum of Zoology and Comparative Anatomy.*

FRANCIS JOHN HENRY JENKINSON, Esq., M.A., Trinity College.

JOHN EBENEZER FOSTER, Esq., M.A., Trinity College.

Rev. BRYAN WALKER, M.A., LL.D., Corpus Christi College.

Rev. Canon MANDELL CREIGHTON, M.A., Emmanuel College, *Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History.*

G. W. PROTHERO, Esq., M.A., King's College, *University Lecturer in History.*

C. WALDSTEIN, Esq., M.A., King's College, *Director of the Fitzwilliam Museum and Reader in Classical Archaeology.*

Excursion-Secretary.

NORMAN CAPPER HARDCASTLE, Esq., M.A., LL.M.

Auditors.

SWANN HURRELL, Esq., J.P.

F. C. WACE, Esq., M.A., *Esquire Bedell.*

REPORT

PRESENTED TO THE

Cambridge Antiquarian Society,

AT ITS FORTY-SIXTH ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING,

MAY 24, 1886.

WITH APPENDIX.



Cambridge:

DEIGHTON, BELL & CO.; MACMILLAN & BOWES.

LONDON: G. BELL AND SONS.

1887.

Cambridge:

PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A. AND SONS
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

CONTENTS

OF COMMUNICATIONS, No. XXVIII.

VOL. VI, PART II.

	PAGE
VI. The Lake of Mœris and the Patriarch Joseph. Communicated by F. COPE WHITEHOUSE, Esq.	177
VII. On Eadmer's Elaboration of the first four books of the <i>Historia Novorum in Anglia</i> . Communicated by MARTIN RULE, M.A., Pembroke College (with two facsimiles).	195
VIII. Remarks on the Land Measures employed in the Channel Islands. Communicated by W. DE GRUCHY, Esq.	305
IX. Some account of the site of a Roman Veteran's holding at Abington Pigotts, in the County of Cambridge. Communicated by the Rev. W. GRAHAM F. FIGOTT, M.A., Peterhouse	309

VII. ON EADMER'S ELABORATION OF THE FIRST FOUR BOOKS OF THE "HISTORIA NOVIORUM IN ANGLIA."
Communicated by MARTIN RULE, M.A., Pembroke College.

[February 8, 1886.]

THE following monograph is the outcome of researches which were begun when I was engaged in editing my volume of Eadmer for the Rolls Series. Those researches were cut short by the discovery that the amount of space allowed me, by a rare and most kind concession, for my Preface was already needed for the preliminary investigations. If anything could console me for the disappointment that ensued on the discovery, it is the fact that I am now privileged to make my labours known under the patronage of an *alma mater* with whom minute and painstaking work is always sure of recognition.

When the duty was assigned me of preparing an edition of the *Historia Novorum*, I resolved to number myself amongst those editors who transcribe and collate for themselves, and not by deputy; and I did so not without hope of discovering some clue that might be of good service to others. A clue I did discover. With what success I have followed it up the learned will determine.

It cannot be necessary that I should again adduce all the facts which go to prove that Eadmer, so far from dying (as all

my predecessors have, on confessedly insufficient grounds, assumed) as early as the January of 1124, lived on for many years. The January of 1144 is the earliest date which can reasonably be assigned to his death. I think it more likely that he lived to see the year 1145; and that he may even have survived it.

There is, however, another chronological question on which it seems proper to dwell before I invite the reader to follow me in my analytical examination of Eadmer's great work. What I say shall be said as briefly as possible.

Not only has it been the fashion to say that Eadmer died as early as 1124; it has also been the fashion to say that William of Malmesbury completed the *Gesta Pontificum* as early as 1125, on the ground that his *Life of St Aldhelm*, which in some copies ranks as a fifth and supplementary book, was originally finished in that year. I cannot accept the inference; for the evidence of the MSS, so far from proving the *Life of St Aldhelm* to have been originally written as an integral and inherent portion of the *Gesta Pontificum*, proves it to be an adjunct which may have been composed in entire independence of it; and every extant copy of the *Gesta* contains in Book III. an allusion, as to no recent event, to the promotion of Archbishop Ralph's brother, Sefred, to the see of Chichester, an event which appertains, precisely, to the year 1125.

The truth is that there are two distinct texts both of the *Gesta Pontificum* and of the *Life of St Aldhelm*; in the case of the former an unexpurgated text (represented by MS. B of Mr Hamilton's collation), when begun I cannot say, but completed after the year 1125, and a recensed text of later date (represented by Mr Hamilton's MS. A); in the case of the latter a short text (as in MS. B) completed as early as 1125, and a longer text (as in MS. A) completed after the recension of Book III. of the *Gesta*.

It is a remarkable fact that whilst the longer and later text

of the *Life of St Aldhelm* contains references¹ to the castigated and later text of the *Gesta*, the first and shorter text of the biography contains none to the first and unexpurgated text of the history.

To determine the dates at which the four books of the *Gesta Pontificum* were severally completed in their first and unexpurgated form would be a difficult and perhaps an impossible task. But, as regards the recensed text of the work, we are not without help.

That portion of the revised text of Book II. which relates to the see of London mentions William of Corbeuil, Archbishop of Canterbury, as one who is no longer living, Book I. being silent about him. I infer, therefore, that the revision of Book II. was completed in or after the year 1137, for the Primate died on the twenty-sixth of November 1136; but that Book I. had been issued before receipt of the news.

The revision of Book III. seems to have been completed after the death of Archbishop William, but before that of Thurstan, the northern metropolitan, in the early days of 1140.

¹ William of Malmesbury says in the later text of the *Life of St Aldhelm* (§ 192) "Cum Wilfridus episcopus de quo non pauca in tertio libro dixi, exul ageretur," &c.; and on turning to *Gesta Pontificum* III. (§ 100) we find that the "non pauca" cannot be meant of the first text (B) of that work, which dismisses St Wilfrid in a few lines, but of the later text (A) which gives him more than six leaves of closely-written manuscript. And another passage in § 231 in like manner proves that MS. A of the *St Aldhelm* was written after MS. A of *Gesta Pontificum* III.

The assumption that the shorter life of St Aldhelm is an abbreviation of the longer has thrown the chronology of William of Malmesbury's literary career into strange confusion. The four MSS. of which I speak in the text were completed in the following order:

1. *St Aldhelm*, B (about A.D. 1125).
2. *Gesta Pontificum*, B.
3. *Gesta Pontificum*, A (about A.D. 1136—1139).
4. *St Aldhelm*, A.

I think I have read all that Sir T. D. Hardy and Mr Hamilton have written on the subject. They assign the last, not the first, to A.D. 1125.

That of Book IV. before the spring of 1148, but how long before it is impossible to say¹.

The years 1135, 1137, 1139, 1141, or, more probably, 1136, 1137, 1138, 1139 may serve as a fair approximation to the dates at which Books I. II. III. and IV. of the *Gesta Pontificum* were given to the world in their revised form. They were followed by the *Life of St Aldhelm* in its new and longer form. This now ranked as a fifth book.

As to the date, or dates, at which the several books of the uncorrected text were divulged, the case of these is so like that of the fourth and fifth books of the *Gesta Regum* that it would be unwise to give a decided opinion as to the one group without having made a careful study of the other, not as they are known to us in existing editions but as they will in due time be made known to us by the right reverend prelate who is at this moment working on the first of William's two great works. Subject, however, to such instruction as may and will accompany the forthcoming edition, I do not hesitate to say that I am very strongly of opinion that neither the uncastigated *Gesta Pontificum* nor the uncastigated *Gesta Regum* was known outside the Malmesbury cloister during the life of Henry I.

In the course of the following pages I make frequent mention of Eadmer's own working copy of the *Historia*. By this I mean, not necessarily the volume which was handed to him by the scribe after the transcription of the work upon its first completion in, say, the year 1111, but the volume which he had in use during the latter years of his life, the years in which he expanded his treatise by the introduction of Amplifications I.—VIII. and X.—XXXVIII. What, then, was it like?

Each of its leaves may be presumed to have contained forty-eight lines; and, whatever the precise number of lines (whether forty-eight or fifty), each of its leaves had the

¹ See *Gesta Pontificum*, Rolls Edition, §§ 73, 125, 169.

textual value of, as nearly as may be, any such forty-nine lines as are to be found in the second and succeeding quires of the C. C. C. archetype¹. I cannot emphasize this fact too strongly if I wish to spare my readers trouble in the sequel.

The volume, then, consisting of leaves each of them ruled to hold the quantity of text just indicated, comprised eight quaternions. The first of the sixty-four leaves carried nothing but the name of the author and the title, which had already, as I believe, been lengthened from *Historia* to *Historia Novorum in Anglia*². Then came the Prologue on one leaf; then the first book on twenty-nine leaves, then the second on twenty-two, and finally a third on eleven³. The very remarkable brevity of this last portion of the work can be by nothing more plausibly or more satisfactorily explained than by the theory that Eadmer, treating of the relations of St Anselm with Henry I. and writing while that prince was still alive, deemed it his wisdom to write with a very considerable reserve. Its first nine leaves will be easily disintegrated by the reader from the accretions which now outnumber them in the proportion of two to one. As to the tenth and eleventh, I give them in my essay as they seem to have stood in the first instance; and I am bold to say that, every abatement made for possible error in a word or two here and there, I have recovered Eadmer's original narrative of the last eight years of his master's life. Those eight years fell within the reign of Henry I. Nothing can, I think, be more instructive than the contrast between the first picture painted

¹ See facsimile of MS. p. 17.

² See MS. p. 260. My references throughout the essay are to the pages of the C. C. C. archetype, as notified on the inner margins of my Rolls edition.

³ There had been a first transcript of the first book, including Amplification A (MS. pp. 10—12), and there was yet to be a final transcript of the entire work which was to accommodate Amplification IX; but of these I will not now speak more particularly than to say that both the former and the latter were identical, as regards the content of their leaves, with the first quire of the C. C. C. archetype. (See below, pp. 285—289.)

while Henry was on the throne and that same picture reproduced after his death on a canvas more than six times as ample, filled in with new details and intensified with higher lights and deeper shadows¹.

I dwell on this theory with all the greater emphasis not only because I believe it to be proved by the following pages, but because I am not aware that the very probable presumption of such reticence as I have indicated has been brought forward by any of my predecessors, or, if brought forward at all, enforced as it deserves to be enforced. Read in its light, William of Malmesbury's prologue to the fourth book of the *Gesta Regum* and Henry of Huntingdon's *Epistola de Contemptu Mundi* are most suggestively eloquent.

Although, then, no copy of Eadmer's first text is known to

¹ The *Historia* known to John of Salisbury would seem to have been the *Historia* of early days; that known to the Worcester chroniclers a later, but not the last recension. Of William of Malmesbury I need not speak at present.

Eadmer's own copy of Book V. was written on leaves of the same textual content as that of the ninth and following leaves of the C. C. C. archetype, each of them bearing to a leaf of his own copy of the *Historia* proper the proportion of fifty-four to forty-nine. A curious trace, I apprehend, of the difference is to be seen in the digression on MS. pp. 287—289, "Lugdunum ...progreuiemur." As we now know it, it has the value of a leaf of Eadmer's own Book V; but it seems in the first instance to have lacked the expletory clause "ubi dominus...inquam cum venissemus." I suspect that Eadmer "dictated" it on his tablets for introduction into the volume which had been destined to accommodate the additions to the *Historia* proper pending their final incorporation into it; but that, perceiving its proper place to be in a corresponding volume ancillary to Book V, and therefore ampler in the capacity of its leaves, he was fain to expand it by the simple but awkward expedient of foisting in the clause I have indicated.

The first issue of the present Book V. was probably (I think, certainly) made prior to the division of the third book of the pristine work into what are now known as Books III. and IV. The Worcester chronicler who carried on Florence's labours worked, not improbably, on a copy of it, a copy having the same parentage as the stray leaf which I have described and collated in my Rolls volume (pp. xi, l).

ppter diuersos casus p̄dite fuerunt ipsi ecc̄. A sacro
 Verū de his ac innumeris aliis bonis quib' inuidan-
 do intā suā consumauit licet in q̄dem seribe opus
 non sit. p̄p̄ta quod & opa ei ita parent ut ipsa se
 euidenter scripto demonstrent. & ipse met de rebus
 ecclesiasticis que suo tēpore gesta s̄t ueracissimo & cō-
 pendioso calamo scripserit. tam p̄ diligēdine memo-
 rie ei que p̄libauimus pauca explicare gratū duxi-
 mus. **Hic** & Lanfranc' cū cantuariā p̄mo uenis-
 set. & ecc̄lam saluatoris quā regere susceperat in cen-
 dio atq; ruinis pene nichil factū inuenisset. in tē-
 c̄sternat' ē. Sed cū magnitudo mali illū cogeret
 desipere. rediit in se. animiq; fortitudine t̄retus.
 sua comoditate p̄habita domos ad opus monachorū
 necessarias citato ope cōsumauit. Quib' ubi p̄ plu-
 res annos usi sunt. ad aucto eorū cūuentu parue ad-
 modū usē sunt. Destruentis itaq; illis. alias decore
 ac magnitudine p̄orib' multū prestantes edifica-
 uit. & edificauit & curiā sibi. & ecc̄lam p̄terea q̄
 spatio septē annorū a fundamentis ferme totā p̄fectā
 reddidit. in cappis. casulis. dalmaticis. tunis au-
 to magnifice insignitis. pallis & aliis ornamentis
 multis ac p̄ciosis nobilitate decorauit. Erga fr̄s autē
 ipsius ecc̄le quā bonus. quā pius. quā beneficis

existerit. inde aliquantulum colligi potest. quod nec ex paren-
 tibus aut fratribus eorum sustinere poterat penuria ulla queque
 affligit. Et quod magis forte mireris. inultum accepit non
 expectare ut subuenire rogaret. sed misericordie visceribus
 plenus. in hunc in illi ultro offerrebat. quod egena cognato
 plurimum temporis auxilio esse ualeret. In quo tam semper
 ducebat precipua discretione. confidato uidelicet penes
 se merito ac necessitate cuius. Adhuc. Quidam ipsius esse
 nobis fidei. singulis annis triginta solidos denariorum ad
 opus matris sue ab ipso patre solebat accipere. Hunc quidam
 uice solidi quique de illis. nam diuise partem uices confere-
 bant. ex precepto ei datus sunt. Quis ipse in panno ligatos.
 matri loquens in manu sicut putabat elanculo dedit.
 At ipsa alias uice intenta. quod filius faceret non aduertit.
 et tanquam decidit. Auri ab inuice se matris et filii.
 Post hec mandauit mulier filio suo. scire uolens quod de
 nimis accu fuerit quod sibi se daturum spondens. Ad-
 miratus ille. fecit eam uenire ad se. Et audiens reuerentia.
 cristiani effectus est. non tantum pro dano quod matri contigerat.
 sed ne hoc archiepiscopus sciret. ob incuriam suam irriter eum
 aliquatenus gratia sua uiuaret. In hoc prius parte pro more
 claustrum introiens. sedit. ac fratrem amantissimo colloquio
 redempte mestum intuens. remotis aliis causa mesticie
 ei secreta perire. Audit. et benignissimo uultu sic iugiter
 erat circa afflictos. ita respondit. Et inde fili kme con-
 trisari. Denarios illos de alii predestinauit et contulit.
 quod eis plus matre tua forcastis indiguit. Tace. et ne cuius

exist, there can now be little doubt as to its scope, its textual content, and its political tone. A planet has vanished from the firmament; but its orbit, its size, and the inclination of its axis are ascertained.

The writings of Eadmer and of William of Malmesbury have long been before the world; but it has been my good fortune to think, and, as I believe, to prove, that Eadmer did not die in the first quarter of the twelfth century, but lived to make acquaintance with William's two great works; and, whatever may come of the theory that no part of the *Gesta Pontificum* was made known before the year 1135, it has further been my good fortune to think, and, as I believe, to prove, that we are indebted to that work mainly, and in a less measure to the fourth and fifth books of the *Gesta Regum*, for the stimulus that urged to new activity a pen set free by the death of Henry I. to obey the will of its owner.

Henceforth, if I am not mistaken, Eadmer and his rival will be read together; with the presumption that where, on subjects likely to interest him, our author did not correct his Wiltshire competitor, he saw little or nothing to correct; and that where the two witnesses present a striking resemblance in phraseology, Christ Church has copied Malmesbury, and not Malmesbury Christ Church.

I have but two more remarks to make before leaving my essay to the reader:—

1. That the accompanying list gives evident proof of the fact that out of thirty-seven amplifications no less than thirty-five have, severally, the textual value of an even multiple of, as nearly as may be, $24\frac{1}{2}$ lines¹; and that the two exceptions are, after all, exceptions which prove the rule, as will be explained in due course.

¹ The later additions lessen gradually down to an even multiple of barely 24 lines. But the reader need not trouble himself to remember this fact just at present. It will be investigated in due course. (See below, p. 277.)

LIST OF AMPLIFICATIONS

	Number	Reference to MS. C. C. C. 452	Textual Content	2. Aggregate for each book in terms of leaves and pages of Eadmer's own copy.		
Book I	I	pp. 12-28	"In hujus regni.....vixit fuisse"	} eleven leaves		
	II	43-45	"Sed quid ?.....prælibavimus"			
	III	52-56	"Veniens autem.....intendit"			
	IV	52-54	"Anselmus tamen.....dispensans"			
	V	83-89	"Ad quam missam.....Normannia"			
Book II	VI	104-108 bis	"Quo cum.....viæ reddidimus"	} ten leaves		
	VII	113-116	"Erat præterea.....concordare"			
	VIII	122-125	"Et quia.....redeamus iter"			
	IX	132-134	"Siquidem illa die.....subtraxit"			
	X	137-150	"Hæc Anselmus.....disponat. Amen"			
Book III	XI	150 bis-156	"non quidem.....ultionem exerceat"	} twenty leaves		
	XII	158-161	"Et de litterarum.....conserere nolo"			
	XIII	162-166	"multa ecclesiastice.....concessit"			
	XIV	166-170	"quatinus pro suo.....obsecrat"			
	XV	166-168	"Erat quippe.....desistere voluit"			
	XVI	172-175	"Acta sunt.....Roman pervenisse"			
	XVII	178-182	"Et ne.....Placentinos fines"			
	XVIII	183-185	"Directis interea.....redigi præcepit"			
					393 $\frac{1}{2}$ = 8 x 49 $\frac{1}{2}$	
					49 $\frac{3}{8}$ - $\frac{1}{2}$ = 49 $\frac{5}{8}$	
			103 $\frac{1}{2}$ - (IV + 5 $\frac{3}{4}$) = 49 $\frac{1}{4}$			
			48 $\frac{1}{2}$			
			151 - 3 $\frac{2}{3}$ = 147 $\frac{1}{3}$ = 3 x 49 $\frac{1}{3}$			
			158 $\frac{3}{8}$ - 11 $\frac{1}{3}$ = 147 $\frac{1}{3}$ = 3 x 49 $\frac{1}{3}$			
			97 $\frac{3}{8}$ = 2 x 48 $\frac{3}{8}$			
			99 $\frac{1}{2}$ = 2 x 49 $\frac{1}{2}$			
			See below, page 288			
			5 + 344 - 5 = 344 = 7 x 49 $\frac{1}{7}$			
			5 $\frac{1}{2}$ + 32 + 110 $\frac{1}{2}$ = 148 = 3 x 49 $\frac{1}{3}$			
			52 $\frac{3}{4}$ - 3 (?) = 49 $\frac{1}{4}$ (?)			
			104 $\frac{1}{4}$ - 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ = 98 = 2 x 49			
			98 - XV = 49			
			49			
			99 $\frac{1}{2}$ - 1 $\frac{2}{3}$ = 98 $\frac{1}{6}$ = 2 x 49 $\frac{1}{3}$			
			98 - $\frac{1}{3}$ = 97 $\frac{2}{3}$ = 2 x 48 $\frac{1}{3}$			
			49 $\frac{3}{8}$			

Book IV	185		24 $\frac{2}{3}$	one page
XIX		"Cura tamen.....mensibus quatuor"	100 $\frac{1}{3}$ - 2 $\frac{2}{3}$ = 97 $\frac{2}{3}$ = 2 x 48 $\frac{1}{2}$	} thirty-nine leaves
XX	186—189	"Quæ autem.....revocaret"	49 $\frac{1}{3}$ - $\frac{2}{3}$ = 48 $\frac{2}{3}$	
XXI	190—191	"Ad quod.....suscepit, inspexit"	55 $\frac{1}{2}$ - 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ = 49	
XXII	192—194	"Cum ergo.....inter eos colloquit"	146 $\frac{1}{2}$ = 3 x 48 $\frac{1}{2}$	
XXIII	194—200	"Hæc autem.....legatum mitiam"	102 $\frac{1}{2}$ - 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ = 98 = 2 x 49	
XXIV	200—204	"Scripsit quoque.....posse putamus"	144 = 3 x 48	
XXV	204—209	"Attamen dicendum.....redeunt"	145 $\frac{2}{3}$ = 3 x 48 $\frac{2}{3}$	
XXVI	209—214	"Suspensus autem.....De his ita"	62 $\frac{2}{3}$ - 14 = 48 $\frac{2}{3}$	
XXVII	214—217	"Itaque Willelmus.....pollicitus est"	52 $\frac{1}{3}$ - 3 $\frac{1}{3}$ = 49	
XXVIII	217—219	"His et aliis.....reversus est"	110 $\frac{1}{2}$ - (XXX + 12 $\frac{1}{2}$) = 49	
{ XXXIX	219—223	"Adunatis autem.....Lundoniensi"	48 $\frac{2}{3}$	
{ XXX	220—221	"Inter hæc.....destitutæ"	97 $\frac{1}{3}$ = 2 x 48 $\frac{2}{3}$	
XXXI	223—226	"In subsequenti.....ecclesiæ"	48 $\frac{2}{3}$	
XXXII	226—228	"Inter hæc.....presentatus"	106 - 8 = 98 = 2 x 49	
XXXIII	228—232	"Inter ista.....adulteræ"	341 = 7 x 48 $\frac{1}{2}$	
XXXIV	232—234	"His diebus.....ordinavit"	48 $\frac{2}{3}$	
XXXV	234—247	"Deinde.....scissuram"	345 $\frac{1}{2}$ - XXXVII - 8 $\frac{2}{3}$ = 287 $\frac{5}{6}$ = 6 x 47 $\frac{5}{6}$	
XXXVI	247—259	"Note tamen.....Amen"	49 (corrected to 48)	
XXXVII	257—259	"Prius tamen.....Decembris"		

* * * To these must be added Amplification A, "De quo prolio.....satis dictum," on MS. pp. 10—12, introduced at an early date. It has the textual content of a leaf of the first quire (pp. 1—16) of MS. C. C. C. 452 (see facsimile of p. 16).

2. That, where it has seemed desirable to do so, I have quoted passages from the preface to my Rolls edition of Eadmer. I have not, indeed, reproduced its last paragraph, because that paragraph is no longer an adequate expression of the obligation under which I have been laid by the Master and Fellows of Corpus Christi College since it was written, or of my sense of the unfailing kindness of the official custodian of their precious manuscript. Last, but not least, of the favours I acknowledge has been the permission granted for the execution of the facsimiles which illustrate this essay.

§ 1. BOOKS I. AND II.

The first book of the *Historia Novorum*, as at present known to us, contains in the C. C. C. archetype 1960 lines¹, an even multiple ($49 \times 40 = 1960$) of $24\frac{1}{2}$ lines. And the Lanfranc memoir (MS. pp. 12-28), which may be presumed to have had no place in the first issue, and which may by reason of its length be accepted as a fair sample, contains $393\frac{1}{2}$ lines; again, with the insignificant error of rather more than a line (for $49 \times 8 = 392$), an even multiple of the same quantity of text.

Forty-nine lines, therefore, which in their turn represent the textual sum of the Prologue and its rubrics, may be assumed as having constituted the textual content of a leaf of Book I. in Eadmer's own working copy.

• *Amplification I.* I have nothing to add to the short account which I have elsewhere² given of the Lanfranc memoir,

¹ The content of the first gathering being reduced to terms of lines of the second and subsequent gatherings. A leaf in the first group is to a leaf in what follows in the proportion of $46\frac{2}{3}$ to 54.

² "The first of these incorporated passages is, perhaps, the memoir of Archbishop Lanfranc which begins on page 12 and ends on page 28. The paragraph which immediately precedes it is devoted to an account of the

unless it be to say that it may have been provoked by the panegyric in *G. P.* §§ 43, 44. A comparison of the two accounts brings to light some curious differences; and if Eadmer read William's as it seems to have been written, he must have noted with surprise that his rival had described stone houses as built of wood and wooden houses as built of stone¹, and had assigned them, not to the city of Canterbury, but to the city of Rochester.

