THE HISTORY AND CHARTERS OF INGULFUS CONSIDERED.[1]

By HENRY THOMAS RILEY, M.A., Cambridge.

Part I.

It is a singular coincidence, that the doubt and mystery which have prevailed for the last one hundred and seventy years in reference to the origin of the *History* and Charters of Ingulfus, have been added to, in no small degree, by the misfortunes which, in the last two centuries, have befallen such few early manuscripts of the work as have been known to exist.

The Manuscripts of the *History* of Ingulfus, which we find mentioned by previous writers, are five in number :—

I. The so-called "Autograph" of Abbot Ingulfus, mentioned by Selden in his Notes to *Eadmer* (1623) as then existing at Croyland (or Crowland), in Lincolnshire. He had endeavoured, he tells us, to gain a sight of it, but in vain. Sir Henry Spelman, more fortunate in this respect, did obtain permission to consult the "Autograph"; and from it he has extracted five Chapters of the Laws of William the Conqueror, inserted in Vol. I., p. 623, of his *Concilia* (1639). This manuscript he speaks of as being "very ancient," and preserved by the churchwardens, under three keys, in the church there. It seems to have disappeared about the middle of the seventeenth century, and all traces of it are lost.

II. A Manuscript from which Selden extracted the copy of the Laws of the Conqueror, given in his Notes to *Eadmer;* and which he speaks of as then (A. D. 1623) being apparently two centuries old. It is identical probably with the manuscript mentioned by Camden, in the Dedicatory Epistle to his reprint of Asser (1603), as containing the whole work

[1] Communicated to the Historical Section at the meeting of the Institute in Peterborough, July, 1861. The present Paper is founded, to some extent, on an article by the same hand in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for April, 1857. The opinions, however, there stated as to the possibility of some portions of the History of Ingulfus being genuine, are, on a closer examination, no longer considered tenable.

of Ingulfus and the *Continuation* of Peter of Blois; and is generally supposed to have been the Cottonian Manuscript of Ingulfus, which was totally destroyed in the fire of 1731.

III. A Manuscript formerly belonging to Sir John Marsham; and from which Fulman printed his edition of the *History* of Ingulfus, in Vol. I. of the *Rerum Anglicarum Scriptores Veteres*, Oxford, 1684. In a Letter of Bishop Gibson, preserved in the Ballard Collection in the Bodleian, it is asserted that this manuscript had been borrowed from Sir John Marsham by Obadiah Walker, the Roman Catholic Master of University College, Oxford, and never returned. Be this as it may, it is now neither in the Library of University College nor in the hands of the representatives of Sir J. Marsham; and what has become of it seems to be unknown. It could not have been identical with the so-called "Autograph:" as there are no less than thirty-four variations between its text and that of the Autograph, in the five short Chapters of the Laws of the Conqueror which Spelman has given in the *Concilia*.

IV. The Manuscript from which Sir Henry Savile printed the First Edition of the *History* of Ingulfus, in his *Scriptores post Bedam* (1596). No information is given by Savile in reference to this manuscript, and what has become of it is unknown. It was imperfect however, breaking off immediately before the Laws of the Conqueror, and omitting the latter portion of the *History*.

V. The Arundel Manuscript, No. 178, in the British Museum; written in a hand of the latter part of the sixteenth century. It breaks off at the same point as the manuscript used by Sir Henry Savile, but differs considerably from his text in the spelling of the proper names.

This last—which, as an authority, is of course worthless—is the only manuscript of the *History* of Ingulfus now known to exist.

For several ages the genuineness of the Charters contained in the *History* of Ingulfus seems to have been unsuspected; and from the *Second Continuation* (also printed in Fulman's volume) we learn that on one occasion they were received as evidences of title,—a fact which, under the peculiar circumstances of the case, will be not undeserving of our future consideration. In Gough's Second Appendix to his *History of Croyland* we find a short account of the place, intituled

"*Croyland's Chronicle*, collected and compiled by Sir John Harrington, Knight, a learned lawyer and antiquary, Steward of Croyland, and nephew to the Reverend Father Philip Everard, Abbot there in the time of King Henry VII. and King Henry VIII." This writer makes free use of the Charters as found in Ingulf's *History*, and, though in all probability he may have seen some at least of the so-called originals, seems to have entertained as little doubt as to their genuineness as his predecessors, both lawyers and laymen, had during the preceding century and a half. Dr. Caius, in his learned work upon *The Antiquity of the University of Cambridge* (1568), is the first probably who has quoted Ingulf's *History* as an authority; which he does unsuspectingly, and without reserve.

For many years after the opinions of the learned upon these Charters had been more strongly challenged by the publication of the *History* of Ingulfus, there seems to have been no expression of a suspicion that either the work itself, or the so-called *Charters* inserted in it, were not, what they respectively represented themselves to be, memorials of Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman times. Sir Henry Savile and Fulman, the editors, do not appear to have entertained any doubts on the subject; and these Charters, as well as the Ingulfan version of the *Laws* of William the Conqueror, are unhesitatingly quoted as genuine by Sir Henry Spelman in his *Concilia*, and by Sir William Dugdale in the *Monasticon*. Archbishop Nicolson suggests no doubts in his *British Historical Library*, and Selden and Stillingfleet rely upon the authority of the work with confidence. At the close even of the last century, Gough, the antiquary, though aware of the doubts that were *then* entertained as to the Charters, does not appear to have shared in them, and, in the Second Appendix to his *History of Croyland*, inserts them all as genuine documents; though, somewhat singularly, and, as though doubting his own judgment, while he upholds the genuineness of Ingulf's *History*, he is ready to admit that Ingulf himself may have been sufficiently unscrupulous to be capable of forging the Charters;—"for Ingulf," he says, "does not hesitate to tell us what artifice he used in the return of the property of his house to the surveyors of *Domesday*,—and Ingulf probably, like many others of his rank, produced forged charters to support his claims."

Among the first, if indeed not the very first, to express a doubt on the genuineness of these documents, was the indefatigable Henry Wharton. In his Latin *History of the Bishops and Deans of London and St. Asaph* (London, 1695), he speaks of the Charters of Ethelbald (A.D. 716), Wichtlaf (A.D. 833), Bertulph (A.D. 851), and Beorred (A.D. 868), as almost satisfactorily proved to be fictitious, by certain anachronisms which his research had detected in the respective attestations thereof. He finds, for example, that the Charter of Ethelbald is attested by Wynfrid and Aldwin, Bishops of Mercia and Lichfield; that of Wichtlaf by Godwin, Bishop of Rochester; that of Bertulph by the same Godwin; and that of Beorred by Alcwin, Bishop of Winchester, at times when none of those prelates were filling the sees respectively assigned to them.

From Humphrey Wanley, the antiquary, we learn that doubts were extensively entertained in his time—the earlier part of the eighteenth century—as to the genuineness of these documents. Among the Harleian MSS. there is a letter written by him to Lord Oxford, in which he says—"As to Ingulfus, I humbly beg leave to observe that some learned men do not think the History bearing his name, or at least a great part of it, to be his; and many Charters cited in that book are vehemently suspected to be spurious. One I can particularly mention, the *Foundation Charter* of Croyland Abbey; which was, or seems to have been, taken from one in being, and not much older, if any at all, than Henry the Second's time."

The so-called original, it may be here remarked, of this alleged Foundation Charter was, according to Dean Hickes, in 1705, in the possession of Dr. Thomas Guidot, a physician at Bath; and would appear to have been the same document that is mentioned by Gough (Preface, p. viii.), as being in 1734 the property of Robert Hunter, Esq., lord of the manor of Croyland; in which year it was exhibited before the Society of Antiquaries. It seems not improbable, however, that there was at least one duplicate of this Charter; which, we are told, was kept in a box at Croyland during the seventeenth century, but was afterwards[2] lost. The

[2] It seems quite possible, however, that these two documents may have been identical.

spurious character of this document, formerly known to the learned as the "*Golden Charter*," will be the subject of further notice.

In the passage above quoted, it is not improbable that Wanley alludes to the opinions strongly entertained on this subject by his friend, the learned Hickes. In the First Volume of that writer's *Thesaurus Linguarum Septentrionalium*, he has devoted a considerable portion of the Preface and of his *Dissertatio Epistolaris* to the proof, that these Charters bear strong internal evidence of an origin posterior to the times of our Saxon kings. In p. 62 of the latter treatise, he points out the use in Ethelbald's Charter, A.D. 716 (pp. 2—4 of Fulman's Edition) of the word *leuca*, "a league" (or rather, measure of 1500 paces), it having in reality been introduced, some centuries later, by the Normans. He also instances such suspicious words as *chirographo patenti*, "chirograph patent;" *sewera*, "drain;" *seisonis*, "seasons;" and *libras legalis monetæ*, "pounds of lawful money;" expressions betraying most undoubtedly a Norman, or Gallic, origin. He further remarks upon the mention of the Benedictines as *Nigri Monachi*, "Black Monks," a name by which it is generally supposed they were not then known, in this country at least; and in support of his position refers to the enactments of the Synod of Cloveshoe, A.D. 743, some time after the reign of Ethelbald, in reference to the monastic dress. In the same work, he has given a facsimile of a portion of the *Golden Charter* of Ethelbald, and has called attention to the lateness of the character in which it is written, and the fantastic shapes and elaborate gilding of the crosses, the latter in especial not being in accordance with the Saxon usage. To his list of objections, we may parenthetically remark, Hickes might have added the employment of the phrase *separalis piscaria*, "several fishery," a purely legal term belonging to a date some centuries later than the reign of Ethelbald. The fanciful and varying subscriptions, too, of the attesting witnesses to this charter are such as are never found in charters of so early a date, but only in documents of the early part of the tenth century and upwards. The same remark will also apply to the attestations of the Charters attributed to Offa, A.D. 793 (p. 6), and to Kenulf, King of Mercia, A.D. 806 (pp. 6, 7); which latter is also blemished with such anachronisms as *passagium*, "passage," or "escu-

age," a feudal term; and *miles meus*, "my knight," also an expression of feudal times.

Though not remarked by Hickes, the Charter of Wichtlaf, King of Mercia, A.D. 833 (pp. 8—11), bears equal marks of spuriousness. Like that of Kenulph, it makes mention of Langtoft, Aswyktoft, Badby, Holbecke, and Pyncebek, many years before the terminations "toft," "by," and "beck," had been introduced by Danish settlers into that part of England, (unless indeed we are ready to give our assent to the unsupported assertion of Gaimar, the Trouvère, that the Danes were established and ruling in this country in the reign immediately succeeding King Arthur's day). The words, too, *ballivus*, "a bailiff," and *advocatio*, "an advowson," found in this Charter, are anachronisms; and while the mention in it of Jews in England, dealing in money, at so early a date, is exceedingly suspicious, the varying subscriptions of the attesting witnesses would alone suffice to condemn it. Earl Algar's Charter too, A.D. 810 (p. 95), is proved by the attestations to be fictitious.

In his Preface to the *Thesaurus*, Hickes expresses himself as fully assured that the Charter of Bertulph, A.D. 851 (pp. 12—15), is equally spurious with that of Ethelbald. He objects to the mention in it of "knights," at a time when knighthood did not exist here: of *feudi*, "fees" or "feuds," long before the feudal system was introduced; and to the use of such words as *quarentena*, a lineal measure, a term of purely Norman origin; and *feria*, as meaning a day of the week, a sense in which, in the Saxon Charters, it is but very rarely to be found. By the extravagance, too, of its varying attestations, this Charter is additionally condemned.

The Charter of Beorred (or Burghred), King of Mercia, A.D. 868 (pp. 18—20), is equally proved to be fictitious; as well by the attestations as by the anachronisms involved in the mention of *miles meus*, "my knight"; *manerium*, "a manor," a term first introduced with the feudal system; *feodum*, "a feud" or "fee," and *advocatio*, "an advowson." Of the spurious character of that of Edred (pp. 32—36) we may, with Hickes, feel equally assured. He calls attention to the mention in it of grant of "waif and stray," a purely Norman right; *maneria*, "manors"; *secta in schyris*, "suit of court of shires," a right claimed under the feudal system; *advocatio ecclesiæ*, "advowson of a church"; *affidare suos*

nativos, "to claim on oath one's natives," or "serfs," an expression connected with feudal usages; and *catallis*, "with their chattels," a term introduced by the Normans.

The fictitious character of Edgar's Charter (pp. 42—44) is equally apparent. Hickes has noticed such expressions as *communam pasturæ*, "common of pasture," and *tenentes suos*, "their tenants;" to which, "waif and stray," and *separalis piscaria*, "several piscary," may be added. The mention, too, of the "Triangular Bridge," at Croyland, in the Charters of Edred and Edgar, documents professing to belong to the tenth century, is at least suspicious; as, at the earliest, it was a century later before the pointed arch was introduced into England; and the triangular bridge as it now stands, with its arches of that form, is not of earlier construction than the thirteenth century. It is just possible, however, that a bridge of somewhat similar conformation, as to triangularity, may have preceded it. In these two Charters, also, it deserves remark that Edred and Edgar are styled "kings," not "of the whole of Britain," as in genuine charters of those sovereigns, but "of Great Britain"; many centuries before that title was heard of.

The Ecclesiastical Censure (p. 44), professing to have been composed by Archbishops Dunstan and Osketul, A.D. 966, to ensure the future possession of the lands and property of the Abbey of Croyland, is condemned as fictitious by the mention in it of "archdeacons" and "archidiaconal rights," 110 years before their introduction into this country by Archbishop Lanfranc.

Cnut's short Charter of Confirmation (p. 58) is equally fictitious. The word *restaurator*, "a restorer" is in reality not to be found in use, until probably some centuries later; and goes far toward proving that this Charter, as well as that of Edward the Confessor (p. 64), is a forgery.

In the Charter of Thorold, A.D. 1051 (pp. 86, 87), Hickes remarks upon several words of Norman origin which had led him to consider it equally fictitious with the others; and he decidedly objects to a gift by a Saxon official, in Saxon times, *in liberam eleemosynam*, "in frankalmoigne," a term introduced by the Normans. The common people, too, at this date, had no double names, such being a usage of Norman introduction; and we must regard Thorold's dependants, "Gunter Liniet," "Outy Grimkelson," "Turstan Dubbe,"

"Gouse Gamelson," and "Besi Tuk," as the creatures of an inventive imagination, and no more.

The deeds alleged to have been executed by Abbot Ingulf to Oger the Priest, Simon of Baston, William the Miller, and others (pp. 101—103), are equally spurious; witness the expressions *manerium*, "a manor;" *in feudo* and *in feudum*, "in fee;" *hæredibus et assignatis*, "to his heirs and assigns;" and *sewera*, "a drain," all belonging to a later date.

From the Charters we now turn to the *History* of Ingulfus itself, which Hickes, and several other writers who have condemned the Charters, have been by no means equally ready to condemn as having no pretensions to be considered genuine. We will deal first with the *internal* evidences which it seems to afford of its spuriousness.

The contents of p. 16 are founded solely upon the peculiar language of the ridiculous subscriptions by the attesting witnesses to Bertulph's Charter; and if those subscriptions fall to the ground as forgeries, which they assuredly must, this attempted explanation of them must of necessity fall to the ground as well.

We shall have occasion to shew in the sequel that this History is based, in all probability, upon certain passages in the Fourth Book of the *Ecclesiastical History* of Ordericus Vitalis, who paid a visit to Croyland in the early part of the twelfth century. Vitalis mentions Kenulf, the first Abbot, and then is silent as to any intervening Abbots to the time of Turketul, a distance of about two hundred and thirty years, To fill up this hiatus, four Abbots are named by the compilers of the *History*, three of whose names are introduced into the fictitious Charters as well; and to the rule of these first five Abbots (Kenulf included) a period is allotted of no less than two hundred and thirty-two years. The rule of the next nine Abbots, on the other hand, who are all mentioned by Ordericus Vitalis, occupies but one hundred and sixty-one years, a comparatively rational space of time. Of the first five Abbots, the names of Theodore and Godric are probably borrowed from the *Chronicle* of John of Peterborough, compiled in the fourteenth century.