Amplification II. The precise amount of added text in the case of the addition on MS. pp. 43-45 is 49½ lines; for to the 48¾ lines in "Sed quid? Plurima.....sermo recurrat" must be added ¾ line for the resumptive "secundum quod prælibavimus" of the succeeding paragraph².

Not only does it contain the remarkable sentence, "Hæc de rege ad præsens succincte memorasse sufficiat, jamque ad destinatum narrandi ordinem sermo recurrat" and the phrase "huic opusculo inserere"; the words "qui illius recordatur" are such as could not well have been employed within two decades of the events to which they refer.

Amplification V. Separated by a brief interval from the innovations introduced by the Conqueror in the ecclesiastical order, and ends with these words, 'Ut itaque cœptum peragamus iter, de his satis dictum'; that which immediately follows is the real commencement of the 'Historia'; and towards the end of the memoir Eadmer tells us that he is now going to begin the narrative which he had been on the point of beginning fifteen pages back. There can be no question that the entire passage is a digression." *Preface*, p. xvi.

¹ *Gesta Pontificum*, p. 72 (Rolls Edition). William may have written from an untrustworthy memorandum. We have his first account in MS. B, and also in MS. A, but corrected in this latter conformably with Eadmer's narration.

² Such phrases as "ut diximus," "ut præfati sumus," "ut prælibavimus," "secundum quod prælibavimus" occur either in, or in direct relation with, additions to the original narrative. I do not think that any exception to the rule can be discovered. See, especially, the instances to be found in MS. pp. 104, 108, 116, 156, 166, 171, 172, 185, 217, 219, 230, 269, 294, 304, 310, 327, 342.

passage on MS. pp. 85—89 to which attention has been already drawn (“*Quæ pecunia.....hos dies rex, Normannia*”) there is another (“*Ad quam missam.....Gundulfo Rofensi*”) which claims admission into the category of subsequent additions to the narrative. For the following reasons:

1. The words “*Ad quam missam*” are in false correlation with the “*missarum solennia*” of the preceding sentence. Had Eadmer written the passage at the time of the first composition he would have said “*Ad quæ solennia*”, not “*Ad quam missam.*”

2. The passage records the coincidence between St Anselm's *prognosticon* and the Gospel read when he assumed the pallium. But in the *Vita*, published in the year 1112, Eadmer makes no record of the later event, an event which he could not have failed to recollect, had he recorded it two years earlier in the *Historia*; particularly as he wrote the *Vita* with the *Historia* lying open before him, and reproduced in the shorter work the account of the *prognosticon* which he had given in the longer.

3. When William of Malmesbury (*G. P.* p. 84) records the incident of the *prognosticon* he quotes the sacred text as Eadmer does, “.....*misit servum suum.....cœperunt simul omnes excusare*”; but when (*G. P.* p. 91) he records that of the Gospel, he gives two various readings in the course of one brief quotation, “.....*misit servos suos.....cœperunt omnes simul excusare.*” This fact raises two presumptions; first, that though he owed the former he did not owe the latter story to Eadmer, and, secondly, that Eadmer's record of the latter was provoked by his.

Nor is it likely that the two succeeding paragraphs (“*Revocato...suscipitur*” and “*Eodem...Rofensi*”) can have figured in the earliest issue of the work. The first of them records the consecration of Samuel, Bishop of Dublin, and the second that of Samson, of Worcester, and Gerard, of Hereford; Samuel,

Samson, Gérard, and a fourth, Malchus, Bishop of Waterford (MS. pp. 87, 88), being four out of the five prelates whose consecration Eadmer has commemorated in that portion of the work with which we are at present concerned.

4. Now, the *Historia* from beginning to end commemorates twenty episcopal consecrations¹, fifteen of which are, in their turn, commemorated by the Worcester chroniclers, and in Eadmer's own words. Of the other five, one, indeed, is recorded by the Worcester writers, but neither in Eadmer's words nor under Eadmer's date. It is that of Samson of Worcester². And of the residuary four not one is recorded by the Worcester writers; and three of the four are those of Samuel of Dublin, Gerard of Hereford, and Malchus of Waterford. It seems fair, therefore, to conclude that when the Worcester chronicler drew up his record of the year 1096 the copy of Eadmer which he then used said nothing about these three consecrations.

But the two passages "Ad quam missam.....Rofensi" and "Quæ pecunia.....Normannia" would seem to be not so much two amplifications as one; for they both have to do with episcopal consecrations and are both concerned with the quasi-patriarchal authority of Canterbury in Ireland.

Between "Ad quam missam" and "rex, Normannia" there are 151 lines; but from this total $3\frac{2}{3}$ lines must be subtracted for "Eo tempore.....tradidit. Quæ," which is evidently old work. The remainder is $147\frac{1}{3}$, an even multiple of $24\frac{2}{3}$ lines.

Amplifications III. and IV. This is the proper place for a few words on the one remaining episcopal consecration of the four which have been recorded by Eadmer but not by the Worcester chroniclers; that of Robert Bloet, Bishop of London.

1. The most remarkable feature in Eadmer's account of this event ("Morati vero.....detraheret," MS. pp. 54, 55) is

¹ Cf. MS. pp. 85, 88, 222, 223, 234, 236, 282, 283, 307, 309, 344, 345, 349; and Florence of Worcester (ed. Thorpe) II. 40, 56, 59, 68, 73, 74, 76.

² Eadmer's date is June 8th; the Worcester date (II. 40) is June 15th.

the fact that it contains the only favourable word which he seems ever to have written about the Red King. Assuredly, the York dispute must have reached a very acute stage before he can have been betrayed into so singular a complacency.

2. And the passage which immediately follows ("Eo tempore.....intendit") is curious. Certainly, it looks like a paragraph foisted in by way of what is now called padding. As certainly, it has no discernible bearing on the subject-matter of Eadmer's work at this part of it. And, in the third place, it must have been written at a time when the wearing of long hair had been for some years out of fashion at Court, and therefore not as early as 1109, for the custom was in full vogue as recently as the Easter of 1105¹.

3. These considerations are sufficient to raise, at least, a doubt about the whole passage "Morati vero.....studiosius intendit." But, since it has not the content of a leaf; since what immediately precedes (namely, "Evolutis dehinc...ducturus") is necessary to the general narrative; and since this in its turn is preceded by a proved augmentation, we are thrown back upon the paragraph "Veniens autem...consistant" on page 52, a story which has as little to do with Eadmer's proper subject as the shearing of the *criniti* or the consecration of Robert Bloet.

Between "Veniens autem," then, and "studiosius intendit" there are 103½ lines which are reduced to 97¾ lines by the subtraction of "Evolutis...ducturus," the necessary link of connexion between the narrative that precedes "Veniens autem" and that which follows "studiosius intendit."

4. Eadmer's *Life of St Anselm* (Rolls edition, p. 362) makes the journey to Hastings take place "*paucis diebus interpositis*" after the consecration of Harrow Church, in contrast to the "*evolutis dehinc aliquantis diebus*" of the passage just noticed, a passage which is *ex hypothesi* a portion of the

¹ See Orderic, *H E.* xi. xi.

pristine treatise. The "pauci dies" were days counted from the consecration at Harrow; the "aliquanti dies" were days counted, not from that event, but from St Anselm's departure from Gloucester at the beginning of January.

Excerpting, then, "Evolutis...ducturus" from what is presumably late work, we find that 97 $\frac{3}{4}$ lines remain; and that 48 $\frac{1}{2}$ of these are concerned with that correspondence with St Wulstan which has been already marked off as a subsequent addition to the first narrative. That is to say, we here have what may be called a compound augmentation, of which the earlier constituent comprises the episodes about Harrow Church, Bishop Bloet, and the *criniti*, the later constituent comprising the Wulstan correspondence.

5. To the foregoing considerations the following may be added:—

Eadmer in the *Vita* (II. vii) lays no stress on the detention at Hastings by adverse winds; whilst the first text of the *Gesta Pontificum* (p. 85 a) must have been written in ignorance of the fact which the *Historia* known to us records, that the prince was kept waiting for fair weather for more than a month. Hence the sentence "Morati...prohibente" must be held to coalesce, not with the old work "Evolutis...ducturus"¹ which precedes, but with the new, "In qua mora," &c. which follows it.

Amplification VI. Few things could be more remarkable than the general agreement, and, in very frequent instances, the verbal identity, which are to be perceived between those portions of the *Historia Novorum* and of the *Vita* which relate to the first exile of St Anselm. In this part of the story

¹ After Eadmer had realized the fact that the delay at Hastings was a long one, his "transfretaturum" in this sentence was scarcely tolerable; but he allowed it to stand until very late in his life, when he changed it to "transfretare volentem." Meanwhile William of Malmesbury (*G. P.* 85 a) appropriated and retained the unsuitable word; and John of Salisbury (*Migne*, S. L. cxcix. 1022 d) many years later did the same.

the shorter work is the merest echo of the longer, with the exception of that part of it which is concerned with the sojourn at Lyons at the close of 1097 and the beginning of the next year.

The *Historia* (MS. p. 104) says "Quo cum demoraremur didicit Anselmus ex iis quæ fama ferebat non multum suæ causæ profuturum si ipse in ulteriora procederet. Imbecillitas quoque sui corporis residuæ viæ laborem perhorrebat, et insidiæ quæ ab indigenis illarum regionum ea tempestate commeantibus, et maxime religiosi ordinis viris, struebantur, eum non-nihil retardabant. Itaque Lugduni resedit cunctis valde acceptus et honorabilis. Scriptam dehinc epistolam unam sedis apostolicæ præsuli destinavit, in qua quid de iis quæ acciderant suggesserit, quoque animi sui desiderium intenderit, tenor ipsius epistolæ quam subscribimus designabit."

That is to say:—

1. Whilst we were staying at Lyons Anselm learnt that he could not better his cause by continuing his journey. 2. Besides, he shrank from the attendant fatigue, and, 3, the road was beset by brigands. 4. He therefore took up his abode at Lyons. 5. When settled there, he wrote to the Pope telling him (i) what had happened and (ii) what was the desire of his heart. Then comes the letter, and, soon after it, the following sentence,—“Sed ille, ut diximus, Lugduni remansit, reditum nunciatorum suorum ibi opperens.”

6. This “ut diximus”, however¹, is unfortunate, for, as the work now stands, another reason has been given for the sojourn at Lyons.

On the other hand the *Vita* (II. xxvii) says:—“Post dies paucos missis litteris consilium a domino papa de negotio suo quæsivit, et quia partim imbecillitate sui corporis, partim aliis pluribus causis præpeditus, ultra Lugdunum progredi nequa-

¹ See *Preface*, p. liii.

quam posset ei suggestit. Ita ergo Lugduni resedit, reditum nunciorum suorum ibi expectans."

That is to say:—

A few days after our arrival at Lyons he wrote to the Pope (i) asking for advice, and (ii) explaining that from ill health and other causes it was impossible he should go any further on the way to Rome. 2. Therefore, and after the letter was written, he fixed his abode at Lyons, where he awaited the return of his messengers.

I need not dwell on the general discrepancy between these two accounts. Suffice it to remark that, while the description of the letter given in the *Historia* is true, that given in the *Vita* is false; for (i) so far from soliciting advice, Anselm in the "Novimus" begged to be released from the primacy, and (ii) so far from setting forth the causes which had induced him to stop at Lyons, he was studiously reticent on the subject.

I infer, therefore, that the account in the *Vita* cannot have been based on that which now figures in the *Historia*; that Eadmer cannot have written it with any knowledge of the real contents of the letter; that in the first instance the *Historia* gave an account substantially identical with that which we now find in the *Vita*; and that, when Eadmer had made acquaintance with the Lyons letter, and had resolved to introduce it into the *Historia*, he changed his description of it from what it was to what it is.

If these inferences be accepted by the reader (and they are strongly recommended by the unlucky "Sed ipse...Lugduni remansit, reditum nunciorum suorum ibi operiens," which would seem to be salvage from the suppressed account) we now have 158 $\frac{2}{3}$ lines in the whole passage "Quo cum demoraremur...viæ reddidimus" (MS. pp. 104—108 *bis*) instead of 11 $\frac{1}{3}$ lines containing an account identical in purport with *Vita* II. xxvii. Their difference is 147 $\frac{1}{3}$ (= 3 × 49 $\frac{1}{9}$) lines.

And here I may pause for a moment to say that these

investigations concerning a letter written by St Anselm in his first exile confirm the opinion suggested by a letter received by him in his second, that Eadmer was not happy in divining the precise purpose of his master's movements¹.

Amplification VII. The digression on the Red King's impieties ("Erat præterea...concordare" MS. pp. 113—116) occupies $97\frac{2}{3}$ lines; and must have filled two leaves, each of which fell short by an insignificant fraction of the full complement of 49 lines.

Amplification VIII. The digression on the Archbishop of Benevento's cope (MS. pp. 122—125) should perhaps be computed to begin with the words "Et quia"; the paragraph having in the first instance filled $3\frac{1}{2}$ lines,—“Inter hæc ego Anselmo per omnia præsens aderam, paratus videlicet ad servitium ejus. Itaque finito concilio a Baro discessimus, comitatum papæ Romam usque non deserentes.” The extant paragraph fills $102\frac{2}{3}$ lines; $102\frac{2}{3} - 3\frac{1}{2} = 99\frac{1}{3} = 2 \times 49\frac{2}{3}$ ².

Of the eight additions³ thus far noticed the first four occur in Book I, and have the aggregate value of $540\frac{5}{4}$ lines; or, eleven leaves of the average content of $49\frac{29}{264}$ lines. The second four occur in Book II, and have the aggregate value of $491\frac{8}{5}$ lines, or ten leaves of the average content of $49\frac{23}{150}$ lines.

Deducting 540 lines from the whole extant content of Book I, we have for the pristine text $1960 - 540$ lines = 1420 lines; that is to say, twenty-nine leaves of $48\frac{28}{9}$ lines.

And, deducting 492 lines from the whole extant content of Book II, together with the 28 concluding lines "Hic occurrit animo," &c. which will be discussed hereafter, we have $1584 - (28 + 492)$ lines = 1064 lines, or twenty-two leaves of $48\frac{4}{11}$ lines.

¹ See *Preface*, pp. xxxvi, xlvi, cxii.

² If we suppose the preceding paragraph to have ended "factus est et veneratione dignissimus comprobatus" (see *Vita* II. xxxiv), we have $102\frac{2}{3} - 3\frac{1}{2} (= 98\frac{2}{3} = 2 \times 49\frac{2}{3})$ lines of new work.

³ I believe none of them to be amongst the earliest of Eadmer's amplifications.

Slight as is the difference between $48\frac{28}{29}$ and $48\frac{4}{11}$, I am unwilling to neglect it; and am disposed to think, pending the discussion of Amplification IX, that after the word "expirantem" on p. 132 there was a comparatively short account which has been suppressed in favour of the passage, "Siquidem illa die... subtraxit." But of this hereafter¹.

§ 2. THE FIRST PORTION OF BOOK III.

("Secundo itaque...investitura subrogatus": MS. pp. 134—166.)

It is probable beyond reach of question that Eadmer's original work, ending, as we are informed in the Prologue to the *Gesta Regum*, with the death of St Anselm, was comprised, not in four books, but in three.

Nor need we be surprised to learn that the third instalment of the original treatise was much shorter than either of the others. The relations with the civil power which had issued in the first exile of St Anselm extended over five years; those which issued in the second extended over two and a half. The most interesting incidents in the earlier period were more dramatic and more susceptible of a copious delineation than the most interesting incidents in the latter, which were, for the most part, brief and official. And even had it been in Eadmer's power to give us in his third book descriptions comparable as regards their length with his accounts of Anselm's election, or of the Rockingham council, or of the Westminster episode in the October of 1097, the very temptation to write minutely would have been accompanied with the most potent of correctives. William Rufus was dead, but Henry I. was living; William of Saint-Calais had gone to his account, but Renouf the Firebrand was alive and in the royal favour. The *Historia Novorum* was given to the world during a vacancy of the see of

¹ See below, p. 288.

Canterbury, and within few years of a concession made at most heavy cost by Henry; and it would have been worse than foolish in the Christ Church monks to allow a prominent member of their body to provoke the resentment of an electoral rival so influential, so tenacious, and so vindictive as was the reigning sovereign.

The third book is divisible into seven sections:—

1. "Secundo itaque...ad sua secessit" (pp. 134—138), in 102 lines.
2. "Hinc paucis...disponat. Amen" (pp. 138—150) in 344 lines.
3. "Cum igitur...subrogatus" (pp. 150—166) in 483 lines.
4. "Mittens ergo...appulimus" (pp. 166—172) in 148 lines.
5. "Acta sunt...pervenisse" (pp. 172—175) in 99 lines.
6. "Itaque venientem...invicem, et Anselmus" (pp. 175—183) in 197 lines.
7. "summo cum honore...actu elongans" (pp. 183, 184) in 49 lines.

The first of these seven sections has the textual content of 2 leaves and 4 lines.

Amplification X. The next comprises two passages which in another connexion have been treated as distinct amplifications¹. They would seem, on the contrary, to be part and parcel of the same amplification. The digression on the king's marriage (MS. pp. 138—143) must, indeed, have begun as early as "Negotium itaque" and may have begun seven lines earlier; but, even if the shorter computation be preferred, it gives the passage the unprecedented length of 151 lines; and the paragraph which immediately follows ("Eodem anno...functus") has by no means the appearance of early work.

Again. The "Legationis tuæ" on MS. p. 146 must be presumed, on the authority of William of Malmesbury (*G. P.* p. 113) to have been added to the treatise after the first issue; but there is no precedent for the opinion that it may have been added on a fly-leaf². If, then, it formed part of an amplification, such amplification must necessarily have consisted of more than

¹ *Preface*, pp. xxiv—xxvi, xxviii, xxix.

² As suggested in *Preface*, p. xxix.

three leaves. In short, we are compelled to choose between two alternatives. Either the digressions on the King's marriage and on the papal letter are unlike all others we have examined, in not being reducible to a proved standard of measurement, or they are parts of a whole, that whole being the 344 lines that intervene between "Hinc paucis" and "disponat. Amen." And, indeed, the fact that 344 is an integral multiple of 49½ would silence question were it not that a connecting link is needed to unite the preceding with the following context¹.

Our search, however, for such uniting bond is rewarded not only with success, but with a very interesting discovery. The sort of paragraph we need is found in the words "Exinde cum ad tempus induciarum, Pascha, ventum esset, et qui missi fuerant nuncii necdum redissent, usque ad adventum illorum induciæ dilatæ sunt," as on p. 144, and, further, in the words "Post hæc Anselmus ad curiam regis venire mandatur, responsurus de negotio de quo induciæ dilatæ fuerunt," as on p. 146. A paragraph equivalent to these two statements must certainly have stood at the beginning of the third leaf of Eadmer's own copy of the third book: but when the necessity of following the sequence of events had obliged its incorporation into the new batch of text, the author was constrained to erase it from its first position and to compose a sentence of the same textual value to compensate the loss thus created. That sentence he introduced at the beginning of the first of the seven leaves devoted to the graft, in the words "Hæc Anselmus...in sua secessit" (p. 137). This done, he accommodated 339 lines of the augmentary 344 in the remainder of his seven leaves, and then, on the erasure at the beginning of what was now the tenth leaf, the remaining five lines.

Analogous instances of the absorption of old text into

¹ That is to say, to connect the suspended narrative on MS. p. 138 ("ad sua secessit") with the resumed narrative on p. 150 ("Cum igitur ad curiam").

new have already occurred, and others will occur in the sequel¹. (See below, p. 303.)

The tenth leaf (Leaf IV of the first computation) carried on the narrative to about the word "commodum" on the eleventh line of MS. p. 150 *bis* ($11 + 27 + 11 = 49$).

Amplification XI. The next four leaves, when the finished work left the hands of its author, comprised all that now intervenes between "commodum" (MS. p. 150 *bis*, l. 11) and "mandasse" on the nineteenth line of p. 157 $\{(156 \times 27 + 19) - (149 \times 27 + 11) = 7 \times 27 + 8 = 197 = 4 \times 49\frac{1}{4}\}$. But the greater portion of their content was new, comprising the "Regi regum," the "Non ignoras," and the "Et patrum." What, then, we have to determine, if we can, is how much, precisely, of these four leaves is old, and how much new. From "Quæ ut melius pateant" (p. 152) to "exerceat" (p. 156), a batch of text which, certainly, was not in the original, there are $110\frac{1}{2}$ lines, a figure which is raised to $142\frac{1}{2}$ lines by the addition of the passage "Sed horum...magis putavit" (pp. 150 *bis*, 151), and to 148 lines by a slight and very probable abbreviation of the two sentences which precede this last. This gives us the value of three leaves of new text; leaving, as the content of what was originally the fourth leaf of the book, "quod inde singulis annis habere solebat perditurum. Ab archiepiscopo igitur missi sunt monachi duo, præfatus scilicet Balduinus Beccensis et Alexander Cantuariensis; et a rege tres episcopi, Girardus videlicet de Herefordensi nuper factus archiepiscopus Eboracensis, Herbertus Tydfordensis, et Robertus Cestrensis" (as on p. 150 *bis*), "Emensa igitur longitudine viæ...primatus dignitate" (as on p. 152) and "Reversis...mandasse" (as on p. 157).

On the whole, then, the most probable account that can be given of Leaf IV of Eadmer's own copy of the first issue of the book is, that it was removed, and its contents blended, in batches of 3 lines, $2\frac{3}{4}$ lines, $16\frac{3}{4}$ lines, and $26\frac{1}{2}$ lines, respectively,

¹ See particularly Amplifications III, V, VI, XI, XX, XXII, XXIV.

with 147 lines of new text. In other words; the fourth leaf of the first computation were replaced by the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth of the new, this last ending at or about the word "mandasse" on MS. p. 157¹.

The fifteenth and sixteenth leaves of the new computation comprise the text that intervenes between "mandasse" on MS. p. 157, l. 19 and "communione" on p. 161, l. 12². We shall see in the sequel that the more probable of two alternative opinions about this batch of text is that half of it is old and half new; in other words, that the fifteenth and sixteenth leaves of the last computation have replaced Leaf v of the first.

The sixth leaf of the first, seventeenth of the final, computation remained untouched.

Amplification XIII. This (MS. pp. 162—166) is, I think, the last addition which Eadmer made to the present Book III. It must have been provoked by that account of the *concilium Lundoniense* of 1102 which survives in some copies of the *Gesta Pontificum*³.

The continuator of Florence of Worcester agrees with Eadmer in the list of bishops present at the Synod, and also in the next words, "In hoc concilio." After this point the narratives diverge. Eadmer continues, "multa ecclesiasticæ disciplinæ necessaria servari Anselmus instituit quæ postmodum sedis apostolicæ pontifex sua auctoritate confirmavit." The chronicler continues, "plures abbates Francigenæ et Angli sunt depositi et honoribus privati quos injuste acquisierant, aut in eis inhoneste vixerunt, scilicet, Wido Persorensis, Aldwinus Ramesiensis, et ille de Tavestoe, Haimo de Cernel, et ille de Micelnei, Ægelricus de Middeltuna, Godricus de Burh, Ricardus de Heli, Rotbertus de Sancto Eadmundo⁴."

¹ In the sentence "Requisiti quæ contestati sunt," &c.

² The interval comprises 101 lines. The reason of this will appear in the sequel.

³ See *G. P.* p. 121, n. 1.

⁴ See Florence of Worcester (ed. Thorpe) II. 51.

It would appear, then, that the Worcester writer copied Eadmer's first account; and that when Eadmer came to introduce the *textus concilii* he suppressed a portion of it, as being partly inaccurate and wholly redundant; in other words, that where we now have 104½ lines of text ("In hoc concilio... postponi concessit") there were in the first instance 6½ lines, "In hoc concilio plures... de Sancto Eadmundo." Their difference is 98 (= 2 × 49) lines.

Such, then, would seem to be a probable account of so much as intervenes between the beginning of Book III. and the words "pari investitura subrogatus" on MS. p. 166. Let us now make further survey of this portion of the work.

§ 3. FURTHER SURVEY OF THE FIRST PORTION OF BOOK III.

Amplification X (continued). And first for the augmentation in seven leaves near the beginning of the book.

Unless at some time or other the work underwent at this part of it a manipulation as to which there is no proof, and not a semblance of probability, this addition was introduced as we now know it and at a date posterior to the earliest moment at which any one portion of it can have been composed. One would suppose that so much as relates to the marriage must have been written after Queen Matilda's death in 1118; but it is fairly open to question whether what we next read about the mutual mistrust of King and barons in the year 1101, about the mortal alarm of Henry, about his explicit promise of obedience to the spiritual power, and, besides all this, Eadmer's implied inference that the promise had been broken; it is, I repeat, fairly open to question whether all this can have been written, or, if written, divulged, before the King's death in 1135.