The story of the Sempects, or five senior monks, dying in the time of King Edgar at the respective ages of 168, 142, 115, and (probably) 120 years, is evidently an account of a coincidence too marvellous not to be fabulous. Vitalis says

that the Abbey was laid waste by Inguar, Guthrum, and other Danish chiefs, and that its possessions fell into the hands of laymen; implying also that it remained in this state of ruin and desolation until the days of King Edred, a period of nearly eighty years. These five venerable personages therefore, there can be little doubt, are an invention of the compilers for the purpose of tiding over the dark period between the ruin of the Abbey by the Danes and the election of Abbot Turketul, A.D. 948; a period as to which, we may conclude from the narrative of Vitalis, there were no historical abbey memorials in existence. To meet this well-known difficulty, as well as the obvious circumstance that no other memorials were likely to exist, relative to the Abbey, between the time of its foundation by Ethelbald, A.D. 716, and its destruction by the Danes, A.D. 870, the writers have created these long-lived Sempects with the express object of placing upon them (pp. 48, 50, and 107), the responsibility of the narrative from the time of the first foundation, until the desolation of the Abbey by the Danes, as is stated in one place (p. 107); or until the fourteenth year of King Edgar, as they say, somewhat seriously contradicting themselves, in another (p. 48).

The Abbey of Croyland is represented (p. 30) as having had the name *Curteys*, "courteous," given to it by reason of the courtesy shown by its inmates to Turketul in the days of King Edred. From other sources, we know that at a later period this monastery really had—in consequence, probably, of its great wealth and its unbounded hospitality—the complimentary epithet of "*Courteous* Croyland" bestowed upon it: but we leave it to the inventors of this clumsy explanation to shew why it should have received a purely French appellation in purely Saxon times.

Turketul, the King's Chancellor, is represented (p. 36) as being the agent through whose advice seven Bishoprics were conferred on one day; whereas, in reality, the Synod at which these prelacies were conferred was held A.D. 905, two years before the date at which, according to Ingulf's own narrative (p. 52), Turketul was born. Dynewulf too, who is represented as the Bishop of Winchester at whose death Turketul refused the see (p. 36), in reality died when Turketul was three years of age. Again, Frithestan, who is styled (p. 36) Turketul's foster-brother (*collactaneus*), is

immediately after made to succeed to the see of Winchester at a period which was two years before the alleged date of Turketul's birth; though in reality he succeeded A.D. 910, three years after the year in which Turketul is here represented to have been born.

Otho I., Emperor of Germany, married Eadgyth, Athelstan's sister, A.D. 924; so that this marriage could not, as represented in the *History* (p. 37), have been *consequent* upon the fame gained by Athelstan at the battle of Brunenburgh, A.D. 937; nor could the[3] Emperor Henry I., as there represented, have sent an embassy to Athelstan *after* that battle, seeing that he died the year before. The statement also (pp. 29, 37) that Constantine, King of Scotland, was slain in the battle of Brunenburgh, is erroneous; it being his son who lost his life there, Constantine himself embracing a monastic life seven years later.

Again, Hugh,[4] "King of the Franks," is named (pp. 38 and 51) as existing A.D. 937. There was no such personage then in existence. Hugh Capet was not crowned until A.D. 987; and the compilers may possibly have been led into the error by mistaking the numerals of the one date for the other.

The alleged exaction of 2000 marks by King Sweyn, within three months, from the Monastery of Croyland (p. 56) is undoubtedly a fable. The amount itself is beyond all belief, as on the same occasion a sum of no more than 48,000 pounds was exacted from the whole of England. The story is founded, there seems reason for supposing, upon the account given by Florence of Worcester of the martyrdom of Archbishop Elphege, by the Danes, upon his refusal to pay an exorbitant sum by way of ransom.

In page 57 we read of a demise of the manor of Baddeby, A.D. 1013 (a period, be it remarked, when manors did not exist in England), for a term of 100 years, at a yearly rent of one peppercorn; the fact being, that a demise for a term

[3] [The History styles him "Emperor of Germany" and "Emperor of the Romans," the latter being a title to which in reality he had no claim. William of Malmesbury (Hist. § 126) calls him "Emperor of Germany."]

[4] [William of Malmesbury, it has been remarked, since the above was written, makes the same mistake (Hist. § 135); but he does not commit the additional error into which the *History* has fallen, of saying that King Hugh sent for Athelstan's sister (Eadhild) for the purpose of giving her in marriage to his son; whereas, in reality, Hugh "Duke of the Franks," married her himself, and that, eleven years before the battle of Brunenburgh was fought.]

of years was unknown in England before the Conquest, and a reservation of a peppercorn rent a thing equally unheard of. Another singular circumstance, too, is the assertion (p. 57) that through the agency of Earl Leofric, the manor of Baddeby had come into the hands of the Abbey of Evesham, "and is still retained by it, *though the term has expired*"; the fact being, that the *History* purports to have been written A.D. 1091, 2, or 3; and that Abbot Ingulf died A.D. 1109, four years before A.D. 1113, the end of the term of 100 years. On the other hand again, in page 85 we find it stated that there are still *twenty years of the lease* to run, and an attempt is made to explain why the manor is described in Domesday as still being in the actual possession of the monks of Croyland. In the so-called *First Continuation* of Ingulf's *History*, attributed to Peter of Blois, we find an account of the unsuccessful attempts made by Abbot Geoffrey, Ingulf's successor, to recover the manor of Baddeby shortly after the expiration of the 100 years. The purpose may perhaps be divined for which these clumsy forgeries about this locality were fabricated, but the real facts of the case will probably remain for ever unknown.

The account of Abbot Turketul (attributed to Abbot Egelric the Younger in page 107, but apparently to the Sempects in page 48) bears abundant marks of a fanciful and spurious origin. It is founded, there can be little doubt, on the comparatively meagre narrative of Vitalis, who mentions Turketul as merely a clerk, and of the royal race. In the present narrative, however, he is expanded into King Edred's Chancellor; an officer who, as the late Sir Francis Palgrave has remarked (vol. xxxiv., of the *Quarterly Review*), "if he did exist among the other officers of the Anglo-Saxon Court, was nothing more than a notary or scribe, entirely destitute of the high authority which Ingulf bestows upon him." With the same writer, we must of necessity agree in rejecting the puerile account (p. 37) of Turketul's prowess at the Battle of Brunenburgh. A story, which relates how that he penetrated the hostile ranks, struck down the enemy right and left, and, amid torrents of blood, reached the king of the Scots; and then immediately stultifies itself by telling us, that in after-times, when he had assumed the monastic garb, he "esteemed himself happy and fortunate in that he had never slain a man, nor even wounded one," surely

cannot have been penned by a person who really knew anything about Turketul, and is evidently deserving of no serious attention from any one in possession of his senses. The whole story of the birth, education, promotion, fortunes, and deeds of Abbot Ingulf, there can be little doubt, with the exception of the slight foundation afforded by the pages of Vitalis, is as unsubstantial and fictitious as the narrative in reference to Turketul. "The passage respecting the education of Ingulfus (at Oxford)," remarks Sir F. Palgrave, "long since roused the suspicion of Gibbon, and it still remains to be proved that Aristotle formed part of the course of education at the University of Oxford at a time when his works were studied in no part of Christendom." It seems not improbable that this story of Ingulf's education at Oxford owes its existence to the fact, of the *History* having been compiled at a period when the scholastic dispute began to run high in reference to the comparative antiquity of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

In narrating the particulars of his journey to the East, Ingulf tells us that he first visited the court of Alexius, Emperor of Constantinople, and immediately afterwards was welcomed by Sophronius, the Patriarch of Jerusalem (p. 74). These assertions are quite irreconcileable; for Sophronius died A.D. 1059, and the first Emperor named "Alexius" did not ascend the throne until A.D. 1081.

Radulph, or Ralph, Earl of Hereford, was the *son* of Goda, sister of Edward the Confessor; whereas the compilers of the present narrative (p. 67) represent him as being her husband, a mistake which a contemporary certainly would not have made.

The stories told (pp. 70, 98) as to the Saxon mode of signing charters with golden crosses, and decorating them with paintings of a splendid and costly description, is utterly unfounded; and there can be little doubt that, in the real ignorance of the forgers as to the Saxon usage, they were penned with the view of supporting the Croyland Charters when the so-called originals should come to be proffered in court. The remarks of Sir F. Palgrave on this subject are much to the purpose: "It is familiarly known," he says, "that the Anglo-Saxons confirmed their deeds by subscribing the sign of the Cross, and that the Charters themselves are fairly, but plainly, engrossed on parchment. But instead of

imitating these unostentatious instruments, the elaborate forgers often endeavoured to obtain respect for their fabrications by investing them with as much splendour as possible; and those grand crosses of vermilion and azure which dazzled the eyes and deceived the judgment of the Court when produced before a bench of simple and unsuspecting lawyers, now reveal the secret fraud to the lynx-eyed antiquary. The Charter of Ethelbald, called the '*Golden Charter*,' bears the impress of falsity."

Vitalis tells us that Abbot Ingulf ruled the monastery twenty-four years, and that his successor Geoffrey was appointed A.D. 1109; thus making the year of Ingulf's nomination to be A.D. 1085. In the present narrative, on the other hand, Ingulf makes himself to have been appointed Abbot immediately on the deposition of Abbot Wulketul; an event which took place A.D. 1075 (pp. 73, 79, 94), ten years in fact before the date given by Vitalis. The earlier date, however, is assigned to Ingulf's nomination in the Peterborough Chronicle, already mentioned. A very suspicious fact, too, is the assertion that, on his deposition in 1075, Abbot Wulketul was placed in the custody (p. 73) of Thurstan, the Norman "Abbot of Glastonbury;" while in reality, as we learn from William of Malmesbury's *Antiquities of Glastonbury*, Thurstan (or Turstin) did not receive that appointment until A.D. 1081.

The alleged sitting (p. 77) of the "King's Justiciars" at Stamford A.D. 1075, for the trial of causes, is an anachronism. Such a thing was unheard of until about a century later, at the earliest.

The assertion is risked (pp. 79, 80) that King Alfred had compiled a roll, very similar to *Domesday*, the whole country being marked out in it by counties, hundreds, and tithings. In reference to this passage Sir Henry Ellis has remarked (*General Introd. to Domesday*, vol. i. p. 1, ed. 1833), that the formation of such a survey in the time of Alfred may be more than doubted, as we have not a solitary authority for its existence; and the most diligent investigation has not been able to discover, among the records either of Saxon or of later times, the slightest indication that such a survey was ever known. The separation into counties is also known to have taken place long before the days of Alfred. Had the writer too of Ingulf's *History* really been a Norman

monk, he would never have fallen into the error of asserting (p. 82) that the French *leuca* at the time of the Conquest was equal to two English miles ; the fact being that it only contained twelve furlongs, or one English mile and a half.

As to the assertion risked also (p. 83) that "Philip" was a *very common* name in France in the eleventh century, Du Cange has remarked (*Glossary, s. v. Philippi*) that, so far from such being the case, the name is scarcely ever to be found before the time of Henry I. of France, who was contemporary with Ingulf.

Mention is again made (p. 95) of the "King's Justices in the County," meaning, to all appearance, sitting in Eyre; and this about a century, as already noticed, before the sittings in Eyre were instituted.

In p. 104 we find the double names, "Harald Gower" and "Roller Quater," represented as belonging to dependents of the convent; at a period, in fact, when as yet double names were not given to persons of that class.

The *vicarius*, or "vicar," of Wedlongburc, is mentioned A.D. 1091 (p. 105) ; whereas, in reality, vicars of churches were unknown here until about a century after that date.

Another and most convincing proof of the spurious character of this History, is afforded through the agency of the copy of the Laws of William the Conqueror which it professes to give. Selden, in his Notes to *Eadmer* (published A.D. 1623), has printed a transcript of these Laws from a manuscript of Ingulfus, which appeared to him at that date to be about two centuries old, and which, not improbably, was identical with the Cottonian copy, now lost; while, at the same time, he informs us that he had attempted, but in vain, to get a sight of the (so-called) "Autograph" of Ingulfus. Another copy of these Laws, also in French, is printed by Fulman, in his edition (pp. 88—91), from Sir John Marsham's manuscript of Ingulfus, which seems to have been neither the Cottonian MS. nor the Autograph. Sir Henry Spelman, in his *Concilia* (published A.D. 1639), remarks (vol. i. p. 623) upon the comparative incorrectness of Selden's version, and, after informing us that he himself had gained access to the original (*archetypum*), then preserved, "under three keys," in the church at Croyland, gives five Chapters of these Laws, most carefully transcribed by himself from the original, by way of specimen. Now, of

course, if this manuscript had really been of Abbot Ingulf's time, and penned in 1091, 2, or 3, the laws would have been found to be written in the Norman language of that period. So far, however, from this being the fact, on examination of this specimen, and minute comparison of it with the text of the Holkham Manuscript, of about the thirteenth century, from which Mr. Thorp has printed these Laws in pp. 201—210 of his *Ancient Laws and Institutes of England*, we find that the French of the so-called "Autograph," satisfactory though it may have been to Sir Henry Spelman, is greatly more corrupt and more unlike pure Norman than that of the manuscript of the thirteenth century. In proof of this, on close inspection—the results of which are given in detail in the note[5] annexed—we find no less than four-

[5] *sont* (are) Autogr.—*sunt*, Holkham. *sont*, is Picard and Burgundian; *sunt*, is pure Norman.

grauntat (granted) Autogr.—*grantad*, Holkham. *grauntat*, is a Picard and Burgundian form; *grantad*, Norman.

conquest (conquest) Autogr.—*cunquest*, Holkham. *conquest*, is Picard and Burgundian; *cunquest*, Norman.

le reis (the king) Autogr.—*li reis*, Holkham. *le*, is late Picard; *li*, is Norman.

son (his, *twice*,) Autogr.—*sun*, Holkham. *son*, is Picard and Burgundian; *sun*, Norman.

cosin (kinsman) Autogr.—*cusin*, Holkham. *cosin*, is Picard and Burgundian; *cusin*, Norman.

saveir (to know) Autogr.—*saver*, Holkham. *saveir*, is a form that belongs to the mixed dialects; *saver*, is pure Norman. (But see below.)

saint (holy) Autogr.—*seinte*, Holkham. *saint*, is a Picard and Burgundian form; *seinte*, Norman.

yglise (church, *five times*) Autogr.—*iglise*, Holkham. *yglise*, is a late form, Anglo-Norman, and perhaps Picard; *iglise*, is the early form.

forfait (offence) Autogr.—*forfeit*, Holkham. *forfait*, is a Picard and Burgundian form; *forfeit*, Norman.

se (if) Autogr.—*si*, Holkham. *se*, is a late general form, after the beginning of the thirteenth century; *si*, is the early general form.

religion (religion) Autogr.—*religiun*, Holkham. *religion*, is Picard and Burgundian; *religiun*, Norman.

enfraint (breaks) Autogr.—*enfreint*, Holkham. *enfraint*, is a Picard and Burgundian form; *enfreint*, Norman.

per (by) Autogr.—*par*, Holkham. *per*, is the Burgundian form; *par*, is Norman and Picard.

home (man, *three times*) Autogr.—*hume*, Holkham. *home*, is a form of the mixed dialects; *hume*, is early Norman.

escondire (to exculpate, *twice*) Autogr.—*escundire*, Holkham. *escondire*, is Picard and Burgundian; *escundire*, the Norman form.

savoir (to know) Autogr.—*saveir*, Holkham. *saveir*, belongs to the mixed dialects; *savoir*, to Burgundy and the south of Picardy.

and-thirty instances in which, in lieu of pure Norman, late Anglo-Norman forms of words are to be found in this small but valuable sample of the asserted Autograph ; convincingly proving that, instead of having been penned in the days of William Rufus, it had been written by careless and ignorant scribes, whose only acquaintance with the French language was in the corrupt form which it had assumed in this country, in the fourteenth and early part of the fifteenth centuries, as a mixture of the Picard, Norman, Burgundian, and Walloon dialects, and who, in transcribing from an earlier copy of these Laws, had inadvertently given their transcript a tinge of their own period. The Laws of the Conqueror, we may therefore conclude, though even *there* incorrectly transcribed to some extent, are to be read in a state much more closely approaching their original purity, in the Holkham MS., of a date two centuries posterior to the days of the Conqueror, than they would have been in the so-called "Autograph" of his contemporary, Abbot Ingulf, had it fortunately survived to our times.