And a like doubt is suggested by the compensatory five lines prefixed to the story of the marriage. These inform us that the King, presumably to gain time, made proposals in the autumn of 1100 which the Primate knew to be utterly worthless and altogether useless; but that the Primate allowed himself to consent to them lest any one should suspect him of an intention, willingness, or disposition, to transfer the crown from Henry to the Duke of Normandy. All this is as unlikely to have been written before Henry's death as the very positive assurance in the latter part of the amplification (on page 146) that, had it not been for Anselm's interposition in the summer of 1101, an interposition purchased by promises that were not kept, the barons would have dethroned the King. Whenever written, this can scarcely have been given to the world before the Christmas of 1135.

Amplification XII. The fifteenth leaf of the final computation begins at or about the words "mandasse per se quoniam" on MS. p. 157, and the sixteenth ends at some point in the sentence "Verum quia" &c. on p. 161. Are these two leaves old work, or are they half old and half new?

The question is suggested by the fact that thus far we have not found a letter which has not been proved to be part of some addition made to the work subsequently to its first completion, and it is justified by the fact that a like experience awaits us in the sequel.

That Eadmer did not turn the "Adversus illam" to account at the same time with the "Regi regum," the "Non ignoras," and the "Et patrum", is morally certain¹; and it is absolutely

¹ I say in my Preface, p. xxviii:—

"No one can, I think, have read our historian's account of the strange scene enacted at Westminster in the August of 1102 without being puzzled to know what letter of the Pope's to Anselm it was which was read on that occasion. Immediately after his account of the failure of the joint embassy to turn the Pope from his resolution he gives us the purport of the two letters which Paschal charged the envoys to deliver on their return to England,

certain that he made an egregious blunder in turning it to account at all in the present connexion.

The question resolves itself into two alternatives. Either Eadmer in the year 1111 turned one, and only one, of Pope Paschal's letters to account, and lived for more than thirty years without discovering the chronological error he had per-

one for the King and the other for the Primate; then comes the text of those documents; and then Paschal's letter to the bishop and canons of Exeter, an irrelevant digression introduced with a 'huic opusculo indere.' At the conclusion of the Exeter letter, however (page 156), he resumes the narrative which had been dropped on page 152, and soon brings us into the thick of the famous dispute at Westminster and the quarrel about the Pope's letter to the Primate. That letter we naturally believe to be the 'Non ignoras' we had read on page 154, until to our amazement he concludes on page 159 with 'Textus autem litterarum hic est' and the 'Adversus illam.'"

"Curiously enough, however, the truth is that the 'Adversus illam,' so far from being in Anselm's possession, and carried by him to the palace of Westminster and read there in the hearing of king, prelates, and barons in the summer of 1102, was not yet in existence at that date. It was written in the following December. By what ill luck Eadmer contrived to make this preposterous blunder we need not just now enquire; but we may be sure that he would not have set forth the 'Adversus illam' in the connexion in which we now find it if, when writing his account of the scene at Westminster, he had just copied out the 'Non ignoras.' A stronger presumption that the 'Non ignoras,' and with it the 'Regi regum,' and the 'et patrum,' had no place in the first text of the 'Historia Novorum' it would be difficult to imagine."

I believe that the ill luck by which Eadmer made the blunder of saying that the document in dispute was the 'Adversus illam' was the misfortune, in his emulation of William of Malmesbury, of following the false guidance of that author. But more of this in its proper place.

I am bound, however, to add that the foregoing extract, although satisfactory in so far as it proves that the four letters cannot all have been introduced into the work at the same time, does not prove that the 'Adversus illam' figured in the original, for there may have been—and, I think was—a second recension. That the first three had no place in the first issue is amply proved by the "legentium oculis ecce præfigimus" which introduces the "Regi regum" and the "Non ignoras," by the "huic opusculo indere" which introduces the "Et patrum," and by the evidence of William of Malmesbury.

petrated when he did so, or he introduced that letter into his work subsequently to the "Regi regum," the "Non ignoras" and the "Et patrum." If the latter be deemed the preferable alternative, Eadmer's new work must, I think, be sought after the sentence ending with "quam te esse judicemus" (MS. p. 158); for after those words there are two remarkable repetitions of phrase borrowed from the antecedent context, "qui Roma venerant episcopi," and "in episcopali veritate contestari"; and, also, four points of contrast with William of Malmesbury's narrative (*G. P.* p. 109) which are well worthy of our attention.

(1) William says, after his account of the dispute about the Pope's letter, "Diu ergo fluctuavit Anselmi sententia quo vergeret"; Eadmer is very different, "Quid ageret, quo se verteret, aliquandiu dubitavit." (2) William says that it might have looked proud and overbearing to reject the testimony of the bishops; Eadmer says that it would certainly have given scandal to reject the testimony of bishops who vowed by their priesthood that what they said was true. (3) William says that it would have been stupid to discredit the sealed letter of the Pope; Eadmer says that it would have been a grave matter to let it be supposed for a moment that a pope's letter might be deemed untrustworthy. (4) More than this, however. William says nothing either about the King's fresh demand of homage from the Archbishop, or about what is incomparably the most extraordinary incident in a very strange episode, the message which the three prelates professed to have received from the Pope for the Primate, and which they delivered to the latter on the faith of their episcopal word and under the sanction of an appeal to the Holy See. Of the two alternatives suggested by these contrasts, it is much more likely that Eadmer should have corrected and supplemented William in an additional leaf than that William with all of Eadmer before him that we now have should have given so confused and broken an echo of it.

Here, however, let me pause to note the strange nemesis which attended Eadmer's vigilant care to correct and supplement the labours of his rival. He had given, and correctly given, the "Non ignoras" as the document over which the two opposed parties in Westminster Hall expended their artillery of sarcasm and repartee; and yet now he rectifies the errors and omissions of William at the cost of following William's lead into the absurdity of saying that the document under dispute was, not the "Non ignoras," but the "Adversus illam"; for that is evidently the letter designated by William in the sentence (*G. P.* p. 108) "Siquidem et epistola quam Anselmo attulerant vulgo jam lectitabatur, in qua non solum investituras non concedere sed etiam statuta Urbani pertinaciter probabatur Paschalis urgere servandaque monere."

When then, the forty-four lines that intervene between "Et de litterarum" and "ii Idus Decembris" have been eliminated¹, together with the eight lines of the passage "Ad quæ qui Roma venerant...conserere nolo" (on MS. pp. 160, 161), there remains precisely such an account as William of Malmesbury seems to have followed.

The difficulty presented by the excess of fifty-two lines over forty-nine is by no means insurmountable; for the Cottonian copy, representing a stage in the history of the work prior to that at which the C. C. C. copy was written, bears witness to an abbreviated superscription and thus to a difference of probably more than a line of text². Nor can I conceal the suspicion that the strange little sentence on pp. 158, 159, "O hinc simultatis detecta confusio," the elimination of which would bring the

¹ "Et de litterarum.....simultatis" = 5 lines;

"detecta.....se iterum" = 27 lines;

"negotis.....Decembris" = 12 lines;

"Ad quæ.....nolo" = 8½ lines.

² All difficulty would vanish if I could be sure that the letter was given without any superscription at all. "O hinc...confusio" = ¾ line, "Paschalis...benedictionem" = 2¼ lines.

amplification almost within normal bounds, is a marginal note, and no part of the amplification, no part of the marvellous repartee, "Væ, væ, nonne et evangelia pellibus ovinis inscribuntur?" But more of this on a subsequent page¹.

§ 4. THE SECOND PORTION OF BOOK III.

("Mittens ergo...elongans": MS. pp. 166—184.)

Amplification XV. William of Malmesbury (*G. P.* p. 109) wrote two versions of the conduct of the King and the Archbishop of York in the case of the bishops-elect of Winchester, Salisbury and Hereford. The first account tells us that Henry, taking an unhandsome advantage of Anselm's moderation, appointed two members of his household to bishoprics by the forbidden ceremony of investiture; the second and castigated account merely says that the two clerks were elected. The first says that Henry, *ira concitator*, bade Archbishop Gerard consecrate William Giffard, Roger and Reinelm; the second tells us, in gentler phrase, that the King was *paulo commotior*. The first calls Gérard a law-breaker; not so the second. The first tells us that Reinelm by his surrender of ring and crosier roused the King's mind to a vehement agitation, and that he was banished the King's court and the King's favour; there is nothing of all this in the second. The first informs us that William Giffard was driven into exile; the second is mute on the subject.

Similarly (*G. R.* p. 500 and *G. P.* pp. 104—106), much that William had said about the impieties of William Rufus, much that he had said about the early anxieties of Henry I. was suppressed in subsequent recensions of the *Gesta Regum* and the *Gesta Pontificum*.

Just, then, as William's suppressed account of the Red King's

¹ See below, p. 239.

impieties was resuscitated and given to the world by Eadmer in Amplification VII; just as William's suppressed account of King Henry's early anxieties was resuscitated and given to the world by Eadmer in Amplification X; so was it with the passage "Erat quippe...desistere volent" on MS. pp. 166—168.

In this passage our author records the very incidents which William of Malmesbury had suppressed in his recension of the *Gesta Pontificum*, and, further, takes care to inform us that as far back as the summer of 1100 William Giffard had refused to receive the crosier at the King's hand, but that he had subsequently received it, and with it the *cura pontificalis*, at the hand of the Primate.

The bearing of this passage on the *Gesta Pontificum*, its textual content of forty-nine lines, the presence in its first sentence of the formula "ut praelibavimus," and the extreme unlikelihood that such revelations concerning Henry I. should have been made by a prominent member of the Christ Church chapter during the vacancy of the see of Canterbury, or, indeed, at any time or on any account during the lifetime of the royal offender, signalize it as an addition to the first narrative, and as an addition made after the later of two events, whatever may have been their chronological order, the King's death and the divulgation of the unrecensed text of *Gesta Pontificum I.*

Amplification XIV. But, like the "Anselmus tamen..... suosve dispensans" on MS. pp. 52—54, the passage we have just examined would itself seem to have been engrafted into an existing amplification of the text. That is to say:—

Leaf VI of the first computation recorded the death of Roger the larderer, and ended, as nearly as can be computed and surmised, with the words "Post hæc ergo rex rogavit Anselmum quatinus ipse per se Romam ire et quod alii nequiverant sua sibi industria conaretur acquirere...et respondit," (as on MS. p. 170), the next leaf continuing, "Differantur hæc," &c.

This became, at an early manipulation of the volume, after an erasure of the last lines of Leaf vi, "Mittens ergo rex rogavit Anselmum quatinus pro suo jure hos noviter electos cum Willelmo jamdudum Wentanæ civitati electo...inter me et illum convenit," (as on MS. p. 166). Then came, on a fresh leaf, "non mutabo. At ille...interposito sacramento asseruit," and then (as on p. 168) "Subsequenti dehinc media fere... et respondit," filling the remainder of the leaf. I must now give the reasons for my opinion.

Something will be said on another page about John of Salisbury. At present it may suffice to remark that there is nothing in his pages, and nothing in those of William of Malmesbury, from which it can be inferred that either of these writers knew anything of the King's extraordinary visit to Canterbury in the spring of 1103. The King, according to Eadmer, remained for three days at Canterbury under some pretext about the Count of Flanders; but people, he adds, soon learnt what had brought him thither, and penetrated the pretext about the count. The truth was (I still follow Eadmer) that Henry had come to fight it out with the Archbishop; for he had resolved either to do him some grievous bodily injury, or to drive him out of the kingdom, should he not consent to comply with all his demands. Henry was in a mighty passion; Anselm's monks were in an ecstasy of alarm, men like Robert of Meulan bathed in tears. Anselm alone was calm. Affairs seemed to be verging on some fatal cataclysm, when suddenly the King turned from threats to prayers, from boisterous rage to bated breath and abject supplication, and begged his placid foe to stoop to his succour.

Now, neither William of Malmesbury nor John of Salisbury gives the remotest hint of all this, nor of the very significant oath (Henry's oaths were solemn things, solemnly made and solemnly remembered; this as well as the rest) which the King had sworn in the previous autumn, that the three bishops

elect should be consecrated together or not at all. John seems to have worked on Eadmer's first text, William on an early recension; and it is as unlikely that, having read these things, they should have said nothing about them as that Eadmer should have made them known during the lifetime of Henry.

If anything more be needed on this subject it may be found in the following considerations:—

On MS. p. 171 we read, "Vulnerabat enim quodam modo mentem ejus quod rex nec per se nec per suos, ut dixi, audire volebat quod litteræ Roma nuper allatæ continerent in se." (1) A very proper and opportune explanation if nothing had been said about the Canterbury incident, but feeble in the extreme as the work now stands. (2) Nor is it to be believed that, if our author had just recorded that incident, he would have described the Pope's letter as "nuper allatæ" after an adjournment of five weeks' duration¹. And (3) the "ut dixi" is a formula which Eadmer frequently, and perhaps exclusively, uses either in or in relation to amplifications of his narrative.

And (4) yet again. Both William of Malmesbury's account and John of Salisbury's lack that chronological perspective which those writers would unconsciously have given to them, had they been aware that the King's request was made at Midlent and the Primate's reply given after Easter. Neither of them seems to have had any suspicion of this.

Between "quatinus pro suo," &c., on MS. p. 166, and "quatinus ipse per se," &c., on p. 170, there are ninety-eight lines, the precise content of two leaves; forty-nine of them being, as we have seen, a distinct insertion.

Amplification XVI. The next subject that claims our notice is St Anselm's second journey to Rome (MS. pp. 172—175)².

¹ Similar instances of what I venture to call false perspective will occur in the sequel. Cf. meanwhile the uncorrected "aliquantis diebus" on MS. p. 54.

² See *Preface*, p. xxxi.

William of Malmesbury, in his account (*G. P.* p. 111) of this portion of the history, gives us to understand, and, indeed, seems to have thought, that there was no delay in the Archbishop's journey: "Anselmus continuo prosperis flatibus marina pericula transvectus, bona etiam fortuna terrenum iter Romanum usque emensus est." It is, I think, to this inaccuracy that we are indebted for the precise date (*MS.* p. 172) of St Anselm's arrival at Wissant, and for the approximate date (p. 175) of his final departure from Le Bec four months later.

Eadmer's narrative of the early part of the journey is written in the plural number,—“Venimus...properavimus...ingressi...appulimus.” But after the words “Acta sunt hæc anno Incarnati Verbi millesimo centesimo tertio, v. Kal. Mai” we have (i) the singular number instead of the plural, and with no expressed nominative¹, a strange grammatical lapse, (ii) a fresh record of the passage of the strait, and (iii) textual peculiarities which I now proceed to notice.

1. The zeugma by which, as the text now stands, it is necessary to place “pace” as well as “omnibus” in regimen with “investitus” (p. 172) is scarcely tolerable and is by no means in Eadmer's style. Either some such word as “potitus” has disappeared, or there has been some awkward manipulation of the text.

2. The termination of the journey is thus recorded (p. 175), “Quapropter paucis dictum accipiatur eum, Divino ubique valante præsidio, summa pace ac prosperitate iter peregrisse atque incolumem cum suis omnibus Romam pervenisse.” Here the “paucis dictum accipiatur” seems to shew that Eadmer is reaching the limit of his allotted space; whilst the “summa pace” and the “cum suis omnibus” by their similarity to the “regia igitur pace” and the “suisque omnibus” that occurred about a hundred lines² before give us no untrustworthy hint of

¹ A similar instance will be found in Amplification xxxiii.

² The repeated “pace” and “suis omnibus” have their analogy in the repeated “amplius concordare” on *MS.* p. 116 (Amplification vii.).

what the first account must have been. It was, I suspect, pretty much as follows:—"Summa igitur pace Anselmus cum suis omnibus iter Romam veniendi assumpsit. Quem venientem ille Willelmus¹." Instead of this, which would have filled $1\frac{2}{3}$ lines, we have the extant "Acta sunt...Romam pervenisse" in $99\frac{7}{8}$ lines.

Amplification XVII. In some such manner Eadmer's account of St Anselm's departure from Rome in the autumn of 1103 would seem to have been cut up and redistributed, the "Post hæc" appearing on MS. p. 178 and "Romam deserentes" surviving in "Roma discedentibus" on p. 179². Here, again, it would seem to have been part of Eadmer's design to correct William of Malmesbury, who in the *Gesta Regum* (§ 417)

¹ The "Guilielmus quidam" of the resumed narrative in the extant copies is very curious. When writing my Preface, I suggested that we owe the "Guilielmus," instead of Eadmer's usual "Willelmus," to a scribe who, writing at a later date, employed a new form, just as in other late work we have "Guarnerius," "Edmundus," "Edmerus" for "Warnerius," "Eadmundus," "Eadmerus," and I characterized the "quidam" as absurd. This William of Veraval is called "quidam Willelmus" in the letter of remonstrance sent by Prior Ernulf to the Archbishop in the course of the year 1104—"pro uno verbo cujusdam Willelmi" (MS. p. 188)—and, again, "quidam Willelmus" by William of Malmesbury (*G. P.* p. 202, note 2). If we could be sure that in these instances the name was spelt "Willelmus," the most that we could fairly infer would be that it was the habit of some, for whatever reason, to call him "a certain William"; but if, on the contrary, it could be proved that in all three instances it was written "Guilielmus" then we might infer that the sarcasm lay in the spelling, and in the pronunciation, the Norman affecting a foreign mode not in fashion, and perhaps not in favour, with Englishmen. It certainly is a remarkable fact that the only occasion on which Eadmer honours the man with "quidam" is the only occasion on which the name is spelt "Guilielmus." There were many Guillaumes in that age; but I am not aware that there were many Williams. As to the "quidam," Eadmer seems to have substituted it, late in the day, for some such phrase as "cujus supra meminimus" (see *Vita*, II. li) or the like, in reply to his Wiltshire rival who had suppressed the word (see as above, *G. P.* p. 202, note 2). Here, as in some other cases, zeal outran discretion, for the absurdity of which I complained cannot be explained away.

² Cf. "Cluniaco" and "Cluniacum" on MS. p. 192. See below, p. 230.

tells us that the "In litteris," a document dated on November 23rd, 1103, was written during St Anselm's second exile at Lyons... "erat... tunc... tempore... Lugduni"—and, therefore, on November 23rd, 1104, an error which would almost inevitably misplace by a year the birth of the King's son William. On the other hand, however, the "Adversus illam" owes, as we have seen, its misplacement in Eadmer to the oscitancy of the Wiltshire historian, whose account of the scene at Westminster in the autumn of 1102 leaves it beyond question that he supposed the "Adversus illam" to have been the subject of dispute, not the "Non ignoras."

Here, however, I may be permitted to repeat what I have said elsewhere (*Preface*, p. xxxii).

"William of Malmesbury in the *Gesta Regum* (pp. 644—647) gives us the text of the 'Suavissimas' and the 'In litteris'; but his record is marked by two noteworthy peculiarities. First, he introduces the two letters, and with them another, the 'Quod Anglici regis,' with a remark which would seem to imply that they were not in his copy of the *Historia Novorum*, not, that is to say, in the copy which lay before him as he wrote the earlier of his two great works, 'Harum causarum tenorem multo verborum circuitu egit domnus Edmerus; nos *pro pleniore notitia* Paschalis sæpe dicti apostolici scripta ad hanc rem pertinentia subnectemus.' And, secondly, he inverts the order of the 'Suavissimas' and the 'In litteris,' making the latter, which was written in the winter of 1103, take precedence of the former, which had been written twelve months before... On the other hand, there can be little doubt that it (the 'In litteris') formed part of the copy which he used for the *Gesta Pontificum* (p. 113); since, writing in this latter of the message which the royal envoy delivered to the Primate on the road from Mont Cenis to Lyons, he says:—'Anselm wrote on the subject to the King. But the letters from the Pope to the King, from Anselm to the King,

and from the King to Anselm, are a long and interminable series which I have no mind to introduce here. Those who wish to read them will find them in Edmer, who added (*or* has added) them to his narrative *ut nullus eum mendacii carperet, et ut ipse invictum robor dictorum assumeret.*'

"It would seem, then, that the truth of Eadmer's story of the message delivered to Anselm by the King's envoy had been questioned by some readers of his first text, and that it was in order to defend himself from the charge of inaccuracy that he enriched a later edition with the 'In litteris,' a document which certainly goes to prove his story. Where the intercalated passage ended may perhaps be surmised from the fact that the present narrative brings the whole party, including William, to Lyons, and then 'harks back' to say what had happened on the road, and to observe that William did not go near the city of Lyons....The pristine text had not improbably been 'Post hæc Romam deserentes protecti gratia Dei sani et incolumes Lugdunum usque pervenimus.'" This last sentence, however, must be so far modified as to keep the interpolated text within the limit of 98 lines or 99 at the very utmost¹. The pristine text must rather have been, "Post hæc Anselmus... ipsemet optas (as on p. 178). Romam itaque (as on p. 179) deserentes protecti gratia Dei...Lugdunum usque pervenimus" &c. (as on p. 182). The corresponding passage in the *Vita* is, "In his negotium regis finem ita tunc temporis sumpsit, et Anselmus, aliis atque aliis cum papa de rerum institutionibus actis, in iter reversus civitatem Florentiam usque pervenit."

On the whole, the most probable account that can be given of the twenty-sixth, twenty-seventh, and twenty-eighth leaves of the final computation is that, comprising the contents of Leaf IX and ninety-eight lines of new matter, they were set by

¹ By an error which at this distance of time I am unable to trace I made the distance between "Post hæc Anselmus" on p. 178 and "protecti gratia Dei" 99 lines. It is 104 lines.

Eadmer into his volume after the composition of *Gesta Regum* V, but before the issue of *Gesta Pontificum* I; Leaf IX being removed and giving place to them.

The history of the twenty-ninth leaf is very curious.

Amplifications XVIII and *XVIII**. There cannot be a doubt that the original tenth leaf, beginning at or about "Anselmus" (MS. p. 183), and ending at or about "Eo tempore" on p. 193, embraced the whole interval of St Anselm's second exile at Lyons. Of this Eadmer transferred the first few lines to a new leaf,—"*Anselmus summo cum honore...habitus.*" Then followed ninety-eight lines of fresh matter, beginning with "*Directis interea nunciis*" and ending on the fourth line of the first page of the next leaf but one. For here, unquestionably, here where now we have the ending of Book III.¹ and the beginning of Book IV, here was that letter of the king's which William of Malmesbury² (quoted above, page 230) has mentioned but taken care not to copy, and which Eadmer at a later date expunged, for whatever reason, from his own pages. The narrative then continued, "*Cum igitur quidam*" &c. (see MS. p. 189).

When, then, Eadmer had resolved to suppress the King's letter, he further resolved, if he could, to obliterate the trace of it. The last leaves of his original work had grown to many, and were likely to grow to many more; and here, if anywhere, was the place at which to divide his third book into two. He therefore cancelled the letter and its context, probably fifty-six or fifty-seven lines in all, and on such erasure as lay at the end of a leaf³ wrote the sentence "*His ita gestis*" &c.⁴ and after it "*EXPLICIT LIBER TERTIUS.*" On such erasure as lay on

¹ I believe the 'leaf' of lines within which the royal letter lay to have been part and parcel of Amplification XVIII; but for the sake of clearness I call it XVIII*, giving XVIII its present value of one leaf.

² *G. P.* p. 113.

³ Twenty-ninth of the final computation.

⁴ Borrowed from *Vita* II. lii.

the beginning of a leaf he wrote "INCIPIIT QUARTUS," and then the sentence "Igitur...præcepit."

§ 5. CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY OF BOOK III.

If we may be allowed to speculate as to the order of time in which the several additions to Book III. were made, I should say that that which held the "Regi regum," the "Non ignoras," and the "Et patrum," that which held the "Fraternitatis" and "In litteris," and that which held the "Quamvis per Willelmum" and the royal letter subsequently suppressed (i.e. Amplifications XI, XVII, XVIII, and XVIII*), were made at an early date.

The next claimants for priority, but after an undetermined interval, are that which, introducing the "Adversus illam," gave fresh particulars about the scene at Westminster (Amplification XII.), and those which recorded the King's visit to Canterbury and St Anselm's second journey to Rome (Amplifications XIV. and XVI.).

Amplifications X. and XV. would seem to have been composed after the divulgation of the first text of *Gesta Regum* V. and *Gesta Pontificum* I; and the *textus concilii Lundoniensis* (in Amplification XIII.) to have been introduced either then or at a slightly later date.

Amplifications XXII and XXIV. It was, I think, before the division into two books of the third instalment of the original work that Eadmer introduced into what had in the first instance been Leaf x. additional text, which, together with Amplifications XVIII and XVIII*, expanded it from one leaf to four, and again from four to six. But as these two batches of new work now form part of Book IV, I defer my examination of them to a later page.

§ 6. THE ORIGINAL NARRATIVE OF EVENTS FROM
CHRISTMAS 1103 TO JULY 1105.

Here, then, I will so far anticipate the result of further research as to attempt a theoretical reconstruction of the original Leaf x. The text must have been pretty much as follows:—

“Anselmus summo cum honore et gaudio a venerabili Hugone Lugdunensi archiepiscopo et toto clero susceptus in majorem ecclesiam ductus est, ibique ut pater et dominus loci ab omnibus habitus. Cum igitur quidam regi insisterent ut eum revocaret, ipse, tam religiositate viri inductus, quam et immanium malorum exuberatione animo consternatus, fieri quidem de reditu viri quod petebatur se libenter velle fatebatur, sic tamen ut paternarum consuetudinum nihil sibi ab eo ulterius derogari ulla ratione pateretur. Unde, nobis adhuc Lugduni degentibus, nuncii Romam ab ipso rege directi sunt qui modis omnibus elaborarent apostolicum ad hoc deducere ut Anselmum Angliam redire et regie voluntati iuberet in cunctis subdi et obœdire. In secundo autem anno adventus nostri Anselmus intellexit se amplius frustra Lugduni Romanam opem præstolari, præsertim cum jam sæpenumero ipsi Romanæ sedis anstistiti legatos et litteras de sui negotii consummatione transmiserit, et eo usque nil nisi quandam quasi consolatoriæ expectationis promissionem de termino in terminum ab eo meruerit. Tertio quoque litteras suas regi Angliæ pro suarum rerum resaisitione direxerat nec aliquid ab eo nisi quod blandientem sibi dilationem ingereret responsi acceperat. Consulto itaque venerabili præfato Lugdunensis civitatis episcopo, Lugduno Franciam petiturus decessit, mœrente super hoc pontifice ipso et omni populo terræ. Eo tempore rex Henricus in Normannia erat, ipsamque pene totam suæ ditioni subegerat. Omnes enim ferme Normannorum majores illico ad regis adventum, spreto comite domino suo, et fidem quam ei debebant postponentes¹, in aurum et argentum regis concurrerunt, eique civitates castra et urbes

¹ “Fidem...postponentes”; probably altered from “fide...debebant.”

tradiderunt. Rogatus ergo a rege Anselmus in Normaniam venit, et habito inter eos colloquio Anselmum rex de redditibus sui pontificatus revestivit, et in pristinam amicitiam utrinque recepti sunt. Quibusdam igitur ad hoc sollicitè operam dantibus ut antistes statim Angliam remearet, rex annuit, sic tamen ut nulli eorum qui a se investituras ecclesiarum susceperant, vel eos consecraverant, suam in aliquo communionem subtraheret. Cui conditioni Anselmus minime adquiescens, obœdientiam videlicet papæ in nullo prætergredi volens, extra Angliam manere delegit, donec illi qui ad ipsum negotium et quædam alia de quibus inter eos illa vice convenire non poterat determinanda ex conducto Romam mittendi erant reversi fuissent. Itaque missi sunt Romam ex parte quidem Anselmi Balduinus monachus et ex parte regis Willelmus sæpe superius memoratus."

This leaf was expanded into three at the first manipulation of the third Book by the introduction of the "Quamvis per Willelmum" and the royal letter and their context; and at a second manipulation the introduction of the particulars of the visit to the Countess Adela increased three leaves to four. It must, one would suppose, have been on or about the latter occasion that Eadmer suppressed the King's letter and made the third Book end where and as it does.

When, then, the division had been effected, the fourth Book began:—

"Igitur ubi Willelmus Angliam pervenit et gesti negotii seriem Henrico regi exposuit, rex illico omnes redditus archiepiscopatus Cantuariensis in suos usus redigi præcepit. Cum igitur quidam," &c.

I think that the accompanying tables may be of service to the reader at this part of my argument, although some of their details anticipate conclusions at which I hope to arrive towards the close of the essay.

The construction of these tabular synopses of the history of the third Book brings to light a fact which, not having been suspected, comes upon me with the suddenness of a surprise

CHRONOLOGICAL SYNOPSIS OF AMPLIFICATIONS IN BOOK III.

Before division into Books III and IV		At division	After division		Conjectural beginning of specified portion
First number of leaf in book	A (? A.D. 1137)	Number of leaf at division	F (? A.D. 1139)	G	
I		i			1
II		ii			2
III		iii			3-10
IV	XI (a)	iv-vii	X (β)		11-14
V		viii, ix			15, 16
VI	XII (a)	x, xi			17-21
VII	XIV (β)	xii	XV (γ)	XIII (γ)	22
VIII	XVI (β)	xiii-xv			23-25
IX	XVII (a)	xvi-xviii			26-28
[X]	XVIII (a), XVIII*	xix [xx-xxiv]			29
[XI]	XXX*	[xxv-xxvii]			
} 8 leaves					
} 8 leaves					

Eighth cure of Eadmer's own volume

Note:—A=Amplifications after issue of *Gesta Regum V* in recensed text, and before issue of *Gesta Pontificum I*.
 B=Amplifications after issue of *Gesta Pontificum I* in recensed text.
 F=Amplifications after divulgation of *Gesta Regum IV, V*, and *Gesta Pontificum I*, in unrecensed text.
 G=Late addition.

[] = Removed at division to form part of Book IV : six leaves.
 XVIII* and XXX*, subsequently suppressed, probably at division : two leaves.

CHRONOLOGICAL SYNOPSIS OF AMPLIFICATIONS IN BOOK IV.

First number of leaf	C (? A.D. 1138)	D (? A.D. 1139)	E (? A.D. 1140)	H (? A.D. 1141)	Final number of leaf	Conjectural beginning of specified portion
ii	XXI (β)	XIX (γ)			1 v.	" Igitur ubi " &c. MS. p. 184
iii	XXIII (γ)	XX (β)			2—5	" Quod dum " &c. MS. p. 185
iv					6—9	" vitæ suæ " &c. MS. p. 193
v			XXVI (γ)	XXV (γ)	10	" Anselmus " &c. MS. p. 200
vi	XXVII (α), XXIX (α)	XXVIII (α), XXXI (γ)	XXX (γ)		11—17	" domunculis " &c. MS. p. 202
vii	XXXIII (γ)	XXXV (γ)	XXXIV (γ), XXXVII (γ)	XXXVI	18—24	[" Reversis " &c.] MS. p. 217
	8 leaves	12 leaves *	6 leaves	9 leaves	25—42	" Ad quam " &c. MS. p. 227

Note :—C = Amplifications before issue of *Gesta Pontificum* III.

D = Amplifications after issue of *Gesta Pontificum* III.

E = Amplifications after issue of *Gesta Pontificum* IV.

H = Late additions.

* Not counting XIX. See below, p. 243.

and the pleasure of a fresh discovery. It is this, that the earliest augmentations of the original text are those in which we find new work so blended with old as to require great care in disintegrating the one component from the other; that those in which nothing more was done than to erase a line or two of old work and, using a new leaf or leaves, to write on till the space at command was filled in are, in the main, of later date; and that those in which a new batch of text was simply 'sandwiched' into an old are, in the main, of later date still¹.

Hence it would seem to follow (though the inference must of course be accepted with caution) that there is a chronological order as well as a scientific truth in the following division:—

a. Amalgamations, in which new work and old were, as it were, kneaded together.

β. Grafts, in which, when necessary, the task of introducing new work was expedited by a single erasure; or, in which, for the introduction of, say, n leaves of new work, the leaf containing the point of introduction was removed and the whole written on $n + 1$ leaves; or, in which some slight disturbance of the context was rendered necessary.

γ. Insertions, which involved no disturbance of the context².

For the first of these both care and leisure were needed. The last may with reason be excused on the score of haste, or, more probably, of physical inability to attempt more crafty methods.

¹ Another curious circumstance comes to light as these pages are passing through the press. Each of the four groups, A, B, F, and C, comprises precisely eight leaves.

² All the additions fall under one or other category, with the exception of xxxvi.

§ 7. ON THE PHRASES "FINIERAT IN ISTIS"
(MS. p. 152) AND "O HINC SIMULTATIS DE-
TECTA CONFUSIO" (MS. p. 158).

This is the place for saying what remains to be said on two short but troublesome sentences, one on MS. p. 152, the other on MS. p. 158.

In my Preface (page xxx) I have hazarded the suggestion that "Finierat in istis" is a marginal memorandum. I think so still. But I believe it to refer, not to the Pope's speech, which it follows in the extant text, but to the succeeding sentence, "Super hæc...dignitate."

The whole passage "Emensa dehinc...primatus dignitate" is, in my opinion, old work, with the sole exception of "Finierat in istis" which has found its way from the margin into the text; and I think that I have detected the meaning and the point of the memorandum. William of Malmesbury had in *G. P. I.* (p. 113) attributed Eadmer's introduction of the letters in xvii. and xviii. to a desire to stand well with his readers, and Eadmer here replies, "Be that as it may, I wish it to be well observed that, although I now introduce the text of the 'Regi regum' and the 'Non ignoras,' I was quite familiar with those documents, and, indeed, quoted from them in the first instance." And if, as it is only fair to believe, the sentence "Super hæc... primatus dignitate" has undergone no change, there is no reply to the claim; and we must own that, although his first account of the Lyons letter was not based on knowledge of the contents of the "Novimus, domine reverende" (see above, p. 211), our author was in this case better informed, for the phrase "regi... ecclesiarum investituras iudicio Sancti Spiritus interdicens" is, clearly, borrowed from the "Regi regum," which has "nos Sancti Spiritus iudicio regibus...interdicimus," whilst the words "Anselmum ut quæ agebat ageret, et quæ loquebatur perloqueretur affectuose deprecans" are, as clearly, taken from

the "Rogamus itaque ut quod agis agas, quod loqueris perloquaris" of the "Non ignoras¹."

The "O hinc simultatis detecta confusio" on pp. 158, 159 is still more interesting. It had long puzzled and tormented me until the accident of discovering that the passage to which it referred was part of an amplification, and, not only so, but of an amplification introduced soon after the appearance of *G. P. I.*, afforded me a clue to a solution of the mystery. I have already shewn that between the words "Et de litterarum" on page 158 and "lites conserere nolo" on page 161 there is a full leaf of text which cannot have been known to William of Malmesbury when he wrote *G. P. I.*; and I may here add that it is as unlikely that William and Eadmer should, each independently of the other, have erred about the date of the "Adversus illam" as that they should, each independently of the other, have erred about the date of the Council of Rockingham and that of Anselm's assumption of the pallium (see *Preface*, page lxii). What, then, are the facts? It is from this very sentence on page 158, "Et de litterarum" &c. that Eadmer begins that long series of corrective insertions in reply to William of Malmesbury which only ends with the conclusion of Book IV. The question, "Et de litterarum quid?", the answer, "Testimonium monachorum contra episcopos non recipimus, et ovinae pellis recipere-mus?" and the rejoinder, "Væ, væ; nonne et evangelia pellibus ovinis inscribuntur?" are, I repeat, the first instance in a lengthened and laboured chain of corrective additions which beginning here ends only at the end. And it is an instance of which Eadmer might well be proud, a natural and effective touch, which William of Malmesbury, had he been present, or had informants of his been present, at the memorable scene,

¹ Eadmer tells us (MS. p. 157) that these two letters were already divulged at the time, and I infer that copies of them lay before him as he wrote his first narrative. They are the only letters of which he seems to have made use whilst thus employed.

would have been careful to introduce into his own account in proof of his independence of Eadmer.

I believe, then, that "O hinc simultatis detecta confusio" is not part of the repartee of the *quidam religiosi*; and I further believe that, though written by Eadmer, it was not written as a comment on the utterers of the repartee, and that it is not of the text of his work. I believe it to be a marginal slap at William of Malmesbury, indited it may be, for Eadmer's delectation only, or, more probably, for the benefit of the readers of his own working copy in time to come. As though he should say, "The following pages will be found to contain details written in correction of one whose name need not be mentioned, details that shew which of us is the authentic narrator and which the plagiarist, which of us a real authority and which a mean rival, details neither few nor insignificant; and of those details this is the first. From this point I proceed to unmask a resentful rivalry and to put it to well-merited shame, "*Hinc simultatis detecta confusio*"¹.

§ 8. FINAL NOTE ON BOOK III.

If guesses on such a matter may be hazarded by the writer and tolerated by the reader, I should say that in the course of the first recension, which I have noted by the letter A, Leaf IV, the first leaf of the final quire of Eadmer's little volume of sixty-four leaves, was replaced by four new ones (iv.—vii.); and also that Leaves IX. X. and XI. together with their engrafted text were replaced by a fresh quire. There were thus nineteen leaves:—

(I II III) + (iv v vi vii) + (v VI VII VIII) + (a quire).

¹ The "O" may be part of the note, but I incline to think it a blundering reproduction of the theta-like catchmark to the sentence which it elucidates.

As to Amplifications XII, XIV, XVI, made in the course of recension B, I should say that they were all transferred into Eadmer's own volume at one and the same time, the object being to make of them and the transcribed content of leaves v. vi. vii. viii. a new quire of manuscript; Thus:—

$$(I \ II \ III) + \underbrace{(iv \ v \ vi \ vii)} + (a \ quire) + (a \ quire)$$

The introduction of Amplifications XXII, XXIV, XXXII, obliged him to disturb the last two leaves of the last of these constituents; and when at length he segregated the six leaves that were to form the nucleus of Book IV, Book III. consisted of the following:—

$$(I \ II \ III) + \underbrace{(iv \ v \ vi \ vii)} + (a \ quire) + \text{the first half of a quire.}$$

He seems to have opened his volume on occasion of recension F, in order to introduce Amplifications X. and XV. The former of these operations was effected by removing the last leaf of the seventh quire and letting in a quaternion of leaves which contained the combined content of leaf III. and the new text. The latter was a still simpler process, a very slight disturbance of the text on leaf xi. and the slipping in of an extra leaf between leaves x. and xi.

Amplification XIII. could not be so easily accommodated, and seems to have been temporarily lodged in a separate fasciculus. Besides, internal evidence shews it to be referable to a very late date.

After the segregation of leaves xx.—xxvii, the elimination of XVIII* and XXX* reduced their number to six, which together with Amplifications XXI, XXIII, XXVII, XXIX, and XXXIII, were, as I imagine, written out on the fourteen interior leaves of a fasciculus in two quires. These fourteen leaves were the expanded nucleus of a book which was destined to grow to threefold dimensions.

§ 9. THE FIRST PORTION OF BOOK IV.

("Igitur.. posse putamus": MS. pp. 184—204.)

Amplification XIX. The passage in 24 $\frac{2}{3}$ lines, "Cura tamen...mensibus" (MS. p. 185), which confronts us quite at the beginning of Book IV. must be later than the first issue of the work. For the following reasons:—

1. The phrase "Ego, ducente Deo, coepto narrandi calle progrediar" is one of a class peculiar to amplifications of the original narrative¹; so also (2) is the "ut præfati sumus."

3. The repetition of statement in the sentence, "Quod dum...quatuor," as compared with "His ita...elongans" on p. 184 is a third instance of a peculiarity proper to these additions.

4. Eadmer here tells us ("Quod...quatuor") that St Anselm remained for a year and four months at Lyons. So he did. But in the *Vita* (II. liv.) he talks about a year and a half ("anno uno ac semis indignatio regis non est sopita") an interval shorter by a month than the continuation of the royal estrangement, and one by which, if the context is to guide us, he means to describe the length of his master's sojourn in the primatial city. At all events, it is unlikely that, if he had in 1111 said that the residence at Lyons lasted for sixteen months, he would in the following year, and writing with the *Historia Novorum* lying open before him, have expressed himself thus vaguely, and indeed contradictorily. I shall revert to the "anno uno ac semis" on a later page; but the "anno integro et mensibus quatuor" seems to be taken by Eadmer word for word from William of Malmesbury (*G. P.* p. 114), though it may have been recommended by his own acquaintance with the papal letter, "De illata tibi."

¹ For similar phrases, all of them in, or in relation to, additions to the narrative, see MS. pp. 12, 86, 125, 264, 289.

Every other addition, save Amplifications A and IX, which will be noticed in due course, fills, as nearly as may be, an even multiple of $24\frac{1}{2}$ lines. But this has the remarkable peculiarity that its textual content is that, not of a leaf, or leaves, but of a single page. There can be no doubt, I apprehend, that Eadmer found room for it on the *verso* of the first leaf of the volume which contained his own working copy of Book IV. I cannot determine the date of its introduction, but am inclined to think that it either preceded or immediately followed the proper constituents of Group D.

*Amplification XXI.*¹

This interpolation, embracing all that intervenes between "Ad quod" on MS. p. 190 and "suscepit inspexit" on p. 191,

¹ I have nothing more to add to what has already been said on this subject (*Preface*, pp. xxxiv, xxxv):—

"That part of the fourth book which begins with 'Cum igitur' on page 189, and ends with 'populo terræ' on page 192, betrays a certain inconsistency sufficient to suggest a doubt whether much of it may not have been inserted into the work subsequently to the first issue. It consists of four portions. The first of them is to the effect that Henry, partly out of respect for the Primate, partly out of dismay at the evils which had come to light in consequence of the Primate's exile, declared himself more than willing to have him back again, provided only he would let him enjoy the disputed *consuetudines*; and that he therefore sent envoys to Rome with instructions to spare no effort to induce the Pope to bid Anselm return to England and yield an unlimited obedience to the royal will. The next portion is irrelevant to the history, and may, like many similar paragraphs, have been inserted to eke out an even number of pages. The third is to this effect:—In the second year of our exile (A.D. 1105) the Pope, who had stiffly rejected the King's overtures, convened a council at the Lateran, excommunicated the Count of Meulan, the count's accomplices, and such prelates as had received investiture from the King, and with all speed sent news of what he had done to Anselm in a letter, which we subjoin. Then follows the letter, which upon inspection is found to contain the further information that, for a reason assigned, the Pope had deferred excommunicating the King himself.

The fourth portion, however, contains the astounding statement, that, the Pope's letter being received and examined, Anselm was at last convinced of the utter uselessness of wasting time in expectation of help from

with the exception of "In secundo autem anno adventus nostri" and "Anselmus," includes the papal letter "De illata tibi." If, as I have intimated, that document had adorned the original narrative, Eadmer would have corrected the error of judgment into which, uninformed by it, he allowed himself to fall.

The precise content of the interpolation is 48½ lines.

Amplification XXII. The passage which begins on MS. p. 192 at the words "Cum ergo," and ends at "reppererunt" on p. 194, informs us that St Anselm, after leaving Lyons in the spring of 1105, with the intention of going to Rheims, changed his route and went to Blois; that after some days spent at Blois he told the Countess Adela that he proposed excommunicating her brother, the King of England; that Adela sent envoys to the latter warning him of his danger; that Henry, advised by his counsellors, craved an interview with the Primate; and that they met at Laigle.

Now, it certainly is open to question whether Eadmer would have published these particulars during the lifetime of Henry; and when we examine the passage, we find, if not absolute proof that it is engrafted work, yet signs which lend probability to the surmise. Thus the scribe of the Cottonian copy, or its parent, seems to have been puzzled by the competing words "Cluniacum" and "Cluniaco," and, unable to make an

Rome which would never come, particularly as the Pope had thus far refused to stir a finger in his behalf; and, mixed up with it, the very suggestive remark, thrown in as if by accident, that Anselm had during his stay in Lyons written three letters to the King demanding the restoration of his property, but had received highly unsatisfactory answers.

Now, this fourth portion of the narrative is quite in harmony with the first, but cannot be reconciled with the third. Curiously enough, too, at its point of junction with the third we find precisely that sort of textual crudity which betrays the manipulation of a clumsy scribe,—*Hanc igitur epistolam postquam Anselmus suscepit inspexit, intellexit se amplius &c.* . . . 'This suscepit inspexit' recalls the 'tempus induciarum Pascha' of page 144, the two sea voyages on one and the same day from Dover to Wissant of page 172, and the blunder about the chaplain on page 182."

amalgam of them, such as we find in "tempus induciarum Pascha" (MS. p. 144) and "suscepit inspexit" (MS. p. 191), to have chosen the alternative of writing one above the other. The thing may have come about thus. In the margin of the volume given to the scribe to copy, and related by a catch-mark to "populo terræ," there were the guiding words, "Cum ergo Cluniacum." These the scribe copied before turning to the place in the additamenta to which they directed him, but which had "Cum ergo a Cluniaco."

Again. In the concluding sentence of the passage we find allusions to the King's "pristina querela" and "pristina feritas," and yet in the very next sentence we are told of his "pristina amicitia," a piece of false chronological perspective which would not have been perpetrated had the narrative first left the author's hands as we now find it. If the quarrel was in middle distance the friendship was in the background, and the proper phrase was not "pristina amicitia" but "antiqua amicitia."

The content of the passage is 55½ lines. But something must evidently have been needed to link together the preceding and the following context; and such connecting bond is found in the two sentences, "Eo tempore...subegerat¹" and "Omnes igitur...tradiderunt." Their content is 6½ lines, which when subtracted from 55½ leave 49.

It is probable, therefore, that the text in the first instance was as follows: "populo terræ (as on p. 192). Eo tempore... subegerat. Omnes igitur...tradiderunt" (as on p. 193).

¹ This short double link, "Eo tempore...subegerat. Omnes igitur...tradiderunt," now incorporated, perhaps in its original form, perhaps in a slightly altered one, into the amplification, is reproduced by the Worcester chronicler, who says, "Rex Anglorum Henricus transivit mare; omnes autem pene Normannorum majores ad ejus adventum, spreto comite domino suo, et fide quam ei debebant, in aurum et argentum regis, quod ipse de Anglia illuc portaverat, concurrerunt, eique castra munitasque civitates et urbes tradiderunt." Hence the pertinent question, Can the copy of Eadmer which the Worcester chronicler used have contained these particulars about St Anselm's visit to Blois? -

Amplification XXIII. And now I must ask the reader to bracket out, as a subsequent addition, all that intervenes between "Hæc autem inter ipsos" on MS. p. 194, and "meum legatum mittam" on p. 200.

Like Amplification XVI. the passage begins with a date; and, as in that instance, the date is given, as it would seem, in rectification of an error of William of Malmesbury's, who had made it appear that St Anselm went from Lyons into Normandy at, or within a week or two of, the vernal equinox of the year 1105¹. Here, as in the previous instance, William was a quarter of a year wrong in his chronology. But this was not his only mistake.

He says (*G. P.* p. 114) that after the interview at Laigle the King returned to England and that Anselm retired to Le Bec; that William of Veraval and Baldwin of Tournay were sent to Rome; that William and Baldwin there settled the controversy (*controversiam sedarunt*) on investiture and homage; and that, during their absence, news was brought to Anselm of certain scandals, as also a letter from the bishops entreating him to hasten his return to England.

What Eadmer here tells us is a very different story. He tells us that the King, after promising to send his agent to Rome at once, so that the Primate might be at Court on Christmas Day, did nothing of the kind; that he neither sent his agent nor permitted Anselm to return; and that, late in the year, Anselm wrote to him to say that, unless he bestirred himself without delay, he would independently of him send his own representative to the Pope not later than Christmas.

This can scarcely have had a place in William's copy of

¹ By "anno integro et mensibus quatuor" William meant, according to the method of his age (a method, ignorance of which has betrayed some recent writers into strange blunders) a year and three months *plus* some proper fraction of a month; he meant this, not necessarily more than this.

the *Historia Novorum*; nor can it have been divulged before the end of the year 1135, at the earliest.

And again. True as it may be (nothing can be more probable) that William and Baldwin did eventually arrange the terms of the final settlement, those terms had not been arranged by the Easter of 1106. They were not arranged, therefore, during that visit to Rome of which William of Malmesbury is here treating.

This passage consists of $146\frac{1}{2}$. ($= 3 \times 48\frac{5}{8}$) lines.

Amplification XXIV. There cannot be a doubt that, with the exception of the incorporated "Itaque post hæc.....solebat acturus," all that intervenes between "Scripsit quoque" (MS. p. 200) and "posse putamus" (MS. p. 204) is late work. It is not to be believed (1) that a passage containing a letter of reprimand to the Count of Meulan can have formed portion of the original; or (2) that so long as Henry was alive Eadmer would have published such an account as we here find of the royal exaction; or (3) that the "eo tempore" of the last sentence can have been written in 1111. Besides, (4) such a phrase as "nos brevitatem studentes pauca quæ dicta sunt pro intentione præsentis opusculi sufficere posse putamus" is nowhere to be found in any of Eadmer's early work. Sparing, therefore, as in analogous cases¹, "Itaque.....acturus," we find that the content of the new work is ($102\frac{1}{2} - 4\frac{1}{2} =$) 98 lines.

I must now ask the reader to retrace his course for a few pages.

Amplification XX. On turning over the leaves of Book IV. from its first word on MS. p. 184 to the point just indicated, not only am I surprised to find how much of the text has been excerpted (namely, one normal page on MS. p. 185, two normal pages on pp. 190, 191, two on pp. 192—194, six on pp. 194—200, four on pp. 200—204); I find that every letter has disappeared, with the sole exception of the "Considerata" on

¹ In Amplifications x, xx, xxii.

page 186, a document of the same class with the eliminated "Carissime" on page 196.