Another somewhat suspicious circumstance which remains to be noticed, with reference alike to the Charters and the *History* of Ingulfus, is the fact that the names of all localities around, or in any way connected with, Croyland, are there to be found spelt, in the eighth, ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, almost exactly the same as, from pp. 502—512 of the *Second Continuation*, we know they were at the beginning of the fifteenth century : a lapse of 700 years seems to have made the very smallest difference in this respect.

forfaiture (penalty) Autogr.—*forfeiture*, Holkham. *forfaiture*, is a Picard and Burgundian form ; *forfeiture*, Norman.

lui ("the," sing. nom.) Autogr.—*li*, Holkham. *lui*, is probably a Walloon form ; *li*, is Norman, Picard, and Burgundian.

le ("the," sing. nom.) Autog.—*li*, Holkham. *le*, is Picard ; *li*, Picard, Burgundian, or Norman.

baron (baron) Autogr.—*barun*, Holkham. *baron*, is a form of the mixed dialects ; *barun*, is Norman.

doner (to give) Autogr.—*duner*, Holkham. *doner*, is Picard and Burgundian ; *duner*, Norman.

demaine (demesne) Autogr.—*demeine*, Holkham. *demaine*, is a Picard and Burgundian form ; *demeine*, Norman.

Three other instances are omitted. On the other hand, there are but six instances in the so-called "Autograph," in which forms are found that have the appearance of being purer Norman than the corresponding words in the Holkham Manuscript. Into the question of the *genuineness* of these "Laws of the Conqueror" we do not profess to enter.

We propose to conclude this branch of our enquiry by subjecting the *History* of Ingulfus to the same test to which the Charters have been already subjected: the detection of errors and anachronisms in the use of words and expressions, implied to have been used at a time when in reality they were unknown. The list, however, might probably be very considerably extended.

Vastum, "waste;" *catalla*, "chattels;" *latomus*, "a mason;" and *argenti trecentas libras*, "three hundred pounds of silver" (p. 4), are expressions that were never used, as asserted, by a poet of the eighth century, we may safely say. *Loquutorium*, "a parlour" of a convent (p. 23), is a suspicious term in an account of the ravages of the Danes, purporting to have been penned in the tenth century. *Pinguissima præbenda*, "a very fat prebend" (p. 30), is an expression savouring of a much later age than that of the Sempects or the Younger Egelric, who are represented as living in the tenth century. *Theoricum verbum*, "the word of God," is a phrase probably not to be found before the time of John of Genoa, whose Glossary was written in the thirteenth century. Hickes has remarked that the Ordinances of Abbot Turketul are drawn up too much in accordance with Norman notions to be genuine; and instances such words as *garcio*, "servant," *pitantiarius*, "pittancer," and *froccus*, "frock," which are there to be found, as being of purely Gallic origin. *Armiger*, "an esquire" (p. 49), is another word too, not very likely to be met with in a code of regulations made by a Saxon Abbot in the tenth century. *Indentura*, "indented list," a word employed (p. 51) in the account of the disposition of his property by Abbot Turketul, is in reality not to be found in use until the reign of King John or Henry III.

Cariare, "to carry" (p. 52), and *bracinum*, "a brewery" (p. 53), are words which, there can be little doubt, belong to a period some two centuries later than the time of Ingulf; a remark which also applies to the use of *secta*, as meaning "a suit of clothes," in p. 54. *Miles*, "a knight," and *manerium*, "a manor" (p. 63), are equally out of place; and the employment of the word *justitiarius*, "a justiciar" (p. 63), is a signal anachronism—once or twice repeated in the work—that word being nowhere else to be found until about the middle of the eleventh century. "*Justitia*" is

the term universally employed to signify a "justice," or "judge," by writers contemporary with William the Conqueror. *Panis secundarius*, "second bread" (p. 66), is an expression of later date than the days of the Conqueror by probably two or three centuries; and we certainly cannot but be taken by surprise at the mention (p. 68) of *corium coctum*, "boiled leather," or *cuir bouilli*, being used for defensive armour by the troops of Earl Harold, in the days of Edward the Confessor!

In p. 78 we meet with the legal word *separalis*, "several," or "separate," which, although introduced also into the fictitious Charters of Edred and Edgar, is not to be met with probably before the beginning of the thirteenth century; and the expression in the following page, *ejus venerabilem personam*, "his venerable person," has the appearance of belonging to a still more recent date. *Portiforium*, "a breviary" (p. 79), is a word not to be found elsewhere till the close of the thirteenth century; *copia*, "a copy" (p. 92), was not so early in use probably by two centuries; and *quindena*, "a quinzaine," or "fortnight" (p. 95), is probably nowhere else to be found until near a century and a half after Ingulf's day.

Conquassare, "to crush" (p. 97), is a word first found in use probably some two centuries later; so too is the form *corrodiarius*, "a corodier," or "pensioner" (pp. 97, 98); while the word *carcosium*, "a carcase," it is presumed, is not to be met with elsewhere before the thirteenth century. *Nativus*, as meaning "a serf" or "bondman" (p. 101), belongs probably to the thirteenth century; and *campanile*, "a belfry," is not a word of Ingulf's age. *Serjantia*, "a serjeanty" (pp. 103, 104), and *publicum parliamentum*, "a public parliament" or "sitting" (pp. 103, 131), are expressions not to be found elsewhere until nearly one hundred years later; while such appellations as *serviens cissor* and *serviens sutor*, "serjeant-tailor" and "serjeant-shoemaker" (p. 103), belong to the fourteenth or fifteenth century. The phrase too, *in tabulis*, "in boards" (p. 104), as applied to the sides of a book, hardly seems to belong to the days ot William the Conqueror or his son. *Sewera*, "a drain," in the closing page (107), is undoubtedly a word unknown till a century or more after that date.

(*To be continued.*)

THE HISTORY AND CHARTERS OF INGULFUS CONSIDERED.

By HENRY THOMAS RILEY, M.A. Cambridge.

Part II.[1]

Enough, it is presumed, has now been stated to shew that neither the Charters nor the *History* of Ingulfus have any fair pretensions to be considered what they profess to be; but that, on the contrary, they are forgeries of a period much more recent than the close of the eleventh century. The question then remains to be solved, at what date these compilations were fabricated, for what purpose, and by whom?—points of some interest, and in reference to which (so far, more especially, as the Charters are concerned) there have been conflicting opinions among the learned.

Speaking of the *Golden Charter* of King Ethelbald, to which allusion has previously been made, Hickes (p. 66 of the *Dissertatio Epistolaris*) states it as his opinion, that "the Convent of Croyland found it necessary to forge this Charter, in order that they might preserve the lands which had been given to them without deed, or of which the deeds had been lost, from the Normans, who would hardly allow the monasteries any just right of holding lands, except by deed;" and asserts that he is "almost compelled either to believe that Ingulf was the forger and corrupter of these Charters, or else that the Convent of Croyland, in an unlearned age, palmed off the *History* upon the world under the authority of his name." In another passage of the *Dissertatio* he says,—"I have given a portion of the Charter of Ethelbald, the founder of Croyland, which I have so often had occasion to condemn. In the original it appears resplendent with gold, the manufacture of some Croylandian forger, perhaps Ingulf himself. This Charter, by means of which that knave cajoled King William, is sufficiently proved to have been fictitious."

Mr. Holditch, in his *History of Croyland Abbey*, published

[1] Continued from page 49.

in 1816, suggests that after the fire at Croyland in 1091, "Ingulph may have borne the principal part of the Charters sufficiently in mind to set down their contents as we see: they run in a form which assists the memory, and their separate particulars are few. Copies of these Charters were made under the direction of Ingulph, and replaced in their archives: even these might be afterwards destroyed, when the Abbey was burnt again, not quite sixty years afterwards, and they might be reproduced in a similar manner. There were violent disputes in the time of Ingulph, between him and Tailbois, a relation of the Conqueror, who was lord of Hoyland, and resident at Spalding; and it was feared that the burning of the Charters would be fatal to the issue of these suits, on the part of the Croylanders. On this account, Ingulph made haste to replace them. In a word, the Charters contain internal evidence of their modern date, and it is even probable that some of them have been made in times still later."

We have already seen that Gough was quite willing to believe that, if there was forgery in the case, Ingulf was the forger. Sir Francis Palgrave again, while considering the Charters to be palpable forgeries, expresses strong doubts whether the compilation (both *History* and Charters) is of much older date than the age of the manuscript said, in the early part of the seventeenth century, to have been the Autograph of Ingulfus; that is to say, the end, in his opinion, of the thirteenth or first half of the fourteenth century.

A close examination of the *First* and *Second Continuations of the History of Croyland*, also printed in Fulman's volume, will perhaps afford some clue to a solution of this question, by suggesting for what purpose, and consequently, at what period, it is probable that at least the greater part of these Charters were compiled; and so tend to remove the obloquy which, from the time of Hickes, has been somewhat unsparingly thrown upon the name and memory of Abbot Ingulf.

The fact seems not to have attracted the notice of previous writers on this subject, but it nevertheless *is* the fact, that neither in the History of Croyland, as contained in Fulman's volume, nor indeed in any other account of Croyland, is any mention made, or the slightest hint given, of the then existence of any one of these Mercian and Saxon

Charters during the period between A.D. 1093 and A.D. 1413, a space of 320 years. Two of them, as will be seen in the sequel, are mentioned elsewhere at a somewhat earlier date than the end of the 14th century.

In the Charter granted by Henry I., mention certainly is made of *a* Charter of Edred; but only by way of reference, it having been mentioned in a previous Charter of William the Conqueror, of which that of Henry is a confirmation. In 1114, admittedly for want of these very Charters, we find the Convent submitting to the loss of the manor of Baddeby, and, nearly at the same time, of its cell at Spalding. In 1153, King Stephen grants another Charter of Confirmation, but no allusion is made in it, or in that of Henry II., to those of the Mercian or Saxon kings. In 1189, Abbot Robert de Redinges is engaged in a suit with the Prior of Spalding, and in a case drawn up by him, probably for legal purposes, he says (p. 453): "The Abbey of Croyland is of the proper alms of the Kings of England, having been granted by their especial donation from the ancient times of the English, when it was so founded by King Ethelbald, who gave the marsh in which it is situate, *as we find in the 'Life of Saint Guthlac,'* which was formerly written." Had the *Golden Charter* of Ethelbald, or the Charters of the other Mercian and Saxon kings, been then known to be in existence, there can be little doubt that the Abbot would have been at least as likely to refer to them in support of his title, as to the meagre "*Life of Saint Guthlac*," written by Felix. The same Abbot, when before the King's Justiciars, shews them the Charter of King Henry II., "which sets forth by name the boundaries of the marsh;" but not a word does he say about the Saxon Charters, which, if the same as those in Ingulf's *History*, would have been found to set them forth much more fully and distinctly than that granted by King Henry.

In 1191, Abbot Henry de Longchamp produces the Charter of Richard I. before the King's Justiciars, as his best evidence of the limits of his marshes, but no mention is made of the Saxon Charters, and he is finally adjudged, on a legal quibble, to lose seisin of a marsh. Without delay, the Abbot proceeds to wait upon King Richard, then a prisoner at Spires in Germany, lays before him his complaints, and produces in support of his claim, not the lengthy

and circumstantial grants made by the Saxon kings, but the comparatively concise Charter that had been granted by King Henry, his father. So again, in the Charter of King John, granted in 1202, no allusion is made to any grants of the Mercian or Saxon kings.

Proceeding with the narrative, we next find the Abbot of Croyland defeated in his claims to the soil of the marsh of Alderland, and forced to make such concessions as he surely would never have been called upon to make, if the Charters, as set forth in Ingulf's *History*, had been among the archives of his house. In the Charter of Henry III., granted in 1226, no mention is made, and no hint given, of the existence of Charters dating before the Conquest.

We are now somewhat interrupted in our enquiry by the mutilated state of the *Second Continuation;* but in 1327 we catch a glimpse of Sir Thomas Wake claiming demesne rights against the Convent of Croyland in the marsh of Goggisland, or Gowksland, and of Abbot Henry de Caswyk manfully opposing him; but we do not find the Abbot relying upon any alleged Saxon Charters as his weapons; though, had they been in existence, he would most probably, like his successors eighty-eight years later, have availed himself of their assistance.

In volumes xliii. and xliv. of the Cole MSS. in the British Museum, there are to be found nearly two hundred closely written folio pages, filled with abstracts from the Registers of Croyland, of lawsuits carried on by the Convent (the inmates of which seem to have lived in quite an atmosphere of litigation), grants of corodies to the King's servants, fines, conveyances, and other memoranda relative to the community. Careful search has been made in these pages, in the few extracts of Registers among the Harleian MSS., in the documents connected with Croyland that are printed in Gough's First and Second Appendix, as also in most of those referred to in Tanner's *Notitia Monastica*, but not a syllable is there to be found to lead us to believe that between the periods above-mentioned these so-called Charters (with the two exceptions before alluded to) were in existence. In p. 76 of vol. xliv. of the Cole MSS. we find a plaint made by Thomas Wake, that Abbot Henry and three of his monks had been fishing at East Depyng, and that *vi et armis* they had broken down his dyke, or embank-

ment. To this the Abbot makes answer, not basing his right upon any grants of the Mercian and Saxon kings, and offering to produce his deeds in support of that right, but merely to the effect that—"of all the waters of the Welland he and all his predecessors have been seised time out of mind, as also of free piscary therein, and that the place mentioned is within the precincts of their manor." Again, on another occasion, in p. 105, we find the Abbot making *profert* of the Charters of King John, Henry III., and Edward I., when those of the Mercian and Saxon kings, had they existed, would certainly, as evidences, have materially promoted the success of his suit. In a plaint made to Edward III. (vol. xliv. p. 53), the monks of Croyland allege that the Abbey had been founded by King Ethelbald 500 years before the Conquest. This they would have hardly dared to assert, if they had had at that moment among their archives such a deed as the Foundation Charter given in Ingulf's *History*, shewing that Ethelbald founded the Abbey A.D. 716, exactly 350 years before the Conquest, and no more. In fact, it is pretty clear, as Cole has added in a Note, that in those days they did not in reality know when their Abbey was founded.

For a moment we must now step out of the History of Croyland, as given in the *Second Continuation* in Fulman's volume.

The 7th of July, 1393, is the earliest date at which we can trace the existence, in the hands of the Convent of Croyland, of any of the Charters contained in the *History* of Ingulfus; for at that date, as we learn from the Patent Rolls now preserved in the Public Record Office, a Charter of Inspeximus and Confirmation was granted by the unsuspecting officials of King Richard II., reciting the Charters of Ethelbald and Edred in exactly the same terms that are set forth in that History. No Inspeximus of a prior sovereign is there mentioned; and at that moment, and with the object of obtaining that confirmation, these two Charters were fabricated, there can hardly be a doubt. For what immediate purpose this step was *then* taken will probably remain for ever unknown; as the fact of this Inspeximus being then granted is not taken the slightest notice of in the *Second Continuation;* no record of the transaction, for obvious reasons, having been kept. It was left perhaps for these so-called Charters to bear their very profitable

fruits some twenty years later, and not before; for then it is that, for the first time, we hear of them being applied to any practical use, and then, not improbably, with the exception of the two just mentioned, the Charters and the *History* of Ingulfus were called into existence.