Assuredly, if Eadmer had resolved to introduce but one letter from St. Anselm's correspondence into his narrative of the last seven years of St. Anselm's life, this is about the last which he would have chosen for that distinction; and the fact that it is an "epistola infixæ" leaves little doubt that it cannot have had a place in his first issue.

The introductory context of the letter must be held to begin with "Quæ autem mala," for what goes before is part of the page of text which Eadmer wrote on the *verso* of the blank leaf at the beginning of his working copy of Book IV; and the subsequent context may be assumed to merge into the pristine narrative within a few lines of the end of the letter, for the text has evidently suffered some disturbance at that part.

According to the extant account (MS. p. 189), certain people, "malorum magnitudine afflicti," urged the King to recal St. Anselm; and yet the King, although "malorum exuberatione consternatus," needed to be thus urged before he allowed himself to own that he was of the same mind as they. Again: "ipsum" on the third line means Anselm, and yet in the very next line the King is called "ipse."

The sentence would seem to have read since the first recension: "Cum igitur quidam regi insisterent ut Anselmum revocaret, ipse, tam religiositate viri inductus quam et immanium malorum exuberatione animo consternatus," &c.; the necessity which urged the author to expand it to its present compass being simply the necessity of filling to their whole capacity the two leaves which he had devoted to his addition. Had the sentence remained as it was, the amplification would have occupied only 95 lines; this expansion has raised it to 97½. Eadmer's two additional leaves were filled, but they were filled at the expense of elegance, euphony and accuracy.

In like manner, and availing himself of the opportunity

offered by the transference of his account of the second embassy (MS. p. 150 *bis*) to a new leaf, he had expanded his "Ab archiepiscopo igitur missi sunt monachi duo, præfatus scilicet Baldulfus Beccensis, et Alexander Cantuariensis; et a rege tres episcopi," &c., into the very important statement which we now possess in Amplification XI.

At any rate, a most remarkable contrast may be traced between the sentence "Cum igitur...pateretur" on page 189 and one which will be noticed presently in another connexion, "Attamen dicendum," &c. on page 204. It is inconceivable that they should have been written at one and the same period of time. The second informs us that in the year 1105 England was deluged with a flood of miseries, a flood so grievous that the Bishops who had long conspired with the King in degrading the Church were at length compelled to turn for help to the very prelate they had persecuted. The first, on the other hand, says, indeed, that in the year 1104 a superabounding stream of evil covered the land, and, as it now stands, it intimates that but for Anselm's absence this would not have happened; yet, so far from calling the King a "depressor" of the Church's liberty or a "depressor" of Anselm, or in any way whatever censuring him, it says that he had a very great respect for Anselm and was sincerely anxious for a better state of things.

§ 10. RECONSTRUCTION OF THE PRIMARY NUCLEUS OF THE FIRST PORTION OF BOOK IV.

Between "Quæ autem mala" on MS. p. 186 and "posse putamus" on p. 204 there are 489 lines, or ten leaves. Three of the ten are represented by Amplifications XX. and XXI.; the early addition "Cum ergo" &c. (p. 192) has the value of one leaf, and "Hæc autem" &c. (p. 194) that of three leaves; and two are represented by Amplification XXIV. That is to

say, of all that now intervenes between "Quæ autem mala" and "posse putamus" nine-tenths had no place in the first issue.

And yet when that remanent tenth is put together (and it is composed, not only of passages between the end of one augmentation and the beginning of another, but of sentences, and even words, excerpted from this or that addition), put together, piece after piece in its proper order, the result is, not a medley of disjointed phrases, but a consecutive and consistent narrative. In other words: Leaf X. of the third book of the first issue, removed by Eadmer from the preceding nine and used by him as the basis of the nucleus of Book IV. was as follows:

"INCIPIT QUARTUS. Igitur ubi Willelmus Angliam pervenit et gesti negotii seriem Henrico regi exposuit, rex illico omnes redditus archiepiscopatus Cantuariensis in suos usus redigi præcepit¹. Cum igitur quidam regi insisterent ut Anselmum² revocaret, ipse, tam religiositate viri inductus quam et immanium malorum exuberatione animo consternatus, fieri quidem de redivi viri quod petebatur se libenter velle fatebatur, sic tamen ut paternarum consuetudinum nihil sibi ab eo ulterius derogari ulla ratione pateretur. Unde, nobis adhuc Lugduni degentibus, nuncii Romam ab ipso rege directi sunt qui modis omnibus elaborarent apostolicum ad hoc deducere ut Anselmum Angliam redire et regie voluntati iuberet in cunctis subdi et obœdire³. In secundo autem anno adventus nostri⁴ Anselmus⁵ intellexit se amplius frustra Lugduni Romanam opem præstolari, præsertim cum iam sæpenumero ipsi Romanæ sedis antistiti legatos et litteras de sui negotii consummatione transmiserit, et eo usque nil nisi quandam quasi consolatorie expectationis promissionem de

¹ As on MS. p. 184; written on erasure, Amplification XVIII* having been suppressed. See above, p. 231. Here was the catch-mark to Amplification XIX.

² "Cum...Anselmum" subsequently cancelled and replaced by concluding words of Amplification XX.

³ As on MS. p. 189. Here was the catch-mark to Amplification XXI.

⁴ As on MS. p. 190.

⁵ "In secundo...Anselmus," subsequently cancelled and replaced by concluding words of Amplification XXI.

termino in terminum ab eo meruerit. Tertio quoque litteras suas regi Angliæ pro suarum rerum resaisitione direxerat, nec aliquid ab eo nisi quod blandientem sibi dilationem ingereret responsi acceperat."

Thus far we have, as nearly as can be computed, the text of the first page. The next carried on the narrative :—

"Consulto itaque venerabili præfato Lugdunensis civitatis episcopo Lugduno Franciam petiturus decessit morente super hoc pontifice ipso et omni populo terræ¹. [Eo tempore rex Henricus in Normannia erat, ipsamque pene totam suæ ditioni subegerat². Omnes enim ferme Normannorum maiores illico ad regis adventum, spreto comite domino suo et fide quam ei debebant, in aurum et argentum regis concurrerunt, eique civitates castra et urbes tradiderunt³. Rogatus ergo a rege Anselmus in Normanniam venit, et]⁴ habito inter eos colloquio, Anselmum rex de redditibus sui pontificatus revestivit, et in pristinam amicitiam utrinque recepti sunt. Quibusdam igitur ad hoc sollicite operam dantibus ut antistes statim Angliam remearet, rex annuit, sic tamen ut nulli eorum qui a se investituras ecclesiarum susceperant, vel eos consecraverant, suam in aliquo communionem subtraheret. Cui conditioni Anselmus minime acquiescens, obœdientiam videlicet papæ in nullo prætergredi volens, extra Angliam manere delegit, donec illi qui ad ipsum negotium et quædam alia de quibus inter eos illa vice convenire non poterat determinanda ex conducto Romam mittendi erant reversi fuissent⁵. Itaque missi sunt Romam ex parte quidem Anselmi Balduinus monachus et ex parte regis Willelmus sæpe superius memoratus⁶."

¹ As on MS. pp. 191, 192. Here was the catch-mark to Amplification xxii.

² As on MS. p. 193.

³ As on MS. p. 193. See Florence of Worcester, II. 54 (*sub anno* 1105); and supra p. 245, n. 1.

⁴ "Eo tempore...venit, et" already cancelled and replaced by last 6½ lines of Amplification xxii. $55\frac{1}{2} - 6\frac{1}{2} = 49$.

⁵ As on MS. p. 194. Here was the catchmark to Amplification xxiii.

⁶ As on MS. p. 201. Incorporated into Amplification xxiv.

§ 11. ON THE PHRASE "PRO LIBERTATE ECCLESIAE SICUT SOLEBAT ACTURUS." (MS. p. 201.)

A singular circumstance must here be noted. There are few things in Eadmer more puzzling than the passage (on MS. p. 201) "Itaque post hæc missi sunt Romam, ex parte quidem Anselmi Balduinus monachus, *vir utique sanctæ libertatis ecclesiæ et omnis boni non fictus amator*, et ex parte regis Willelmus sæpe superius memoratus *pro libertate ecclesiæ sicut solebat acturus*." The last six words are quite unlike all that we know of William of Veraval in the earlier part of his career; and the "sicut solebat" involves the strangest of contradictions.

This was for a long time a most exasperating puzzle to me; and a puzzle it would have remained, but for the lucky resolve to disintegrate Eadmer's old work and Eadmer's new and, if possible, rehabilitate the original leaf x. This was no sooner done than the truth flashed upon me. The difficulty is, I am sure, referable to a technical blunder, thus:—

The last two lines of leaf x. contained the text "mam... memoratus." Eadmer, then, as I imagine, wishing to pay a compliment or, still more probably, a posthumous honour to Anselm's incomparable adviser, Baldwin of Tournay, wrote in the lateral margin "*vir utique sanctæ libertatis ecclesiæ et omnis*," and then, travelling into the lower margin, "*boni non fictus amator, pro libertate ecclesiæ sicut solebat acturus*." The last six words, however, ran immediately under the lowest line of text, and running thus, were thought by the perfunctory scribe to belong to it and not to their proper context. Thus:—

o vir utique sanctæ lib- mam ex parte quidem Anselmi Balduinus monachus^o,
ertatis ecclesiæ et omnis et ex parte regis Willelmus sæpe superius memoratus,
*boni non fictus amator, pro libertate ecclesiæ sicut solebat acturus*¹.

I believe that the marginal note was meant to apply entirely and exclusively to Baldwin, and that we have to thank the

¹ I give the gloss in italics.

scribe for making two halves of a whole and giving one of them to the wrong man.

If it be urged that Eadmer does not seem to have been cognizant of the clerical blunder I claim to have detected, I reply that I do not believe the final transcription of the *Historia Novorum* to have been effected before the year 1143, by which time the author was seventy-nine years of age, exceedingly busy in the development of his work, and little disposed, if able, to make any long-continued exertion in a task so trying to sight and patience as that of hunting up either the errata of other men, or such technical errors of his own as were likely to have attended the process of frequent introduction of new work into old. And if we examine Book III. and the first part of Book IV. we shall find enough to justify this opinion.

§ 12. TECHNICAL LAPSES IN BOOK III. AND THE FIRST PORTION OF BOOK IV.

It is a remarkable fact that, with two exceptions, the textual blemishes and other analogous peculiarities hitherto detected occur in, or are occasioned by, amplifications in Book III. and the first portion of Book IV.

1. The first of these is on MS. p. 144 in the clause "Exinde cum ad tempus induciarum, Pascha, ventum esset."

Now, we have seen that some such sentence as "Exinde... dilatae sunt" must have helped to connect the narrative suspended at "statum rediret" (MS. p. 137) with the resumptive "Cum igitur ad curiam" (MS. p. 150); and I infer that "tempus induciarum Pascha" is an amalgam of two readings; one in the original passage doomed to suppression and the other in the rough draft of Amplification X. (See below, p. 303.)

2. Again. The phrases "episcopi qui Roma venerant" and "contestati sunt in episcopali veritate" occurred on leaf IV. of the third book as it stood at first. These are inelegantly

repeated in Amplification XII, where we find "in episcopali veritate illa vera esse contestantium" (MS. p. 159) and "qui Roma venerant episcopi" (MS. p. 160). The pertinence of this observation will, I think, be admitted by all whose experience has taught them how much more prone we are to repeat ourselves in interrupted than in continuous narratives. In the latter case the instinct of authorship steers clear unconsciously of a rock which in the former it is hardly possible to avoid.

3. In Amplification XIV. we have (MS. p. 166) "ille" for the King followed in the same sentence by "illum" for Anselm. This irregularity may fairly be explained by the theory that our author, busy late in life in engrafting new work into old, lacked either the leisure, the vital energy, or the visual keenness that are indispensable to that most tedious of all labours, the work of the file.

4. The repetition at the end of Amplification XVI. (MS. p. 175) of a phrase that had occurred at its beginning, the solecism at the beginning of the resumed narration, and other traces of awkward welding, may be mentioned again in this connexion¹.

5. Similar to the double-minded "ille" on MS. p. 166 is the "ipse" on page 189, in Amplification XX. This "ipse" means now the Archbishop, and now, on the next line and in the same sentence, the King. The blemish raises a presumption that the text has undergone some change in this place; and the further presumption of late handling is raised by Eadmer's omission to rectify it.

6. The "suscepit, inspexit" in Amplification XXI. (MS. p. 191) is another instance in proof. The rough draft would seem to have stopped short with the words, "Hanc igitur epistolam postquam Anselmus suscepit (or inspexit)"; whilst on Leaf X. and on an erased space which had carried the words "In secundo autem anno adventus nostri Anselmus," and

¹ See above, p. 227.

marked with a symbol of reference to the engrafted work, there was the clause, "Hanc igitur epistolam postquam Anselmus inspexit (or suscepit)¹".

7. In this category must be placed the remarkable "a Cluniacum" of the Cottonian copy with its alternative "vel Cluniaco" (MS. p. 192).

8. So, too, again in Amplification XXII. we find the phrases "pristina querela" and "pristina feritas" (MS. p. 194) succeeded in the resumed narrative by "pristina amicitia," which, correct enough before the introduction of the added text, is now intolerable. Eadmer had sufficient acumen to avoid his rival's "antiqua" (see *G. P.* p. 114, n. 4) when writing, or, as I incline to think, when revising his batch of new text; but wanted the time, the vigour, or the sight, to perceive that close after the point of intromission there lurked the words "in pristinam amicitiam," which should have been altered to "in antiquam amicitiam²."

9. The next instance of the kind, indicative, assuredly, of a late touch, occurs at the beginning of Amplification XXV. in the words "Attamen dicendum quod" (MS. p. 204). An indis-

¹ Thus (the words on the erasure are in italics):

juberet in cunctis subdi et obedire. *Hanc igitur epistolam postquam Anselmus inspexit intellexit se amplius &c.*

² The only analogous instance which I can find in Books I. and II. occurs on MS. p. 54 in "Evolutis dehinc aliquantis." In a sentence which in the first instance followed immediately on the record of events two months distant, "aliquantis" was suitable enough; but when the Harrow incident had been interposed Eadmer would have done well to replace the word by "paucis" (as we find in *Vita* II. vii.) When, however, St Wulstan's letter in Amplification IV. had been introduced, the entire phrase should have been recast.

I refer to this fact here, 1. to shew how infrequent are these disfigurements in Books I. and II.; 2. in the hope that the blemish may be of service in helping scholars to a reasonable surmise as to the dates at which Amplifications III. and IV. were introduced; and 3. to strengthen my contention that these grammatical lapses occur either in, or in necessary connexion with, new work intermixed with old.

tinctly written memorandum on the lower margin of leaf x. directed the copyist to the next passage that awaited his labours; and the perfunctory scribe read it "Attamen dicendum" instead of "Est tamen dicendum."

Now, singularly enough, none of the additions which involved these errors falls either in the earliest or in the latest groups of amplificatory work; five of them being in B, two in C, one in D, and one in F. All of these errors, that is to say, were committed between the years 1136 and 1139, or, if the reader still holds his judgment in suspense as to the precise dates, none of them was committed before Eadmer began to correct the *Gesta Pontificum*, and none in cases where he employed the very simple but inartistic method of laying in new work in batches of leaves without any attempt at welding that new work with the old. The fact goes to prove that the additions which had been made before William of Malmesbury completed the first book of the *Gesta Pontificum*, were made at a period when Eadmer had strength, sight and leisure at command for the prevention or correction of mistakes; but that that period had passed when our author undertook the correction of the *Gesta Pontificum*.

§ 13. JOHN OF SALISBURY ON THE YEARS 1105-1107.

John of Salisbury's *Life of St Anselm*¹ is based upon Eadmer's three works, the *Historia*, the *Vita*, and the *Miracula*, to the exclusion, apparently, of all other treatises.

So much of it as is referable to the *Vita* has evidently been taken from a late recension of that work. It would be waste of time to prove so manifest a fact; but it may be well to add that the copy used was, in all probability, one which contained the capitula, and that John's "vicarium eius qui

¹ I have worked on the Abbé Migne's reprint, *Patrologia*, Series Latina, vol. cxcix. col. 1009.

imperat ventis et mari" (Migne cxcix. 1025 D) was suggested by Eadmer's title to II. xxiii.

So much of it as is referable to the *Historia Novorum* must have been taken from that work as it stood at an early, perhaps at its earliest, stage.

Our investigations have thus far revealed to us no less than twenty-four distinct passages in the *Historia Novorum*, the aggregate value of which amounts to nearly half of the extant text; but there is not the remotest allusion to any one of them in the whole of John of Salisbury's *Vita*. As, therefore, it is inconceivable that John of Salisbury should by a series of perpetually recurring accidents have been guided to avoid so large a quantity of text so multitudinously distributed over the volume on which he worked, the most obvious inference is the only reasonable one, that he worked on a copy of an early, perhaps the earliest, issue.

And, indeed, there are passages in his work, some of which invite, whilst others compel, the inference, thus:

1. In his account of the consecration of Harrow Church (1022 c) he gives the story of the missing chrismatory, but says nothing about the visit of the two canons of St Paul's which forms part of Amplification III.

2. His account (1026 c) of the sojourn at Lyons in 1097-8 is taken from Eadmer's *Vita*, not from the divergent story in Amplification VI.

3. Similarly (1031 D) he represents Henry I as asking Anselm to go to Rome, and the bishops, abbots, and *proceres* as standing by and applauding the proposal. This is based on a mistaken interpretation of Eadmer's *Vita*. II. I, and was, assuredly, written in ignorance of the Canterbury episode, the subject of Amplification XIV.

4. On col. 1033 A we read "Exigentibus negotiis quibusdam ecclesiasticis, vir Dei in Franciam veniens a rege Henrico rogatus in Normanniam progredi rerum suarum tandem a rege.

investituram accepit." This is plainly referable to Eadmer's *Vita* (II. lvi.); but I cannot think that John of Salisbury would have made so insipid a statement if he had known, on the authority of Eadmer, what it was that had brought St. Anselm into France in the summer of 1105; if, that is to say, his copy of the *Historia* had contained Amplification XXII.

5. He then goes on to say, "Rege autem in Angliam transeunte, post pauca Willelmus.....Beccum reversus est." This "post pauca" is borrowed from the phrase "in brevi" of Eadmer's *Vita* (II. lvii.), "Willelmus Angliam ad regem vadit, ac in brevi ad Anselmum regressus" &c.: but Eadmer's "in brevi" means only a week or two, whereas John's "post pauca" stretches over an interval of a year. John of Salisbury cannot have had the slightest idea that in the few words "Conversante dehinc Anselmo in Normannia" Eadmer had very cleverly bridged over twelve calendar months during which things had been done and things left undone in a manner far from creditable to the sovereign; but this would have been evident to him had his copy of the *Historia* contained all that now intervenes between "Hæc autem" and "posse putamus" (MS. pp. 194—204); had his copy, that is to say, contained Amplifications XXIII. and XXIV.

I infer, therefore, that John of Salisbury's copy represented the work as it stood prior to the introduction of Group B and its successors.

Knowing, then, as we do, that in the second portion of Book IV. not a few things have been suppressed and not a few added, it may help us to recover some of the suppressions and to identify some of the additions if we examine John of Salisbury's record in the corresponding portion of his *Life of St. Anselm*. His record is as follows:—

(1) Certain ecclesiastical affairs urging Anselm to go into France, King Henry sent and asked him to come a little further and meet him in Normandy. (2) He did so and received possession of all his belongings.

(3) The King returned to his kingdom, and, (4) shortly afterwards, William the King's envoy appeared at Le Bec with an urgent request from his master that Anselm, their differences being now appeased, would come at once to England. (5) Rejoiced at the liberation of the Church from servitude, Anselm set forth on his journey, but fell ill at Jumièges. The next thing that happened was that (6) the King returned to Normandy, and (7) on the Feast of the Assumption paid a friendly visit to the Archbishop at Le Bec. (8) Soon after this (how soon we are not told) Henry won a great victory over his brother the Duke of Normandy. When, then, (9) the King and the Primate met on the first of August, the triumph of the Church was manifest to all men. Then follows (10) an account of the settlement on investiture, (11) a notice of St Anselm's last philosophical treatises, (12) just so much of the York dispute as to allow the admission of the "Tibi, Thoma," and (13) the end.

The first thing that strikes us in all this is the absence of dates. When did Anselm go into France? When did he meet the King in Normandy? On what Feast of the Assumption was it that they met at Le Bec? What first of August was it on which they met once more?

The next thing that strikes us is John of Salisbury's profound unconsciousness, not only of the King's procrastination and bad faith in the latter part of 1105, but of the unworthy means he chose for raising money. The deluge of miseries about which the extant Eadmer is so pathetic had no existence to John of Salisbury.

Nor does he tell us what were the terms of the arrangement made at Le Bec; whilst his account of the final settlement, differing materially from that which is now extant in the *Historia*, may be presumed to have tallied with that earlier account which it is evident that Eadmer at some time or other in his career suppressed.

§ 14. WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY ON THE YEARS 1105—1107.

William of Malmesbury, who, when writing the *Gesta Pontificum*, worked on a somewhat amplified text of the *Historia*

(see *Preface*, p. xxxii.), gives the following account (*G. P.* pp. 114—121):—

(1) Anselm (when or where we are not precisely informed) thought of excommunicating the King. (2) News of this being sent to the King by his sister, the Countess of Blois, (3) he begged that Anselm and the Countess would come to him in Normandy. (4) He came, and was put in possession of his property, but (5) deferred his return to England because he would not communicate with the King's *investiti*. (6) The King went to England, the Primate to Le Bec. (7) Envoys were sent to Rome, namely, Baldwin and William, who (8) settled the long controversy. The terms of settlement were that the King should receive the homages of prelates-elect, but should not give investiture to any one. (9) Meanwhile Anselm received news that the King contemplated certain extortions, and (10) wrote to him on the subject. (11) The King, advised by Robert of Meulan, sent a temperate reply:—

“Nothing of the kind,” retorts Eadmer in Amplification XXIV. “Robert of Meulan was a very bad man indeed. He was at the bottom of all the mischief that was done during the Archbishop's exile, and he it was that contrived to keep him out of the country when he might have come back (see MS. p. 201). And as to contemplating extortionate measures, why, the King committed them, and very scandalous they were.” (MS. p. 202).

William proceeds:—

(12) On the return of the envoys Henry lost no time in seeking Anselm, who was then at Le Bec. (13) There they came to certain specified terms of agreement. (14) Anselm now returned to England, and, without delay, effected many reforms; churches were no longer farmed, simony was suppressed, priests were restrained to celibacy, and unlawful marriages were annulled. (15) The King soon had his reward, for he won the battle of Tenchebrai, sending news of his victory to Anselm:—

“Stop,” cries Eadmer. “The battle of Tenchebrai was fought in 1106, and the reforms you mention were not effected until long after that event; indeed, not before the Whitsuntide of 1108. The King, whom you describe as absent in Normandy, was present at the synod, which was holden after the death of Archbishop Gerard in the early days of May, 1108.” (MS. p. 230).

William's account continues:—

(16) The King came back to England and resigned for ever the investitures of churches, Anselm conceding that no one should on account of homage made to the King be refused consecration. And so, thanks to Anselm, the Church was at peace again. (17) I need not say much

about the synods he held, for their decrees are a dead letter. Still, here is the *textus* of one of them :—

“On the contrary,” retorts Eadmer in Amplification XIII. “The Holy See confirmed the decrees of 1102; and Anselm, so far from quashing one of them, simply allowed it to be neglected.”

Now, of these seventeen statements, the first three are in substantial agreement with Eadmer's story in Amplification XXII, an addition to the work which John of Salisbury cannot have seen; the next three are taken from Eadmer's first narrative; and the seventh accords with the pristine “Itaque missi,” &c., which has been preserved in XXIV. But of that amplification itself William seems to have known nothing; nor indeed of the specific details in XXII. The same may be said of the date at the beginning of XXIII. and the other contents of that addition. The ninth, tenth, and eleventh statements must have provoked the 144 lines which intervene between “Attamen dicendum” and “Merlebergam,” (MS. pp. 204—209¹); and the twelfth is not in agreement with Eadmer's extant narrative. The fourteenth and fifteenth must have provoked our author's account (MS. p. 230) of the synod of 1108²; and the seventeenth his insertion of the *textus concilii Lundoniensis* (MS. pp. 162—166) in XIII.

Unless, then, an examination of William's eighth, twelfth, thirteenth and sixteenth statements should raise a doubt against the validity of the inference, we may conclude with some confidence that when the Wiltshire historian put the last touch to his notice of St Anselm, Amplification XXIII. and much other late work had not as yet been made known in the *Historia Novorum*.

The eighth, twelfth, thirteenth and sixteenth statements made by William of Malmesbury are very curious.

The first is that Baldwin and William, being sent to Rome, there settled the controversy, and that they settled it

¹ Amplification xxv.

² Amplification xxxiii.

on these terms, that the King should receive the homages of prelates elect, but that he should not give the forbidden investiture.

If John of Salisbury may be trusted, there was in the first issue of the *Historia Novorum* no such statement of the outcome of the embassy to Rome of which William is here speaking. And the *Historia* as now known to us assigns, by implication at least, the final arrangement of terms to a later embassy, that of 1107 (see MS. p. 219).

William's statement of the terms of settlement is taken from the "Quod Anglici regis" of Paschal, but that letter had no place in Eadmer's first issue.

The *Historia* as we know it contains the "Quod Anglici regis" (MS. p. 210), and also (MS. p. 221) an account of the final settlement analogous in terminology to the concessions contained in that letter.

But, on the other hand, the *Historia* as we know it contains (MS. p. 227) a reference to a statement of the terms of settlement such as is not now to be found in the work, and, close to it, a reference to a papal reprimand of Count Robert of Meulan, all record of which has now disappeared from its pages. These references, however, are contained in what is unquestionably an amplification, an amplification provoked by a passage about Robert of Meulan in the *Gesta Regum* (p. 649).

The most probable inference, then, is that the amplification in which these references occur was introduced after the appearance of the fifth book of the *Gesta Regum*, and that that which contains the "Quod Anglici regis" was introduced after the appearance of the first book of the *Gesta Pontificum*; and, thus, that in making the "Quod Anglici regis" the authority for the terms of settlement it was Eadmer who followed William, and not William Eadmer.

In other words, William of Malmesbury's eighth statement in the *Gesta Pontificum* was not taken from that copy of the

first recension of the *Historia Novorum* which lay before him as he wrote.

William's twelfth and thirteenth statements are to the effect that on the return of the envoys Henry lost no time in seeking Anselm, who was at Le Bec, and that there they came to terms on all the subjects which had hitherto estranged them. The statement that Henry lost no time cannot have been taken from any such account as that which we now find in the *Historia* (pp. 214—216)¹, an account which informs us that the King sent for the Primate; that the Primate set forth on his journey, but, falling ill on the way, sent his excuses to the sovereign, who returned a message promising to come to him; that after waiting for him in vain for a month at Jumièges he thought it the more dignified course to retire to Le Bec; and that at Le Bec the two men met. They met, but not until some three months had passed since the return of the envoys.

On the other hand, however, the two accounts of the precise terms of reconciliation at Le Bec tally very remarkably; so remarkably, indeed, that one must have been borrowed from the other. Hence the question arises, Has Eadmer copied William, or has William copied Eadmer? William says (p. 115) "*omnia quæ illos hactenus in diversa trahebant...prolata et sedata*"; Eadmer says in like terms; "*omnia quæ illos in diversa traxerant pacem et concordiam invenerunt*." William says "*Ecclesias siquidem quas Willelmus frater Henrici censui subegerat ipse in manus Anselmi liberas reddidit*"; Eadmer says "*Siquidem ecclesias Angliæ quas Willelmus rex frater regis Henrici sub censum...primus redegerat liberas ab eadem exactione rex in manus Anselmi reddidit*." This is strikingly similar in terms, but more carefully worded as a whole. William continues, "*et se de his nihil accepturum quamdiu pastore carerent promisit*"; Eadmer, "*et se de ipsis dum viveret nil accepturum quamdiu essent sine pastore promisit*." William

¹ In Amplification xxvii.

says, "*Omnia de archiepiscopatu sullata cum Angliam redisset redditurum dato vadimonio pollicitus est*"; Eadmer says, "*Cuncta vero quæ de archiepiscopatu, exulante Anselmo, suo jussu accepta fuerant, se redditurum cum in Angliam esset reversus dato vadimonio pollicitus est.*" Here again Eadmer carries off the palm for care and precision.

I conclude, therefore, that in his statement of the terms of agreement at Le Bec William anticipated Eadmer; that if Eadmer errs, as undoubtedly he does, in saying that "all was settled" he errs because he carelessly copies from his rival; and that his first account of the interview at Le Bec had been some such account as we find in John of Salisbury, or in his own *Vita*, II. lix. The men were reconciled in the August of 1106, but the main controversy was not brought to an end. And so far from the "all" that lay between them consisting of an outstanding grievance against William Rufus, the exaction of money from the clergy, and the seizure of the archiepiscopal revenues, this is the first word that has been said on the first of those subjects, and the second of them was an affair of yesterday. That there remained subsidiary grievances as yet uncomposed there need be no doubt; nor that these three specific subjects were discussed at the Le Bec interview. All that I question is Eadmer's accuracy in saying that these three subjects were the "omnia" of the estrangement of King and Primate; and in doing so I do enough to raise a doubt whether the extant paragraph "*Igitur in Assumptione*" &c. can have formed part of the pristine treatise.

The truth is that in the *Vita Sancti Anselmi* (II. lix.) Eadmer had mentioned certain "omnia" as settled at Le Bec, "omnia" that appertained to, and formed part of, the occasion of Anselm's second exile and the postponement of his return; first and foremost, his refusal to communicate with excommunicated homagers and *investiti*, and, besides this, certain disciplinary measures taken in the Council of London in 1102. These at

the time when Eadmer wrote the *Vita* (and, it may be presumed, in the preceding year when he was writing the *Historia*), these in the year 1111 were the "omnia quæ resederant" of the "sæpefatum negotium" that had been submitted to the Holy See, that had been handled in the papal "Quod Anglici regis" and that formed, at any rate, the principal topic of the Le Bec interview.

The truth would seem to be that William of Malmesbury, who, writing rapidly, voluminously, at second hand, and a quarter of a century after date, had by no means a clearly defined notion of the particulars of the history, misunderstood the meaning of Eadmer's "omnia" in the *Vita*, and gave, if not an untrue, yet a false, because materially insufficient and misleading, account of the Le Bec interview; and that Eadmer in his turn, oblivious of his own early work, but nervous as ever in his anxiety not to be outstripped by his rival, transplanted that rival's blunder into the *Historia Novorum*.

Analogous with this is his statement that the document in dispute at Westminster in 1102 was the "Adversus illam." Six and twenty years had passed since he said that it was the "Non ignoras" (see MS. pp. 154—159); but now that William (*G. P.* p. 108) says that it was the "Adversus illam," he fondly says so too. That, certainly, is the document to which William refers in the sentence "Siquidem et epistola quam Anselmo attulerant vulgo jam lectitabatur, in qua non solum investituras non concedere, sed etiam statuta Urbani pertinaciter probabatur Paschalis urgere servandaque monere." Analogous, also, as regards the verbal conformity of the two accounts, is our author's notice of the council of London, which, written after the divulgation of William's unrecensed text of *Gesta Pontificum I*, borrows its phraseology; for where William¹ says "*Hic est concilii Lundoniensis textus, qui non post multos dies in omnibus pene prævaricatores habuit...Illud sane præceptum de*

¹ *G. P.* p. 121, n. 1.

sodomitis omni Dominico die excommunicandis Anselmus ipse postea, quibusdam rationabilibus exigentibus causis, immutavit," Eadmer¹ writes "Et hic quidem. *Lundoniensis concilii textus est, qui post non multos institutionis suæ dies multos sui transgressores in omni hominum genere fecit. Sane quod ultimum, de renovanda excommunicatione Dominicis diebus, statutum fuit ipsemet Anselmus, rationabili dispensatione usus, postponi concessit.*"

On the whole, then, I conclude that William of Malmesbury's twelfth and thirteenth statements were not taken from that copy of the first recension of the *Historia Novorum* which lay before him as he wrote.

His sixteenth statement is—"Venit igitur rex sullimi trophæo splendidus, et triumphali gloria Angliam invectus; investituræque ecclesiarum Anselmo in perpetuum in manum remisit, eodem concedente ut propter hominum regi factum nullus arceretur a benedictione²." He had already said (p. 114) speaking of the embassy of 1105, "*Concessit siquidem papa ut rex homagia de electis acciperet sed nullum per baculum et anulum investiret.*"

The extant account in Eadmer is, "In Kalendis ergo Augusti... nam papa concesserat hominia... annuit rex et statuit ut ab eo tempore in reliquam nunquam per dationem baculi pastoralis vel anuli quisquam episcopatu aut abbatia per regem vel quamlibet laicam manum in Angliâ investiretur, concedente quoque Anselmo ut nullus in prælationem electus pro hominîo quod regi faceret consecratione suscepti honoris privaretur³."

The date seems to be preserved from the first issue; for John of Salisbury gives it; but it is much more likely that the rest should be an amalgam of William's two accounts, that of the negotiations at Rome and that of the final settlement, than that these should be a bifurcate rendering of Eadmer's one account. And, indeed, what we now read in the *Historia* can

¹ MS. p. 165.

² *G. P.* p. 117.

³ MS. p. 220.

have had no place in the first issue, since Eadmer himself informs us, on MS. p. 227 and in an unsuppressed amplification, that his work once contained a record of the final settlement with which the present one cannot be identified. In other words, the extant account, which tallies with the "Quod Anglici regis," has replaced an earlier one, which tallied with the "Non debeo tacere."

On the whole, then, I conclude that William of Malmesbury's sixteenth statement was not taken from that copy of the first recension of the *Historia* which lay before him as he wrote.

If, then, my readers agree with me that, out of seventeen statements concerning the events that took place between the spring of 1105 and the summer of 1107, William did not find the last eleven in his copy of Eadmer, I shall take the liberty of inferring that after the point already reached in our investigations Eadmer has very vigorously retouched his earlier work.

§ 15. THE SECOND PORTION OF BOOK IV.

("Attamen dicendum...Amen": MS. pp. 204—259.)

I now proceed. From "Attamen dicendum" on MS. 204 to "missi fuerant redeunt" on p. 209 there are 144 lines. After these there is a passage, "Suspensus autem fuerat...De his ita" (pp. 209—214), which contains two digressions, one about the Archbishop of Rouen, the other about a pious crusader; and, thrown in between them, as if by chance, that very important letter of Paschal's, the "Quod Anglici regis." This strange medley fills 145 $\frac{2}{3}$ lines (Amplifications XXV, XXVI)¹.

¹ On the latter of these additions I say in my *Preface* (p. xxxviii),

"The next instance begins with the words 'Suspensus autem fuerat' on page 209 and ends with 'De his ita' on page 214. It has the textual content of six pages of the original; the hagiographical digression is quite

On pp. 223—228. are the two amplifications which have already been noticed elsewhere, "In subsequenti...ecclesiæ" and "Inter hæc...præsentatus¹." Nor can there be a doubt that the passage, in 48½ lines; "His diebus...ordinavit," on pp. 232—234, is new work; or all that follows it from "Deinde" on p. 234 to "scissuram" on p. 247 (Amplifications XXXI, XXXII, XXXIV, XXXV).

There now remain for consideration the following passages:—

1. "Itaque Willelmus...pollicitus est" (pp. 214—217) in 68 lines,
2. "His et aliis...reversus est" (pp. 217—219), in 52½ lines,
3. "Adunatis autem...Lundoniensi" pp. (219—223), in 110½ lines,
4. "Inter ista...velut adulteræ" (pp. 228—232), in 106 lines,
5. "Inter hæc languor...Amen" (pp. 247—259), in 345½ lines.

Amplification XXVII. The first of these, "Itaque Willelmus...pollicitus est," in 68 lines, contains, assuredly, a large amount of new text. Part, at least, of "Itaque...postulavit" must be retained, as necessary to the narrative, but immediately after it we have signs of an awkward welding of old and new; the "Qui Willelmus ad nos...infirmum invenit" being, so to speak,

in character with others which are manifestly sarcinatory; the letter 'Quod Anglici regis cor' had no place in William of Malmesbury's earlier copy; and the facts that even now its place in the work is utterly unworthy of its importance, and that the context makes no allusion to it, complete the evidence, which goes to prove that the 'Licet causæ tuæ' and the 'Quod Anglici regis cor' were as little used by Eadmer in his earlier days of authorship as the other letters of Pope Paschal II. to which I have already drawn attention."

¹ On these I say (ib. p. xli.),

"There can be little doubt that the double digression 'In subsequenti...Röfensis ecclesiæ' (pp. 223—226) had no place in Eadmer's original; and as little that the 'Inter hæc...præsentatus' (pp. 227—228) which immediately follows it in our extant copies, but which it divorces from its proper context, is an earlier augmentation. The 'huic operi admiscere' which follows Anselm's letter to the Pope, the avowal that the letter had been introduced in justification of an account given on a previous page, and the fact that the entire passage has the precise content of one leaf of Eadmer's own book, combine to give us all the certitude we need desire that it had no place in the original."

out of drawing with "lætus ille ad audita illico Anselmum ad ecclesiam suam redire per eundem Willelmum postulavit." And, again; the detailed account of the transmission of messages between Normandy and England does not seem to have been known by William of Malmesbury or by John of Salisbury. Nor is the envoy's speech about the King likely to have been published by our author before the King's death.

I need not repeat what has been already said about the next paragraph, "Igitur in Assumptione...pollicitus est"; but I may remark that, the first issue having said nothing thus far about the King's extortionate treatment of the clergy in 1105, an allusion to it (at any rate, such allusion as we now have) would have been absurdly out of place.

On the whole, then, it is probable that the first account was to this effect:—

"Reversis itaque nunciis qui Romam missi fuerant¹, et enarratis quæ de sæpefato negotio apud Romanum pontificem acta fuerant, rex lætus ad audita illico Anselmum ad ecclesiam suam redire per Willelmum postulavit². Cui cum Anselmus promptus acquiesceret³, et iter aggressus Gemmeticum veniret, infirmitate ne iter expleret inibi detentus est. Qua sopita Beccum révertitur, regem Angliæ transfretaturum illic præstolaturus. Ubi omnibus mira alacritate de reditu illius exultantibus⁴, ecce lacrimabile malum concussit atque subvertit gaudium ipsum; nam tam gravis infirmitas iterum invasit Anselmum ut de eo præter mortem nihil expectaremus. Sed omnipotens Deus ipsum contra omnium opinionem sanitati restituit, et multos magno exinde gaudio lætificavit. Dehinc in Assumptione Beatæ Dei Genitricis et perpetuæ Virginis rex Henricus Beccum venit⁵, et omnia quæ inter se et Anselmum de sæpefato negotio resederant delevit, atque de singulis ad quæ tendebat suæ illum voluntatis cõpotem fecit."

¹ See MS. p. 209.

² See MS. p. 214.

³ See *Vita*, II. lvii.

⁴ See MS. p. 216.

⁵ See *Vita*, II. lix.

Some such narrative, then, as this, corresponding with the first design structure and character of the work, and filling 19 lines¹ would seem to have been replaced by the extant 68.

Amplification XXVIII. The passage, in 52½ lines, which immediately follows, namely, "His et aliis.. reversus est," holds within its limits a leaf of augmentary text; for (1), the paragraph "His et aliis" &c. contains an allusion to the contents of Amplifications XXIV. and XXV; (2) the next paragraph is singularly explicit in its allusion to those additions, and to Amplification XXVII. as well; and (3) the third paragraph, contrary to the first design of the work, introduces a letter. The original text must have consisted of three or, at the most, four lines, and was probably equivalent in length to some such sentence as, "His et aliis quæ res expetebat inter viros compositis, Anselmus iter Angliam remeandi ingressus est, et, Divino tutamine fretus, sanus et alacer cum suis omnibus Dofris appulsus est." But its precise terminology is by no means easy to guess. The words "et aliis quæ res expetebat" had no place in it; nor do I think that it had "ingressus est... appulsus est," Eadmer's style requiring either "ingressus..., appulsus est" or "ingressus est...appulsus."

And yet, curiously enough, the extant text ends with "reversus est," giving the same sort of half echo to old work which we have found in other instances; and hence I have no doubt that the sentence I wish to reconstruct ended with a past participle, or with a "...sus est."

And we may assume, I apprehend, that so brief a sentence as we want can have contained no record of the subjugation of Normandy by Henry I.

Thus we should have some such sentence as this:—"His ergo inter viros compositis, Anselmus iter Angliam remeandi

¹ It scarcely fills nineteen lines as printed. This is as it should be, for my attempted restorations are comprised in forty-eight, not forty-nine, lines to the leaf.

ingressus est, et Dofris appulsus in sedem suam reversus est.”

But this is too short.

What we want is some such sentence as this in $3\frac{1}{2}$ lines:—

“His ergo inter viros compositis, Anselmus iter Angliam remeandi ingressus est, et Dofris appulsus cum magno sanctæ ecclesiæ gaudio et honore¹ in sedem suam reversus est.”

Amplification XXIX. John of Salisbury's Evidence. The next batch of text that awaits our inspection begins with “Adunatis autem” on MS. p. 219, and ends with “concilio Lundeniensi” on p. 223. It contains $110\frac{1}{2}$ lines.

1. The first $20\frac{1}{2}$ lines might possibly pass for early work, were it not that William of Malmesbury seems to have been profoundly ignorant of that errand to the Pope in 1107 which they record; nor does John of Salisbury seem to have known anything about it. And when we examine the account we find that very repetition of thought and phrase which so often indicates the introduction of new work:—“dilata est ecclesiarum ordinatio,” and “rex itaque omnia...distulit².”

2. We next find the “De presbyterorum filiis,” a letter which, in accordance with all previous documents of the kind, must be eliminated; and, 3, after it, that new account of the settlement of which mention has already been made.

4. We have seen that on MS. p. 227, Eadmer quotes St Anselm's “Non debeo tacere” in justification of some account which he had given of the settlement of 1107. Discredit, as it

¹ See *Vita* II. lxi. “magno sanctæ ecclesiæ gaudio et honore,” and John of Salisbury's *Vita* 1034 A “ad suam (scil. sedem) cum honore et gloria remeavit.” When John of Salisbury (*Becket Memorials*, Rolls edition, VII. 396) writing to the Christ Church monks, says that the *Historia Novorum* describes their predecessors as having gone forth to meet St Anselm on his return from one or other exile, he is really quoting, not Eadmer, but himself. See his *Vita*, 1031 c.

² The repetition, too, of “rex,” the subject of the preceding sentence, is curious; the more so as in the sentence itself we have just had “ejus” for the King.

would seem, had been thrown on that account, something too being said concerning the Count of Meulan which Eadmer wished to contradict, notwithstanding all the severe things which he himself had said about him. The culprit, as in other instances, was William of Malmesbury. This is to say:—After Eadmer's story had been before the world for nearly a quarter of a century, an account was published which differed from it, namely this:—"Investituram anuli et baculi indulsit in perpetuum, retento tamen electionis et regalium privilegio" (*G. R.* § 417). What, then, can Eadmer have said about the election of prelates, that this of William's about the privilege of election and the regalia can have conflicted with it? Of course, the "Non debeo tacere" must be supposed to give the hint; and when we examine that document we find that it represents the King as electing prelates in conformity, not with his own caprice, but with the advice of men of religion. That is to say:—Eadmer, who in 1111 had represented Henry as a pious prince clerically guided in the election of prelates, quarrelled in, or about, 1136 with William of Malmesbury, who now represented that sovereign as having been a stickler for royal privilege in the disposition of great preferments. Eadmer's account in 1111 must have been that Henry claimed nothing as of privilege and followed as he was led. This, in general outline at least; this, or something equivalent to, or reconcilable with, what he in 1112 or 1113 wrote in the *Vita* (II. lxiii):—"non per se elegit personas in regimen ecclesiarum."

5. Now, then, let us turn to John of Salisbury. That author says (cxix. 1034 B) "neque aliquid vindicante in electionibus nisi assensum qualem sacri canones non excludunt," and "neque enim eligere sibi pro more antiquo usurpans." The second statement being the counterpart of Eadmer's "nec per se elegit" in *Vita*, II. lxiii, I infer that the first is the counterpart of the earliest account in the *Historia*; and I do so, both from the evident congruity of the thing, and also because

it harmonizes with the account suggested by the "Non debeo tacere."

6. The paragraph "Inter ista...promiserat" (MS. pp. 221, 222) cannot have had a place in the first issue; for William of Malmesbury's strangely erroneous account (*G. P.* p. 259) of this business of Archbishop Gerard's must, assuredly, have been written before its appearance.

Amplification XXX. 7. Here, however, a very curious fact starts into view. On looking back from the word "destitutæ" on MS. p. 221 to the initial "Inter hæc" on p. 220, we perceive that in the midst of the batch of text which we are examining there is another, comprised in 48½ lines and complete in itself, newer work in new, as was Amplification IV. in III. and XV. in XIV.¹

8. As, however, the extant account of the settlement is contained in this newer work; and as, before this was laid in, there must have been an earlier account somewhere; the place of that earlier account is to be sought within the limits of XXIX; and the most probable theory would seem to be that where we now have sixty-two lines ("Adunatis...accepit" in 20½ lines and "Inter ista cœpit...concilio Lundoniensi" in 41½ lines) there were in the first instance thirteen, containing a statement from which John of Salisbury has borrowed the former half of his dual account.

9. There is no reason whatever for believing that the first of John of Salisbury's statements was not taken from an early copy of the *Historia*, and there is good reason to believe that it was. And when we examine that statement we find in it the following peculiarities:—

(1) It says, "Cum autem...rex et archiepiscopus convenissent," the "archiepiscopus" being not in the style of Eadmer, who would have preferred "Anselmus."

¹ Forty-eight and a half, not forty-nine, is the average number of lines for the additions to Book IV. I shall discuss this subject on an early page. See below, p. 277.

(2) The very phrase "Cum autem rex et archiepiscopus convenissent" occurs in the anonymous life of St Anselm, which Ralph de Diceto has incorporated into his *Abbreviationes Chronicorum*.

(3) So, too, does the word "triumphus," in the phrase "victoriosissimum reportasset triumphum."

The most probable conclusion, therefore, at which I can arrive is that Eadmer, basing his first account on a statement used by the anonymous biographer, wrote in words identical, or nearly identical, with those which we now find in John of Salisbury; and that it was followed up by the sentence "Quibus ita...destitutæ" as on MS. p. 221, with the sole exception that the word "diu" was not to be found before "viduatæ." Thus:—"Cum ergo in Kalendis Augusti rex et archiepiscopus Lundoniæ apud palatium regis convenissent, triumphus ecclesiæ omnibus patuit, rege investituræ ecclesiarum palam cedente et concedente archiepiscopo, neque aliquid vindicante in electionibus nisi assensum qualem sacri canones non excludunt." This, or something like it; and then, something like this—"Quibus ita dispositis pene omnibus ecclesiis Angliæ quæ suis erant pastoribus viduatæ per consilium Anselmi ac procerum regni sine omni virgæ pastoralis aut anuli investitura patres a rege sunt instituti. Instituti quoque sunt ibidem et eodem tempore ab ipso rege quidam ad regimen quarundam ecclesiarum Normanniæ, quæ similiter suis erant patribus destitutæ."

The history of the subsequent changes will be more properly and more conveniently considered in a supplementary note to the present essay.

Amplification XXXIII. The fourth batch of text that awaits attention, "Inter ista...velut adulteræ" (MS. pp. 228—232), contains three passages that look like new work. The paragraphs "Inter ista...deterrebat" and "Item moneta...agebat" relate to subjects foreign to Eadmer's first design; and whilst both this latter and the passage, "Quod incontinentiæ

crimen...velut. adulteræ" have the King for their subject, there lies between them a paragraph "Divina...habebant" the subject of which is not the King, but Anselm; and that without any mention of his name or any pretence of grammatical propriety¹. I think, therefore, that "Inter ista...deterrebat," "Item moneta...agebat" and "Quod incontinentiæ...adulteræ" are new work. They have the aggregate content of 98 lines.

Here, as in the case of the *criniti* on p. 55, a chronological question suggests itself. If Eadmer's account of the King's severity against the moneyers be late work, it may not follow, as of necessity, that any such measures as are here described were taken in the year 1108. The paragraph may really have reference not to that year, but to the terrible and famous 1125².

Amplification XXXVI. The passage "Notæ tamen...tene-
rent," on pp. 247, 248, in the last batch of text that awaits us must, I think, rank as late work. The fact that it contains a letter raises a presumption in favour of this view; but, on the other hand, the presence of that letter in John of Salisbury suggests caution.

1. John of Salisbury gives no other letter besides this, the "Tibi, Thoma;" but he does refer (1032 B) to the "Fraternitatis tuæ" of Paschal II. So far, however, is he from suggesting that he had seen the "Fraternitatis tuæ" in Eadmer that he speaks of the original as lying at Canterbury and leaves us to infer that he had seen it there. Similarly, he may have

¹ A similar instance occurs in Amplification XVI. Here, however, I may take occasion to say that when I endeavour to reconstruct the final leaf of Eadmer's pristine work it will be necessary to omit, as a marginal addition, so much of the passage "Divina...non habebant" as relates to inserted work. See above, p. 227.