To return to the narrative of the *Second Continuation.* We learn that during the latter years of Abbot Thomas Overton, who was afflicted with blindness, Prior Richard Upton had the management of the Convent. In 1413, being at a loss (p. 501) how to prevent the encroachments of the people of Spalding and Multon (to which, we may remark, the Croylanders had had to submit very often before), he determined "to unsheathe against them the sword of ecclesiastical censure, which had been specially granted by the most holy father Dunstan," and had been "laid up with singular care among the treasures of the place;" in conformity with which resolution, "he publicly and solemnly fulminated sentence of excommunication, at the doors of the church, against all persons who should infringe the liberties of the Church of Saint Guthlac." Perhaps it is not an unwarranted assumption to believe, that if the Convent had had this "*sword*" of Saint Dunstan for so many centuries in its possession, it would not have been now unsheathed for the first time.

Not content with thus brandishing the sword of excommunication, and responsible to no one but the bedridden Abbot, Prior Richard seems to have employed his energies in forging still other and sharper swords for the people of Multon and Spalding; for (p. 501) "he resorted to the temporal arm and the laws of the realm, and, taking with him the muniments of the illustrious Kings, Ethelbald, Edred, and Edgar, hastened to London, to prosecute his cause against both parties;" this being *the first time*, be it remarked, that the fact of the existence of these Charters is noticed, in the Annals of Croyland, for a period of three hundred and twenty years.

From the *Second Continuation* of the *History* (pp. 501, 502), which, there seems every reason to believe, is a faithful and trustworthy chronicle of events connected with the Abbey of Croyland in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries, we learn that on his arrival in London Prior Richard was detained there "*nearly two years before he*

could bring matters to the desired conclusion," or, in other words, make arrangements for coming to trial. The blame of this delay is certainly laid (p. 501) upon the shoulders of the Duke of Lancaster, the alleged supporter of the Spalding people, and the lords of the vills of Multon and Weston. Unfortunately, however, for the accuracy of the story which Prior Richard seems to have told to the outer world who were not in his confidence, there happened to be at that time no "Duke of Lancaster" in existence, and it seems anything but improbable that these two years (or thereabouts) were, in reality, very profitably expended upon completing the fabrication of the long list of Charters which were so essentially to minister to the discomfiture of his antagonists at Multon and Spalding, and in compiling the original manuscript of the *History* of Ingulfus, afterwards known at Croyland as the "Autograph," in support of them. This explanation too will sufficiently account for the singularly large outlay upon these law proceedings of no less a sum than "500 *pounds*" (p. 513), equal in value to many thousands of our day; for compilers and scribes, clever enough to fabricate a circumstantial abbey history, and to concoct a series of Charters thickly spread over 350 years or more, would at any time require to be handsomely paid for their labours, and be not unlikely, upon such an occasion as this more especially, to make their own terms in the way of remuneration. The forgery of ecclesiastical and other documents, there seems reason to believe, had, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, become an established trade in the metropolis; and it was only a few years after this period—namely, A.D. 1430—that the Prior of Barnwell, in Cambridgeshire, acting as delegate for Pope Martin the Fifth, through the agency of a skilful notary-public whose name has come down to us, admitted as valid (and with a guilty knowledge, it has been surmised), the forged Bulls of Popes Honorius I. and Sergius I., which remain still inscribed on the Great Register of the University of Cambridge.

Upon this supposition, and knowing what effects a guilty conscience, the fear of failure, and the dread of detection, are not unlikely to produce, we are not surprised to learn from the *Second Continuation* (p. 501), that "Prior Richard, seeing that his business now lay at the mercy of the cast of a die, and that it was far from being likely to prosper

according to his wishes, but daily looked worse and worse, fell into so deplorable a state of ill health, that the physicians even despaired of his recovery ; his stomach, in its indignation, refusing to retain anything that was offered to it."

The most singular part of this story, however, remains to be told. The Prior would seem not to have been the sole contriver of this plan for defeating the enemy ; but to have had a partner alike in his schemes and in the disquietude which they entailed. To continue, in the words of the narrative (p. 502)—" A certain Serjeant-at-law, who was of counsel for the Prior, William Ludyngton by name, acted as his agent in this business, and as his most trusty advocate. While he was in bed one night, kept awake by extreme sadness and disquietude, and revolving many matters in his mind, he found himself unable to sleep. Suddenly, however, a gentle slumber seeming to steal upon him, he had reposed for a short time, when behold ! a venerable personage, arrayed in the garb of an anchorite, stood near and uttered words to this effect :—' Why, amid the fluctuations of thy mind, art thou in fear as to the prosecution of thy suit, and why pass the night in sleeplessness, as thoughts crowd upon thee from every side ? Come now, rest a while, and relax thy limbs in repose ; for to-morrow morning everything shall succeed to thy utmost wish, and the matters which have hitherto seemed to thee to wear an adverse aspect, will benignly smile upon thee at thy will and pleasure.' So saying, the vision disappeared. Rising early in the morning, and his mind restored to tranquillity by the oracle which had undoubtedly been revealed to him from heaven through Saint Guthlac, he at once began to entertain better hopes. Accordingly, he immediately hastened to the Court, and after holding a short conference on the subject with those who were of counsel for the other parties, at last brought the whole matter to this issue ; that each party at once agreed readily and willingly, putting an end to trouble and expense, that arbitrators should be chosen for coming to a righteous decision upon the matter in dispute. As for the Prior, who was still there, as already mentioned, lying on a bed of sickness, upon hearing that an outlet was about to be found to this most intricate labyrinth of agonizing toil, and that such an expensive source of litigation was about to be soon set at rest, he was greatly rejoiced

thereat; and now, breathing more freely, returned abundant thanksgiving to God for the divine consolation which had been granted to him from above."

The sequel is soon told. This consolatory vision must have been vouchsafed by Saint Guthlac to Serjeant Ludyngton, the Prior's more than ordinary counsel, in the first half of the year 1415; for in June of that year, as we learn from other sources, he was created a Justiciar of the Court of Common Pleas; a piece of promotion which, under the peculiar circumstances of the case, must have gladdened Prior Richard's heart as much, or even more, than Saint Guthlac's opportune appearance in the worthy Serjeant's dream. In the latter half of the same year, arbitrators were appointed in the suit between the Abbot of Croyland and the people of Multon and Weston, and in that between the Abbot and the people of Spalding. In the first suit two umpires were chosen as well; and, strange to say, one of them, no other than the self-same judge, William Ludyngton, who a few months before had been the Prior's agent and adviser, and the sympathizing sharer of his woes. In the second suit again, that with the Spalding people, but one assessor, or umpire, was chosen, a character in which we find Judge Ludyngton once more presenting himself. After such clever management on the part of the Convent as this, there could of course be little doubt as to its ultimate success. To the entire satisfaction of both umpires and arbitrators, the spurious Charters of Ethelbald and Edred were produced in Court, as well as the genuine ones of the Norman and early Plantagenet Kings, and the Inspeximus recently obtained under the Great Seal of Richard II.

Immediately upon the production of this to them most novel and unlooked-for evidence, endorsed too by the approbation of the learned and dignified umpires, the people of Multon and Spalding appear to have been panic-stricken, and not to have had a word more to say in their respective behalves; whereupon, both arbitrators and umpires pronounced their decisions entirely in favour of the Convent of Croyland, and awarding it rights and privileges almost commensurate with the fullest scope of the so-called Mercian and Saxon Charters: and thus did the monks of Croyland, the first time apparently for centuries, gain a complete legal victory over their troublesome neighbours of Multon, Weston, and Spalding.

William Ludyngton (or Lodington, as the name is now spelt), we may add, the counsel and judge who acted so conspicuous a part in this suspicious transaction, died A.D. 1419, and lies buried at Gunby, in Lincolnshire, where a brass to his memory still exists. If Lodington in Northamptonshire was the place of his birth, as seems not improbable, we may the more readily account for his evident participation in the most secret counsels of his near neighbours at Croyland, and the interest that he appears to have manifested *per fas et nefas* in the support of their claims.