² See Henry of Huntingdon (Rolls edition) p. 246. The chronology of Eadmer's literary career may also be affected by this. I refer to the erasures and marginal additions on p. 137 of MS. C.C.C. 371 in his *Life of St Dunstan*. See *Preface*, p. lxxxii.

seen the "Tibi, Thoma," copies of which had been deposited in every cathedral church in England, or, at any rate, in every cathedral church of the southern province, either at Canterbury or elsewhere; not necessarily in his copy of the *Historia*.

2. William of Malmesbury gives us the "Tibi, Thoma" in the third book of the *Gesta Pontificum*, introducing it thus,— "Scripsit Thomæ *epistolam* quam etiam omnibus *episcopis Angliæ singulam singulis cum suo sigillo* misit, ut scirent qualiter *se erga Thomam* agere deberent" (p. 260). Eadmer says, "Hanc *epistolam omnibus episcopis Angliæ singulam singulis cum suo sigillo* direxit unicuique mandans atque præcipiens...ut secundum quod in illa scriptum erat *se erga ipsum Thomam* deinceps tenerent." Here, as in other instances, we have the same words in either author; here, as in other instances, Eadmer's account where it diverges from William's carries off the palm for accuracy; here, if those other instances may guide us, it was Eadmer who followed William, not William who followed Eadmer.

Neglecting for a moment the paragraph "Post hæc...septuagesimo sexto," the greater part of which must be old work, I have no hesitation in saying that the next following paragraph, "Itaque post hæc...præceptum acceperat," is comparatively new.

All, again, is new till we reach the words "cenam meam" on MS. p. 257, and, a few lines further on, "fini addicam."

We next come upon a distinct insertion in 49 lines, "Prius tamen...Decembris," and then follows the doxology in 4½ lines.

Amplification XXXVII. I think I shall consult the convenience of my readers if I say at once the little there is to say on the passage "Prius tamen...Decembris" on MS. pp. 258, 259¹. Clearly it is a distinct amplification. But I cannot per-

¹ The very remarkable difference between William of Malmesbury's account (*G. P.* p. 259) of the papal letter "Quanquam prave" and Eadmer's account of the same document invites the inference that Amplification xxxvii. was introduced into the work, after the completion of *G. P.* iii, and at an earlier date than xxxvi.

suade myself that its introduction was accompanied by any disturbance whatever of the context. Still, its real textual content is 48, not 49, lines; for although, as a matter of fact, it occupies forty-nine lines in the C. C. C. exemplar, the scribe has evidently at this part of the work spaced out his writing to the aggregate extent of a line, in order, I presume, to begin Book V. on a fresh leaf. There can be no question that this batch of new work is an insertion (γ) of 48 lines.

In so minute a matter it would not, I think, be fair to press either a single amalgamation (α) or a single graft (β) into the service of an argument; but the case is different with single additions which lie clear-cut in the work. On comparing, then, the List of Amplifications for Book IV. with the corresponding Chronological Synopsis, I find that the only insertions (γ) which fall below the figure of $48\frac{1}{2}$ lines to the leaf are XXV, XXVI, the present instance (XXXVII), and another to be discussed presently (XXXVI); and that all of them were added in or after the year 1141.

But since we have chronologically determined groups large enough to be consulted on a question of average, it seems right, now that a chronological reason suggests itself for the dwindling of a leaf from forty-nine lines of content to forty-eight, to enquire what evidence those groups have to offer¹. The result is as follows:

In Group A	the average content of a leaf is	$49\frac{1}{5}$
" B	" "	$49\frac{1}{288}$
" C	" "	$48\frac{41}{48}$
" D	" "	$48\frac{3}{4}$
" E	" "	$48\frac{37}{72}$

¹ Group F is out of the argument, for its chronological relation to the others cannot at present be determined; and, even if this difficulty were surmounted, its evidence would be of inconsiderable value, for it is composed of only two constituents.

Amplification XXXVI. (continued). I now revert to the addition which has evidently absorbed into itself Eadmer's earlier account of the death of his master and carried off the concluding doxology to a distance of some hundreds of lines. I wish to precipitate from it (if I may employ the phrase) so much of old work as it holds in solution; and, observing that it belongs to Group H, the leaves of whose constituents may be assumed to have the textual value of 48 lines, or thereabout, I proceed as follows:

We have independently of "Prius tamen... Decembris," ($345\frac{1}{2} - 49 =$) $296\frac{1}{2}$ lines with which to deal. Eight and a half of them, leaving a residue of ($6 \times 48 =$) 288 lines, may fairly be reckoned as old work; and are to be sought for in "Inter hæc... fiebat," "Post hæc... sexto," and "Hinc igitur... Amen." Thus:—

"Inter hæc languor qui corpus patris Anselmi graviter affligebat gravior sibi ipsi de die in diem fiebat. Post hæc xi. Kal. Maii defunctus est Cantuariæ in metropoli sede gloriosus pater Anselmus, et die sequenti, qui fuit Cena Domini, in majori ecclesia ad caput venerandæ memoriæ Lanfranci prædecessoris sui, honorifice sepultus anno Incarnati Verbi millesimo centesimo nono, regni vero Henrici gloriosi regis Anglorum nono, pontificatus autem ipsius Anselmi sexto decimo, ætatis vero septuagesimo sexto. Hinc igitur et in omni opere laudetur ipse et benedicatur qui, idem in se manens, innovat omnia, transfert regna, et quem vult super illa constituit, vivens et regnans ante et ultra omnia sæcula Deus. Amen."

From all this we must eliminate (1) "patris" and "gloriosus pater Anselmus," phrases which Eadmer did not employ for many years after his master's death; (2) "ad caput... prædecessoris sui," which would seem to be borrowed from William of Malmesbury (*G. P.* p. 121); (3) "regni vero... Anglorum nono;" and (4), for the reasons given in my *Preface* (p. lviii), "idem in se manens.. illa constituit."

§ 16. TECHNICAL LAPSES IN THE SECOND PORTION OF BOOK IV.

When I fixed upon "posse putamus" on MS. p. 204 as a convenient resting-place in our enquiry, I hoped that I had got clear of the region of technical lapses; but I was mistaken. My hope was grounded on the fact that the last sixty-five pages of Book IV. (MS. pp. 194—259) evidently contained very little old work and that most of the amplifications fell under the category of insertions (γ), being passages laid in without any disturbance of context. But scarcely had I started on my new journey when I found an instance in Amplification XXVII; whilst XXVIII. was found to have the sort of peculiarity which had been found in XVI.¹

But when we come to XXIX, we find enough to raise a very strong presumption indeed that there has been some active manipulation of text in the twenty lines that intervene between "Adunatis autem" on MS. p. 219 and "accepit" on p. 220. Within these limits we have "dilata est," "distulit", and "dilatum est," one and the same verb used three times and of as many different subjects, first an election of bishops, then the whole business, then an assembly. And, further, within these limits the word "concilium" occurs twice, first of an ecclesiastical council convened by the Pope and then of a national council summoned by the King. And, yet again, we are assured with the tell-tale "ut diximus" we have so often met that this latter council had been deferred from an earlier date; but on looking back are left to guess what it is to which this "ut diximus" alludes.

Here then is a passage to which we shall have to recur on an early occasion.

In XXXVI, too, we have "gloriosus" "gloriosus" and "vero" "vero," repetitions which Eadmer would instinctively,

¹ See above, p. 270.

I should rather say unconsciously, have avoided in a passage that was entirely new.

§ 17. RECONSTRUCTION OF THE PRIMARY NUCLEUS OF THE SECOND PORTION OF BOOK IV.

The following is as correct an approximation as I can make to the contents of the eleventh and last leaf of the third book of the *Historia Novorum* as originally written :—

“Reversis itaque nunciis qui Romam missi fuerant et enarratis quæ de sæpéfato negotio apud Romanum pontificem acta fuerant, rex lætus ad audita illicò Anselmum ad ecclesiam suam redire per Willelmum postulavit¹. Cui cum ille promptus adquiesceret et iter aggressus Gemmeticum veniret infirmitate ne iter expleret iubi detentus est. Qua sopita Beccum revertitur, regem Angliæ transfretaturum ibi præstolaturus. Ubi, omnibus mira alacritate de reditu ejus exultantibus, ecce lacrimabile malum concussit atque subvertit gaudium ipsum ; nam tam gravis infirmitas iteram invasit Anselmum ut de eo præter mortem nihil expectaremus. Sed omnipotens Deus ipsum præter omnium opinionem sanitati restituit et multos magno exinde gaudio lætificavit. Dehinc in Assumptione Beatae Dei Genitricis et perpetuæ Virginis Mariæ rex Beccum venit, et omnia quæ inter se et Anselmum de sæpéfato negotio resederant delevit, atque de singulis ad quæ tendebat suæ illum voluntatis compotem fecit². His ergo inter viros compositis, Anselmus iter Angliam remeandi ingressus est, et Dofris appulsus cum magno sanctæ ecclesiæ gaudio et honore in sedem suam³ reversus est⁴. Cum ergo in Kalendis Augusti rex et archiepiscopus Lundoniæ apud palatium regis convenissent, triumphus ecclesiæ omnibus patuit, rege inves-

¹ See MS. pp. 209, 214. Here was the catchmark to Amplification xxvii.

² “Cui cum...comptem fecit.” Portions of this erased for accommodation of latter part of xxvii. See *Vita* II. lvii. Here was the catchmark to xxviii.

³ “Dofris...suam,” erased for conclusion of xxviii.

⁴ Catchmark to xxix.

tituram ecclesiarum palam cedente et concedente archiepiscopo, neque aliquid vindicante in electionibus nisi solum assensum qualem sacri canones non excludunt¹. Quibus ita dispositis, pene omnibus ecclesiis Angliæ quæ suis erant pastoribus viduatæ per consilium Anselmi ac procerum regni sine omni virgæ pastoralis aut anuli investitura patres a rege sunt instituti. Instituti quoque sunt ibidem et eodem tempore ab ipso rege quidam ad regimen quarundam ecclesiarum Normanniæ, quæ similiter erant suis patribus destitutæ². Divina nihilominus officia quoniam indigne per quorundam sacerdotum manus eoque tractabantur instituit Anselmus ut et ipsa suo ritu caste celebrarentur. Multi nempe presbyterorum statuta concilii Londoniensis postponentes suas feminas retinebant, aut certe duxerant quas prius non habebant³. Inter hæc languor qui corpus Anselmi graviter affligebat gravior sibi de die in diem fiebat⁴. Ipse autem xi. Kal. Maii defunctus est Cantuariæ in metropoli sede, et die sequenti, quæ fuit Cena Domini, in majori ecclesia honorifice sepultus, anno Incarnati Verbi millesimo centesimo nono, sui autem pontificatus sexto, decimo, ætatis vero septuagesimo sexto⁵. Hinc igitur et in omni opere suo laudetur ipse et benedicatur qui vivit et regnat ante et ultra omnia sæcula Deus. AMEN. EXPLICIT HISTORIA.”

§ 18. CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY OF BOOK IV.

Starting, then, upon the assumption that the first book of the *Gesta Pontificum* was issued in the year 1136, I infer that the year 1137 or 1138 witnessed the completion of Recension B, a recension which raised the number of the leaves of the third portion of Eadmer's great work, already augmented from eleven

¹ See John of Salisbury, 1034 B. Incorporated, probably with changes, into XXIX. See below, p. 295. Here followed XXXII. on one page; XXXI. preceding it at a later date.

² See MS. p. 221. Suppressed on introduction of XXIX, but restored in XXX. Here was the catchmark to XXXIII.

³ As on MS. p. 230. Incorporated into XXXIII.

⁴ Catchmark to XXXVI.

⁵ See MS. p. 248. Incorporated into XXXVI. Here was the catchmark to XXXVII.

to nineteen, from nineteen to the higher figure of twenty-seven; and, further, the abscission of six of these seven and twenty leaves to form the nucleus of Book IV, and the suppression of Amplifications XVIII* and XXX*.

In the year 1138 or 1139 Book IV. was expanded from six leaves to fourteen by the introduction of Amplifications XXI, XXIII, XXVII, XXIX, and XXXIII.

It was natural that Eadmer should at length tire of those nice but tedious devices for amplifying his narrative, which must have cost him and his scribe the expenditure of many an hour. Hence his later additions were for the most part mere batches of text on one or more leaves, which might be put in or taken out or changed from one place to another without disturbance of context, expenditure of time, or trial of sight and patience.

I think the account, on MS. pp. 232—234¹, of the erection of the See of Ely, and again, that on p. 254¹ of the translation of Bishop Hervé, must have been composed after the appearance of the fourth book of the *Gesta Pontificum*, which probably saw the day in 1140². Besides the more important differences between the two writers, there is a minor divergence. According to William, the council of the realm which was concerned with the erection of the see of Ely met in or after the August of 1108, and at a time when the King was in Normandy³. Eadmer gives it an earlier date.

¹ Amplifications xxxiv. and xxxvi.

² *Gesta Pontificum*, p. 325.

³ His words are, "Habuit ergo hoc cenobium abbates usque ad nonum annum Henrici regis. Tunc enim...consilium habitum est... Intronzatus est ergo ibi Herveus," &c. The ninth year of Henry began in the August of 1108.

Eadmer makes the discussion precede the twenty-ninth of June, 1108.

Henry of Huntingdon (Rolls Edition, p. 237), makes the King cross over to Normandy after the death of Philip I. King of France, and in the eighth year of his own reign. Philip died July 29th, 1108.

To the years 1142 and 1143, or 1143 and 1144, I should be inclined to assign the final recension of Books V. and VI.¹

§ 19. THE FINAL TRANSCRIPTION.

In the year 1143 (or 1144, at any rate) the final transcription of the six books had already begun on gatherings identical, as regards their ruling, with the first quire of MS. C. C. C. 452. In the middle of each page and in a space that measured about $5\frac{1}{2}$ inches by $3\frac{1}{2}$ inches lay four and twenty exquisitely written lines, surrounded by an ample margin, and the content of each page was equivalent to $23\frac{1}{3}$ such lines as throughout this essay I have employed as our standard of measurement².

The Prologue and Book I, comprised in 2009 lines³, filled forty-three leaves ($43 \times 46\frac{2}{3}$).

The original content of Book II. cannot be precisely determined: but its present content is 1584 ($= 34 \times 46\frac{2}{3}$) lines.

The 1423 lines of Book III. have not been increased to the nearest multiple of $46\frac{2}{3}$; for the obvious reason, as it seems to me, that before the scribe had reached that part of his work the silver cord was broken and the golden bowl loosed. This is no fanciful account, for, as I have remarked in another connexion, the C. C. C. copy in its text of Book III. presents

¹ I said in my *Preface* (p. lix) that I did not think Book VI. could have been written before the year 1140 or thereabout. A curious corroboration of this view has since been noticed by me. The verbal (I had almost said the syllabic) resemblance of the words (MS. p. 342) "quibus jubeatur... officii plecteretur" in *H. N.* vi. to William of Malmesbury's "qua jubeatur... officii plecteretur" in *G. P.* III. (p. 266) cannot, assuredly, be accidental. If, therefore, in this case, as in others, Eadmer has borrowed from his rival, *H. N.* vi. is later than *G. P.* III.; later, therefore, in my opinion, at least, than the year 1138 or 1139.

² See facsimile of MS. p. 16.

³ Or, with a slightly abbreviated prologue, as I have suggested, 2006 ($= 43 \times 46\frac{2}{3}$) lines.

no such improvements on MS. A as we find in its text of Books I. and II.¹

§ 20. ADDENDUM ON BOOKS I. AND II.

The only additions to Eadmer's text to which I have not as yet assigned an approximate date are in Books I. and II. When, however, I find that Amplification XXXVII. seems to refer to the Lanfranc memoir as to something recent; when I call to mind the fact that, notwithstanding Eadmer's long and intimate acquaintance with Nicholas, Prior of Worcester, the five consecrations as to which the Worcester chroniclers have not had Eadmer for their guide are consecrations recorded in III. and V, and that IV. is presumably later than III; when I remember that a passage in II. and the whole of VII. seem to have been provoked very late in Eadmer's career, and that William of Malmesbury seems to have written without any knowledge of VIII, I am obliged to infer that none of these additions are of earlier date than Group A in my chronological synopses, and that all of them may be as recent as F, G, or H².

I conclude, therefore, that of the numerous additions hitherto discussed there is not one that can reasonably be assigned to an earlier date than the issue of *G.R.* V, whatever be the date of that event, and that the overwhelming majority were introduced after Anselm had been for nearly thirty years gathered to his fathers.

Whatever, therefore, be the date of Group A, I should say that as late as the year 1136 Eadmer's volume, increased by Amplifications XI, XVII, XVIII, XVIII*, XXX, and XXX*, was comprised in nine quires; thus,—

¹ See *Preface*, p. lxi.

² The Lanfranc memoir was, I think, the first, and Amplification iv. the last of the additions numbered I.—VIII.

An outer leaf	=	1 leaf.
Prologue	=	1 leaf.
Book I.	=	29 leaves.
Book II.	=	22 leaves.
Third Book	=	19 leaves.
		Total 72 leaves.

Amplification A. As early, then, as the year 1136 the work was on leaves having the textual content of forty-nine such lines as I have taken as a standard of measurement. But a quarter of a century had elapsed since the completion of the work as it appeared on its first issue; and the question now arises whether the first, or the second, or the third book had appeared in the very first instance on leaves of this textual content. As to the first book, at least, a negative answer must, I think, be given.

The concluding sentence of the first book, as we now know it, gives us to understand (MS. p. 77) that there was a time when it and, presumably, the prologue formed one volume; it being, I presume, Eadmer's intention to obtain the opinion of his friends upon it pending the further prosecution of his design. This first instalment, therefore, was comprised in a volume of four quires; thus,—

An outer leaf	=	1 leaf.
Prologue	=	1 leaf.
Book I.	=	29 leaves.
An outer leaf	=	1 leaf.
		Total 32 leaves.

Here, then, as throughout his literary career, we find Eadmer true to his instinct of order and neatness. He had his parchment so ruled as that the first instalment of his work should fill precisely the interior leaves of a little volume consisting of an integral number of quaternions. This consideration, and this alone, has given me a clue to the solution of a puzzle which would otherwise have proved intractable.

Immediately before the Lanfranc memoir, and beginning on MS. p. 10, there is a passage of the precise textual content of a leaf of the first gathering of MS. C. C. C. 452¹, as to which there can be no possible doubt that it is inserted work. The construction of its opening sentence, "De quo proelio," &c., and its concluding words, "Ut itaque cœptum peragamus iter, de his satis dictum," are proof sufficient of this; and if further proof be required, we have it in the "adhuc" of the first sentence.

And yet it would be a violation of all reason to attribute this additional matter to the final transcription of all. That transcription was indeed, as I have no doubt, made on quires like the first quire of the C. C. C. exemplar; but the passage I am discussing must have had a place in the parent of the Cottonian copy. And even if this objection could have been fairly evaded, it is so extremely unlikely that participants in the battle of Hastings should have survived till the year 1144, for a young man of nineteen in 1066 would by that time have been ninety-seven years of age; and it is so extremely unlikely that Eadmer should have let four and thirty years elapse before supplying what is, after all, an indispensable key to his record, an account of the Conqueror's four ecclesiastical *consuetudines*:—all this is so unlikely that I am driven to give this addition a date earlier than that of the earliest set of additions made on leaves which we have hitherto recognized as normal units of new work. Can it be possible, then, that the *format* which he ultimately adopted was, after all, the *format* of his very first instalment? Can it be possible that his very first issue of Book I. was written on leaves each of which had the textual capacity of Amplification A; that is to say, on such leaves as form the first gathering of the C. C. C. exemplar? I think it is.

Segregating from the book as it now stands the textual aggregate of Amplifications I.—IV. and also the textual content of "De quo...satis dictum" we have a remainder of

¹ See facsimile of MS: p. 16.

($1960 - 540\frac{7}{4} - 46\frac{2}{3} =$) $1373\frac{1}{4}$ lines, and assuming that Eadmer distributed these over twenty-nine leaves, we get a quotient of $47\frac{1}{3}$ lines for each leaf. This figure is so near to $46\frac{2}{3}$ that I must pursue my quest. It is possible, of course, that two-thirds of a line were at some moment in the lapse of thirty years suppressed by Eadmer in the passage "De quo," &c. and the alternative deserves consideration. But I prefer the other account that lies open to us, and think that we shall reach the truth by keeping to $46\frac{2}{3}$ as the lineal content of each of the original leaves, and making the last of them end at the distance of ($29 \times \frac{2}{3} =$) $19\frac{1}{3}$ lines, or thereabout, before "tædio afficiat." I am happy to say that the word "sedem" in the sentence "His ita gestis," &c. ends, within a minute fraction of an inch, at the distance of $19\frac{1}{3}$ lines short of the stop after "afficiat".¹

If, then, I am right in preferring this alternative, I should say that Eadmer quite early in the career of his work changed the *format* of Book I, and in doing so seized the opportunity of adding the details which we now possess of the banishment of Baldwin and the two clerks and the arrest of the Primate's chamberlain; just as, when quite late in life he made the precisely converse change in Book II, he seized the opportunity of suppressing what he seems to have said about Walter Tirel and adding some very fine reflections on the character of the Red King.

Similarly, I believe that the Prologue had ended with the words "altius ordiendum putamus"; that it was lengthened out to "progrediendum" when our author adopted a slightly ampler leaf; that when reverting at last to the smaller leaf he intended the Prologue once more to end with "altius ordiendum;" that his wish was not obeyed by the scribe; that in

¹ I think, indeed, that there had been a still earlier form of the work, a form without "Regnante in Anglia.....regnum obtinuit" (MS. pp. 3-10), the Prologue being proportionately shorter by the absence of "Fuerunt.....suffecerit" and of "et ab ipsa.....progrediendum."

consequence of this the first quire of his final copy was discarded and replaced by another; and that the discarded quire survives in the C. C. C. exemplar¹.

Amplification IX. I now approach firmer ground and a very interesting subject. The number 1584² is not sufficiently near to a multiple of 49 to allow us to think that it represents the content of Book II. in Eadmer's own working copy. I believe that before the final transcription it contained about $(32 \times 49 =)$ 1568 lines, and that Eadmer availed himself of their incapacity to cover thirty-four leaves of his new volume, to say something new about the death of William Rufus, and add the reflections with which we are all familiar (see MS. p. 132); thus filling 1584 $(= 34 \times 46\frac{10}{17})$ lines.

Our endeavours to recover the suppressed account are not much helped, I regret to say, by John of Salisbury, for here (1031 A, B), as in no other instance, it would almost seem as if he had forsaken his guide. His "adhuc incertum est" is not consistent with a borrowed account, and his "etiam cum ageret in extremis" relates to a time long posterior to Eadmer's earlier days of authorship. Nor can I conjecture whether what he says be a contradiction or an amplification of what he had

¹ See facsimile of MS. p. 16.

² The new work in Book I. fills $(393\frac{1}{3} + 49\frac{1}{8} + 49\frac{1}{4} + 48\frac{1}{2} =)$ 540 $\frac{5}{8}$ lines, leaving, say, $(1960 - 540 =)$ 1420 lines of old work.

For Book I, therefore, the average value of a leaf of old work is, say, $(1420 \div 29 =)$ 48 $\frac{2}{3}$ lines.

The reader has no need to be reminded that the 1960 lines of Book I are a common multiple of 49 and of 46 $\frac{2}{3}$ lines.

In Book II. the new work fills $(147\frac{1}{3} + 147\frac{1}{3} + 97\frac{2}{3} + 99\frac{1}{5} =)$ 491 $\frac{8}{15}$ lines. And if to these we add, for old work, say, $(22 \times 48\frac{1}{2} =)$ or 1077 lines, we have a total of, say, $(492 + 1077, \text{ or})$ 1569 lines.

Whereas, then, at one time there were 1569, there are now 1584 lines of text; and I suspect that all or nearly all of the thirty-six lines that intervene between "Siquidem illa die" and the end of the book is new, having replaced twenty or twenty-one of old.

The average value, in lines, of a leaf of new work in Book II. is $(491\frac{8}{15} \div 10 = 49\frac{23}{50})$ say, 49 $\frac{3}{20}$ lines.

found in Eadmer. It may be that Eadmer had made Walter Tirel the unintentional agent of the king's death, and that his reason for suppressing the account was that Walter had in his own last hours denied all concern with the tragedy.

It must have been either during or soon after this last transcription of the first and second books that Eadmer made such few but important emendations in their text as are brought to light by a comparison of the Cottonian and C. C. C. manuscripts. But these do not concern us at the present moment. The fact on which I just now wish to dwell is, that of all Eadmer's amplifications of his text, the very last seems to have been one in which he, presumably, at least, suppressed his first account of the death of William Rufus.

§ 21. MEMORANDUM ON WILLIAM OF
MALMESBURY.

It is a very remarkable fact that much of Eadmer's new work relates to precisely those details which, having been recorded in the first text of the *Gesta Pontificum*, were afterwards suppressed in the second. The following is a list of instances, certain or probable:—

- Amplification II: see *G. P.* p. 83, n. 4.
- „ VII: see *G. P.* p. 104, n. 1.
- „ IX: see *G. P.* p. 91, n. 4.
- „ X: see *G. P.* p. 104, n. 1, and *G. R.* § 418.
- „ XIII: see *G. P.* p. 121, n. 1.
- „ XV: see *G. P.* p. 109, n. 1.
- „ XIX: see *G. P.* p. 113, nn. 5, 10.
- „ XXII: see *G. P.* p. 114, n. 4.
- „ XXIV: see *G. P.* p. 115, n. 1.
- „ XXXVI: see *G. P.* p. 260, n. 3.

The first of them records the Red King's impious speech to the Bishop of Rochester, which had been suppressed in William of Malmesbury's castigated text; and the third, written with or

after it, contains an allusion to it which must have been provoked by the suppression of an analogous passage a little later on in *G. P. I.* In both of them Eadmer evidently echoes his rival.

The second and fourth are just as remarkable, and the fact that they both refer to one and the same portion of suppressed text invites, if it does not compel, the inference that they were added at one and the same time.

The fifth seems to have been added after the division of the third book into two parts, and the sixth after the introduction of the second group of additions to the former of them.

I am strongly of opinion, therefore, that Eadmer's acquaintance with the first text of the *Gesta Pontificum* was made after, not before, his acquaintance with the second, or castigated, text; and also that the first text of *Gesta Regum* IV, V, was brought under his cognizance at, or about, the same time with the first text of *Gesta Pontificum* I, that is to say, after the year 1137.

When William of Malmesbury died, is not known; but if it be true, as has been conjectured, that he passed away in 1143, it is conceivable that the first text of his two great works may not have been divulged until he was out of harm's reach. I do not, however, think that that was the case. On the contrary, I believe the first text to have been divulged not more than a year or two after the castigated text. When it came to Eadmer's notice I cannot say; nor can I say how, whether in its completeness or a book at a time.

We need not doubt that Amplification XXXVI. was added to the work after the publication of *G. P. III.*; and if I could feel certain that Eadmer's "Notæ rebellionis non immemor," provoked as it seems to have been by William's substitution of "consilio" for "rebellione" (*G. P.* p. 260), was not later work than the remainder of the sentence, I should say that he had read both texts of *G. P. III.* before introducing the addition.

Amplification XIX. seems, in like manner, to contain an animadversion on a slight, but far from unimportant change in *G. P. I.* I refer to Eadmer's "redigi præcepit," words which echo the "redegit" of his rival's first account. The complexion of that account had been quite altered by its author, who, after saying in his first text "Rex ergo fratris sui more omnem ad se archiepiscopatum redegit," said in his second "Rex ergo archiepiscopatum saisivit, propensiori tamen modestia;" and who, after saying in his first text "Misit [Anselmus] litteras regi super veritate dictorum Willelmi exculpanda, *accepitque responsum id regem iussisse*," omitted in his second text the words I have italicized. Nor can we reasonably doubt that Eadmer's "feritas" in Amplification XXII. has been recovered from a cancelled passage in *G. P. I.* and appropriated by our author instead of some such word as "ira."

§ 22. MEMORANDUM ON THE ANONYMOUS LIFE OF ST ANSELM IN RALPH DE DICETO.

The anonymous life of St Anselm which Ralph de Diceto has incorporated into his *Abbreviationes Chronicorum* (Rolls Edition, I. 223—229) would seem to have been written in entire independence of Eadmer; and, indeed, so far from following Eadmer's narrative, it contains much that is inconsistent with the theory that its author can have been in any way indebted to Eadmer for either his facts or his opinions. One of its special uses lies in this, that it confirms the results of a careful study of Eadmer's narration on subjects in the treatment of which Eadmer had not foreseen some grave modern errors¹. But on these I need not now dwell.

¹ The biographer was a man of clear head and precise, perhaps pedantic, diction, firm in his grasp of facts, luminous in his exposition of ideas and principles, and master of the motives that had animated St Anselm. His latinity may possibly afford a clue to his nationality, or some

It informs us that William Rufus, falling ill in the fourth year after the death of Archbishop Lanfranc (i.e. between the summer of 1092 and the summer of 1093) took counsel about the vacant see of Canterbury; and it implies that after the counsel thus taken Anselm was summoned from Normandy. This raises the question whether the King may not have had a serious illness in the summer or autumn of 1092.

It also informs us that the King was not the sole agent in the appointment, and that Anselm's refusal to accept it was subdued by the concurrent votes of all who had a right to share in the business.

It tells us that Anselm was in his sixtieth year on the fifth of December, 1093, whence we are to infer that he was born either in the last weeks of 1033 or in the early months of 1034.

It represents the King's reason for demanding a thousand marks of silver as being this, that he had assented to Anselm's promotion without the interposition of a bribe.

It says, or seems to say, that Anselm having been drawn into a discussion on the subject of the lawfulness of mentioning the Pope's name, the King not having taken the lead, was then and there accused of lese-majesty for doing so.

It hints that certain terms were fixed as the condition of the King's reconciliation with Urban II.

It tells us that Anselm in 1097 left the country with the King's leave, which yet was such an "unleave-like" leave that it deprived him of the hope of return.

Its description of the scene on the beach at Dover reads like that of an eye-witness.

It tells us that at the council held at the Vatican in 1099, not merely was excommunication threatened, but excommunication *ex ipso facto* denounced against both the givers and the recipients of lay investiture, and also against the consecrators of lucky accident may reveal his name. Nothing would surprise me less than to learn that it was Baldwin of Tournay.

such recipients; but it says nothing about the like legislation on homage.

It represents St Anselm's difference with Henry I. as to the right of the prince to invest newly appointed bishops as having arisen in the latter part of 1100 or the beginning of 1101.

It concludes as follows:—

“Bonis itaque suis denuo confiscatis, annus elapsus est et dimidius. Postmodum archiepiscopus a rege rogatus intravit Normanniam. Cum autem Becci rex et archiepiscopus convenissent sub audientia virorum illustrium tanquam in iure professus est rex se nihil iuris vel sibi vel heredibus suis in posterum in ecclesiarum investituris vendicaturum, nec in electionibus faciendis aliquid alium quam solum assensum sicut sacrorum canonum censura præscribit. Quibus in hunc modum pacificatis, est regressus in Angliam archiepiscopus, ubi dum in causa Dei, dum in causa matris ecclesiæ victoriosissimum reportasset triumphum, in bona quiete consenuit.”

Now, notwithstanding the author's evident independence of Eadmer, this account of the reconciliation is substantially, and almost verbally, the same as that which, preserved in John of Salisbury, it is to be presumed figured in the first issue of the *Historia Novorum*.

The simplest theory is perhaps the true one:—

1. That both Eadmer and the anonymous writer made use of a draft or memorandum of the terms of the reconciliation at Le Bec in 1106 on the “*sæpefatum negotium*” of investiture; the subjects of domestic and personal interest, which formed a separate group, not being mentioned in it.

2. That the anonymous writer gave the terms their proper assignation; but

3. That Eadmer, misapplying them, set them down as the terms of the settlement at Westminster in 1107; and

4. That Eadmer, questioned as to his accuracy, appealed to the “*Non debeo tacere*,” and letting his account remain, perhaps

unaltered, perhaps partially recast, introduced Amplification XXXII. (MS. pp. 226-228) in justification of it.

5. That William of Malmesbury in the *Gesta Regum* (§ 417) gave, perhaps purposely, an account, which, referring to a decision of the King's before the August of 1107, and yet making no mention of Le Bec or the August of 1106, was quite unimpeachable; namely this, that the King gave up for ever investiture by ring and crosier, retaining only the privilege of election and the regalia, meaning by regalia the clerical homage, or rather the fealty, which had now for many years been in vogue when he wrote.

6. That in the *Gesta Pontificum*, knowing or believing William of Veraval and Baldwin of Tournay to have arranged with the Pope the terms of the settlement, but supposing them to have done so as early as the spring of 1106, he turned to the "Quod Anglici regis," which was written at that time, that he might borrow his phraseology from it; and that this is the reason why the *Gesta Pontificum*, unlike the *Gesta Regum*, makes no mention of "privilegium electionis" or of "privilegium regaliū," but only, instead of the latter, of "homagia de electis." Still, he does not give the letter as his authority; on the contrary, he makes no mention of it, and his account taken as it stands, may be, and no doubt is, correct enough.

7. That Eadmer was safe enough in so far as he merely copied the *Gesta Pontificum*; but that he erred deplorably in saying that the terms of the settlement had been laid down, specifically, in the "Quod Anglici regis;" for that letter, written a year before the last embassy, and more than a year before the settlement, had granted a concession which concerned homage proper and was meant to be but temporary.

§ 23. MEMORANDUM ON EADMER'S ACCOUNT OF
THE SETTLEMENT OF 1107.

John of Salisbury, whose account coincides very remarkably with that of the anonymous author in Ralph de Diceto, says of the settlement of 1107:—

“Cum autem in Kalendis Augusti rex et archiepiscopus convenissent, triumphus ecclesiæ omnibus patuit, rege investituram ecclesiarum palam cedente et concedente archiepiscopo, nec aliquid vindicante in electionibus nisi assensum qualem sacri canones non excludunt. Neque enim eligere nec virga pastorali investire sibi pro more antiquo usurpans, procedere permisit in dispositione ecclesiarum canonicas sententias.” (cxix. 1034 B).

I think that I am entitled to assume that the first of these two statements concerning the settlement of 1107 was taken from that copy of the *Historia Novorum* which he used for his *Life of St Anselm*, and the other from Eadmer's *Vita*. I proceed then as follows:—

Eadmer's first account in the *Historia* was, I apprehend, to this effect:—

(A₁) “Cum ergo in Kalendis Augusti rex et archiepiscopus Lundoniæ apud palatium regis convenissent, triumphus ecclesiæ omnibus patuit, rege investituram ecclesiarum palam cedente et concedente archiepiscopo, nec aliquid vindicante in electionibus nisi solum assensum qualem sacri canones non excludunt. Quibus ita... destitutæ.”

This was written in or about 1111. In or about 1113 he wrote in the *Vita* as follows:—

(A₂) “Eo tempore, adunatis in palatio regis Lundoniæ cunctis primoribus Angliæ, victoriam de libertate ecclesiæ pro qua diu laboraverat Anselmus adeptus est. Rex enim, antecessorum suorum usu relicto, nec personas quæ in regimen ecclesiarum sumebantur per se elegit, nec eas per dationem virgæ pastoralis ecclesiis quibus præficiantur investivit.”

But when, informed by a series of episcopal and abbatial appointments, Eadmer was at last convinced that, though the King never touched a crozier, he, as a matter of fact, if not of form, did elect "per se," he qualified A_2 by a "quodam modo" introduced between "Anselmus" and "adeptus est"¹.

Whether he made any early change in A_1 it would be vain to speculate. But after the appearance of *Gesta Regum V.* he was roused to action in his own defence. The account there given was:—

(B) "Diu ergo et revocare illum et monitionibus apostolicis obsecundare distulit...comitis de Mellento instinctu...Veruntamen rex investituram anuli et baculi indulsit in perpetuum, retento tamen electionis et regalium privilegio" (§ 417).

Laying hands, therefore, but with very inconsiderate haste, on the "Non debeo tacere" which had been written in 1105, and not, as he believed, in or after the August of 1107², he introduced it into his work together with text that raised the aggregate addition (Amplification XXXII.) to the precise content of a leaf. The document contained the words "Rex... investituram ecclesiarum omnino deseruit," and "Rex ipse in personis eligendis nullatenus propria utitur voluntate"; but, immediately after it, Eadmer took care to add "Hanc epistolam iccirco placuit huic operi admiscere ut, ea teste, monstrarem quæ de investituris ecclesiarum dicimus rata esse," remaining eloquently reticent on the King's share in elections³.

Meanwhile, however, *Gesta Pontificum I.* had appeared with this account:—

(C) "Venit igitur rex sullimi tropheo splendidus et triumphali gloria Angliam invectus, investituræque ecclesiarum Anselmo in perpetuum remisit; eodem conce-

¹ See *Preface*, pp. xciv—xcvi.

² See *Preface*, pp. xli—xlvi.

³ Of course the letter had the further merit of contradicting, or seeming to contradict, the rival's account of Robert of Meulan's conduct.

dente ut propter hominum regi factum nullus arceretur
a benedictione. Consecrati ergo sunt," &c. (p. 117).

Eadmer was thus constrained to own, slowly, reluctantly, and with not a little hesitation, that the settlement of 1107 had been concerned with the subject of homage as well as with that of investiture. Taking, therefore, William of Malmesbury for his guide, he re-wrote the second half of A₁ and made a very curious change in the first. He let the words "cedente et concedente archiepiscopo" remain, but, giving a new turn to the sentence, converted "archiepiscopo" into an ablative and made "concedente" agree with it instead of with "rege." Such, at least, is the best theory that I can offer on this confessedly intricate subject.

Eadmer's second account, then, in the *Historia* was, I apprehend, to this effect, compounded of A₁ and C:—

(A₃) "Cum ergo in Kalendis Augusti rex et archiepiscopus Lundoniæ apud palatium regis convenissent, triumphus ecclesiæ omnibus patuit, rege investituram ecclesiarum palam cedente, et concedente archiepiscopo ut nullus in prælationem acceptus pro hominio quod regi faceret consecratione suscepti honoris privaretur. Quibus ita...destitutæ."

Such record was irreprehensible; for, although it gave a prospective application to the terms concerning homage, there was nothing in it, written, as it was, a quarter of a century after the event, to divert the reader's mind from the only right interpretation of which it was susceptible, namely, that, though consecrated prelates might not become the men of the King, prelates elect might do him homage.

But, whatever may have been William of Malmesbury's notion of the character and extent of the concession made to the King (a concession not precluded by the ecclesiastical decrees¹ on homage) his account in the *Gesta Regum* was

¹ The first of them was promulgated at Clermont in 1095. There can, therefore, be no greater mistake than to suppose that when St Anselm in 1093 became the man of the King he was a law-breaker.

followed by a statement which, at any rate, implied that the final settlement had preceded the council of the nation. That statement Eadmer, as I apprehend, believed to be inaccurate¹, and, after careful investigation and enquiry, resolved to correct; and he resolved, by giving particulars (1) about the meeting of the Easter court, (2) about the postponement to Whitsuntide, and (3) about the further postponement to the first of August, to correct it "ad simultatis detegendam confusionem." He, therefore, replaced the first 6 lines of A₃ by a new account in 13½ lines, "Quibus ita...destitutæ" remaining as it was, and then added "Inter hæc...Lundoniensi" in 41½ lines, thus:—

(A₄) "Adunatis autem ad curiam eius in Pascha terræ principibus, dilata est ecclesiarum ordinatio in subsequens festum Pentecostes; sed Anselmo gravi corporis infirmitate correpto, inducias in Kalendas Augusti cœpit. In Kalendis ergo Augusti conventus omnium episcoporum abbatum et procerum regni Lundoniæ in palatio regis factus est, præsentem Anselmo, cui annuit rex et statuit ut ab eo tempore in reliquum nunquam per dationem baculi pastoralis vel anuli quispiam de episcopatu vel abbatia per regem vel quamlibet laicam manum in Anglia investiretur, concedente quoque Anselmo ut nullus in prælationem electus pro hominio quod regi faceret consecratione suscepti honoris privaretur. Quibus ita...destitutæ. Inter ista cœpit...concilio Lundoniensi."

¹ Inaccurate in this respect it certainly was; unless, indeed, we are to say that the account related to the meeting at Le Bec on the Assumption of 1106, and that William of Malmesbury had nothing to say about the settlement of 1107 beyond the words "decisa litigia" as believing that the terms of the pacification in 1106 and of the settlement in 1107 were identical.

William does not tell us what he means by the "privilegium regalium"; probably because his readers had no need to be told, probably, too, because "privilegium" would determine the sense of "regalia." The regalia were not the regalia of a past generation (cf. *G. P.* p. 84, "regalia pro more illius temporis"); they were not, that is to say, the homage known to the Conqueror and the Red King (cf. *G. P.* p. 106, "more antecessorum suorum...hominium"); but the fealty of which he speaks in the *Historia Novella* (cf. §§ 14, 15 and two passages in § 42).

This, of course, was Amplification XXIX. in its first form.

I suspect, however, that before many months had passed Eadmer discovered that, however well deserved this chastisement of the *Gesta Regum* might have been, the *Gesta Pontificum* bore proof of a larger acquaintance than his own with the correspondence of Paschal II. and St Anselm; for William's words "ut propter hominium regi factum nullus arceretur a benedictione" had evidently been suggested by a passage in the pontiff's "Quod Anglici regis," "Siqui vero... etiam si regi hominia fecerint, nequaquam ob hoc a benedictionis munere arceantur¹."

But on making this discovery Eadmer in his agitation omitted to note that William of Malmesbury had not, at any rate, as of necessity, given any other interpretation to the papal concession than an interpretation retrospective from the date of the settlement; he omitted, that is to say, to note that William's "propter hominium regi factum" need not mean more than "on the score of homage already paid." He also omitted to note that even if William had meant his "eodem concedente" &c. to have a prospective application, he had not mentioned the "Quod Anglici regis," and by not mentioning the "Quod Anglici regis" had not forced on the word "hominium" a meaning which for now nearly thirty years it had ceased to hold in the case of men of religion.

Here, then, and now it was that Eadmer committed his very strange blunder. Ambitious to outstrip his predecessor, he followed him to the brink of the precipice, and, instead of stopping, walked on and walked over. For, although his own A₄ implied that Anselm made a prospective, not a retrospective,

¹ "Siqui vero deinceps præter investituras ecclesiarum prælationes assumpserint, etiam si regi hominia fecerint, nequaquam ob hoc a benedictionis munere arceantur, donec per omnipotentis Dei gratiam ad hoc omittendum cor regium tuæ prædicationis imbribus molliatur."

concession (his words being "pro hominio quod regi faceret," not "pro hominio regi facto" or "propter hominium regi factum"), it yet contained no reference to the "Quod Anglici regis," and, containing no reference to the "Quod Anglici regis," invited the inference that the homage meant was not the homage to which churchmen for now nearly thirty years had been strangers.

By this time, too, he had so far rectified his first impressions as to feel sure (i.) that August 1, 1107 was the date, not of the settlement, but of the introductory debate; and also (ii.) that at that debate Anselm had not been present.

To make it clear, therefore, (4) that he was, as well acquainted with the "Quod Anglici regis" as was William of Malmesbury; and further to let the world understand that (5) he knew where the council met and (6) how long its discussions lasted, (7) when Anselm was present and (8) when absent, and (9) what share Anselm had in the business, but (10) prudently taking care to say nothing explicit about Robert of Meulan, he resolved on drawing out the account which now figures in the *Historia Novorum*, devoting a leaf of text to the purpose. In order to fill the leaf he prefaced the account with the "De presbyterorum" and its context in $21\frac{1}{2}$ lines; then came the extant account (A_2) in 20 lines; and then "Quibus ita...destitutæ" in $7\frac{1}{4}$ lines.

Thus was Amplification XXX. formed.

The "In Kalendis...privaretur" of A_4 being thus superseded, and the "Quibus ita...destitutæ" removed to another place, it became necessary to expand the "Adunatis autem...accepit" of A_4 to the compass of 20 lines. Hence the notable peculiarities presented by it, to which attention has already been drawn¹.

Simultaneously with this change he introduced Amplification XXVI, in which we find, smuggled in as if without

¹ See above, p. 271.

a purpose, the "Quod Anglici regis" between two utterly irrelevant digressions.

*Amplification XXX**. I said just now that the "Non debeo tacere" (MS. p. 227) would seem with its context to have been introduced into the work soon after the appearance of *Gesta Regum V*; because it was deemed to throw discredit on William of Malmesbury's account therein set forth, and because it contained phrases that seemed to justify Eadmer's own A_1 and A_2 . The context, however, of the "Non debeo tacere" alludes to a passage now no longer extant, a passage which certainly contained some notice of a papal letter to Robert of Meulan and, presumably, gave the text of that letter. It may have been Paschal's "Nos te in familiaritatem." Be that as it may, the letter has disappeared from the *Historia Novorum*, and with it, no doubt, text which, with the letter, had the value of a single normal leaf. This lost amplification I call *XXX**, for it must have held the place now occupied by *XXX*; and I assign it to the first group of additions. I cannot determine the date of its suppression; but think that it shared the fate of the lost letter of the King's, on the division of the third book into two.

§ 24. CONCLUDING REMARKS.

What I have yet to say shall be said briefly.

I will not, for I need not, expatiate on Eadmer's omission to turn his master's correspondence to account when preparing his first issue of the *Historia Novorum*, or characterize his treatment of it in his declining years; nor is it my present business to compare his merits or his defects in this particular with those of William of Malmesbury.

I will not, for I need not, expatiate on Eadmer's rivalry of

William; or write congratulations of myself on its discovery and elucidation.

I will not, for I need not, expatiate on the differences discernible between the first account and the last account which either author wrote of the final settlement of the great controversy in which Anselm had been engaged; nor can anything I might say deepen the conviction which my readers must, I think, by this time share with me that neither William nor Eadmer possessed authentic documentary evidence of the terms of that settlement.

I will not, for I need not, expatiate on the reticence which marked Eadmer's notices of the reigning sovereign and his confidential advisers¹, as contrasted with his freedom of utterance after they had passed away; or note the lesson of critical caution in the perusal of other authors similarly laid under constraint which that reticence seems calculated to teach.

The Worcester chroniclers seem to have worked on a late edition of Eadmer's work, and would even seem to have known it when it had already received a still larger expansion². But I will not anticipate the labours that await the scholar, whoever he may be, that shall yet give us an adequate edition of the work known by the name of Florence.

There can, I think, be no doubt that the four Groups A, B, C, and F, in my chronological synopses, represent as many several recensions of the work, the first and second of which expanded it from eight quires to nine and ten quires respectively; whilst in C we have a second edition of the new Book IV. which enlarged it from a volume in one quire to a volume in two quires. I cannot feel so certain about D, E, and H; but am inclined to think that, in the last years of his long life, Eadmer did not at stated periods call in the copies of his work

¹ See above, pp. 250, 251, 280, 281.

² I say this on the evidence of unpublished MSS. which I have taken opportunities of consulting.

which had issued from his cloister, but added to them as they happened to be sent back to him for expansion.

One copy, however, seems to have remained as it was; the copy on which John of Salisbury worked nearly twenty years after Eadmer's death. Should that copy ever come to light, it will, I suspect, be found to have lurked somewhere outside our island. Until it shall be discovered, I commend to the frank and generous consideration of scholars my attempt to work back from the *Historia* that is to the *Historia* that once was.

POSTSCRIPT.

Addendum on page 216 (after line 2).

The narrative in the first instance was, in all probability, as follows:—"Hæc Anselmus annuit, dismissaque curia in pace ad sua secessit (as on MS. pp. 137, 138). Exinde cum ad Pascha ventum esset, et qui Romam missi fuerant nondum redissent; usque ad adventum illorum induciæ dilatæ sunt (as on p. 144). Post hæc Anselmus ad curiam regis venire mandatur responsurus de negotio de quo induciæ dilatæ fuerunt" (as on p. 146). This at the introduction of Amplification X was superseded by its textual equivalent, the extant "Hæc Anselmus...ad sua secessit."

Leaf II of the first computation must have ended at or about "Exinde cum."

SYNOPSIS OF THE FOREGOING PAPER.

	PAGE
Introductory	195
§1. Books I. and II.	205
2. First portion of Book III.	213
3. Further survey of the first portion of Book III.	218
4. The second portion of Book III.	223
5. Chronological summary of Book III.	232
6. The original narrative of events from Christmas, 1103, to July, 1105	233
7. On the phrases 'Finierat in istis' and 'O hinc simultatis detecta confusio'	238
8. Final note on Book III.	240
9. The first portion of Book IV.	242
10. Reconstruction of the primary nucleus of the first portion of Book IV.	249
11. On the phrase 'Pro libertate ecclesiæ sicut solebat acturus'	252
12. Technical lapses in Book III. and the first portion of Book IV.	253
13. John of Salisbury on the years 1105-7	256
14. William of Malmesbury on the years 1105-7	259
15. The second portion of Book IV.	267
16. Technical lapses in the second portion of Book IV.	279
17. Reconstruction of the primary nucleus of the second portion of Book IV.	280
18. Chronological summary of Book IV.	281
19. The final transcription	283
20. Addendum on Books I. and II.	284
21. Memorandum on William of Malmesbury	289
22. Memorandum on the anonymous Life of St Anselm in Ralph de Diceto	291
23. Memorandum on Eadmer's account of the settlement of 1107	295
24. Concluding remarks	301