Vague and meagre as were the genuine title-deeds of the Abbey, and limited perhaps to the Charters of the Norman and early Plantagenet kings, we can fully understand why the ten or twelve lines of the *History* of Vitalis (B. iv., c. 17), in which he states that King Ethelbald founded the Abbey of Croyland, made a grant to it of lands, and conferred upon it a Charter, signed by him in presence of his bishops and great men, were with avidity made available for the purposes of the Inspeximus of 1393, and amplified into the circumstantial details of the *Golden Charter;* why such care was taken, in almost every succeeding fabrication down to the so-called Charters of Edred and Edgar, to make especial reference to the original grant of Ethelbald; these last two Charters being carefully ratified by name in equally fictitious Charters of Cnut and Edward the Confessor; why the reader is so particularly informed in the *History* (p. 22), that upon the destruction of the Monastery A.D. 870, "the Charter of Foundation of King Ethelbald, and the Confirmations thereof by other kings," were saved from the ravages of the enemy; why we are so circumstantially (p. 85) made acquainted with the fact that Abbot Ingulf took with him to London the Charters of Ethelbald and the other Mercian Kings, as well as those of Edred and Edgar, and that the same "were publicly read and carefully examined in presence of the renowned King William and his Council, and adjudged by all, with acclamation, to be most worthy of the royal confirmation;" why these Charters are filled *ad nauseam* with fulminations of wrath, censure, and excommunication, against all who should dare to question them, or to subtract from the possessions, privileges, or immunities, of the Abbey of Croyland; why the hint of Vitalis was ingeniously improved upon, and the Ecclesiastical Censure of Archbishops Dunstan and Osketul was fabricated;

and why, too, the story of the wicked Asford was devised (pp. 76, 77), who, as a judgment for withholding from the Monastery the Manor of Helieston, fell from his horse, while riding to meet the King's Justiciars at Stamford, and broke his neck, "and so was sent to hell the soul of him who was going in his pride to oppose the Lord."

Even the passage inserted in the *History* (p. 79), to the effect that the surveyors for *Domesday* "shewed a kind and benevolent feeling towards the Monastery, and did not value it at its true revenue, nor yet at its exact extent; and so, compassionately took due precautions against future royal exactions and other burdens, and with the most attentive kindliness made provision for its welfare,"—there can be little doubt was fabricated to serve a purpose. The forgers knew that it was quite within the limits of possibility that their fictitious Charters, with their outrageous pretensions to circumstantiality as to the extent of the Abbey lands, might come to be placed before a judicial tribunal in juxtaposition with the pages of *Domesday:* and the present passage, it is far from improbable, was inserted with the view of meeting any objections to discrepancies that might possibly arise.

That they themselves resorted to the *Book of Domesday*, then preserved in the Exchequer, there can be no doubt; and hence the copious extracts in the *History* which Abbot Ingulf is represented as having made during his sojourn in London, on his visit to the Court of William the Conqueror. The transcribers, however, in their ignorance, have executed their task in a manner that Abbot Ingulf himself would never have tolerated. For example, they were not aware that "*Elloe* (properly 'Ellohe') *wapp*" signifies "the Wapentake of Elloe," but have absurdly converted it into "Ellowarp" (p. 80), as the name of a place. In the same manner too, the Wapentake of Kirketon (Chirchetone) is represented as "*Kirketona Warp.*" Other material misstatements are made; in addition to which, the *Domesday* contraction for *modo*, "now," is almost uniformly lengthened into *monetæ*, "of money"; the word *carucata*, "carucate," or "ploughland," is sometimes confounded with *caruca*, "plough"; and, in one instance, "V," standing for *quinque*, "five," is interpreted as *vero*, "but."

The fabricators too of the *History*, finding a passage in *Domesday* to the effect that, "from the time of King Ethel-

red, the seat of the abbacy has been quit and free of all secular services," have laboured (p. 84) to make it incidentally subservient to their design. Ethelred the Unready, son of Edgar, is no doubt the sovereign meant; but they would suggest that it is just as probable that Ethelred, King of Mercia, and afterwards Abbot of Bardeney in Lincolnshire, is the personage alluded to; drawing attention, at the same time, to the fact that his name is subscribed as an attesting witness to Ethelbald's Charter; a locality in which the Abbey authorities who had shortly before obtained the Inspeximus and Confirmation of Richard II., themselves had taken care to have it placed.

Another suspicious circumstance calls for remark. Vitalis says that, in the days of Abbot Ingulf, part of the Abbey Church of Croyland, with the sacristy, books, and many other articles, was suddenly consumed by fire. This was too tempting a statement not to be made capital of by the forgers: availing themselves of it with skill, they would be armed against every contingency in reference to their Saxon and Mercian Charters in a court of law. We are accordingly told (p. 98) that the flames reaching their *cartaria*, or muniment-room, *all* their muniments, charters, and privileges granted by the Mercian Kings, both great and small, nearly 400 in number, were destroyed. Then again, we are informed (p. 98) that Abbot Ingulf had some years before, taken from the muniment-room many Charters written in Saxon characters; and that, having duplicates of them, and in some instances triplicates, he had put them in the hands of the præcentor, to instruct the juniors therefrom in a knowledge of the Saxon characters, which had then become neglected and nearly obsolete. These, the *History* tells us, being kept in the cloisters, were saved, "and now form our principal and especial muniments." Again, in another place (p. 86), Ingulf is represented as saying that, in spite of the grant by deed of the vill of Spalding, A.D. 1051, by Sheriff Thorold, he was deprived thereof through the enmity of Ivo Tailbois; at the same time advising his successors, when desirous to regain the same, especially to rely on the Charter of Thorold, "the other Charters being *for certain reasons* concealed," he having learned from the lawyers that *that Charter* would prove much more efficacious for the assertion of their rights than the rest. At a later period again, and after the destruction of the

Monastery by fire in A.D. 1091, Abbot Ingulf is made to say (p. 107), that though Tailbois imagined that *all* their Charters were destroyed, he showed him in Court that such was not the case ; but, on the contrary, produced by the hands of Brother Trig, his proctor, the Charters of Sheriff Thorold and the Earls Algar, whole and unburnt. This trial concluded, Abbot Ingulf further says (p. 107)—"I took our Charters and placed them in such safe custody that, so long as my life lasts, neither fire shall consume nor adversary steal them ; our Lord Jesus Christ and our blessed patron, the most holy Guthlac, showing themselves propitious, and, as I firmly believe, extending their protection to their servants."

Again, it was by the same hands, there can be little doubt, that the statement was inserted in the so-called "*Continuation by Peter of Blois*" (part, at least, of which is certainly quite as spurious as the *History* of Ingulfus, and equally founded on the narrative of Vitalis), that (p. 124) "although the original Charters of the Abbey had been burnt, and Abbot Geoffrey (Ingulf's successor) *was at a loss to know in what place Edred's Charter of Restoration had been deposited* by his predecessor, Abbot Ingulf," still he "proceeded to Evesham, and produced there *a copy* of the Charter of Restoration (or Refoundation) of his Abbey ;" but, for want of the original, failed in the object of his mission.

Though, at first sight, these contradictions may seem puzzling, yet, upon consideration, the reasons for the insertion of them in the pretended *History* would seem to be pretty obvious. It would of course occur to the authorities at Croyland, that the people of Multon, Weston, and Spalding, might very possibly question the genuineness of the Charters now proffered by them in evidence, for the first time. If they themselves should be able to convince the Court that they were genuine, of course all would be well and good, and their purpose would be answered. Should, however, on the other hand, their spurious character be detected upon a close scrutiny by the Court, it would then be in their power to produce in their own exculpation Ingulf's *History*, penned more than three centuries before, to show that the original Charters really had been burnt, that contemporary duplicates had been saved, and that, if these were not the identical copies mentioned by Ingulf, it was no fault of theirs ; that they had proffered them just as they had de-

scended into their hands from their predecessors; and that, if forgeries they really were, they must have been forged by some of those predecessors—who alone were the guilty parties—for the purpose of tallying with the narrative of the *History*.

Again, it would be not unlikely that inquiry would be made, how it was that these Charters had never been proffered in Court during the repeated litigations of the preceding three hundred years. The story of the safe concealment of them by Abbot Ingulf was accordingly invented, in order that an excuse might be afforded, in case one should be needed, for the sudden and unexpected appearance of them after so long a lapse of time, during which the fact of their existence had been unknown.

In reference to the so-called "Charter of Restoration" of King Edred, it deserves remark that a Charter of privileges granted by that King is mentioned in the Charter of William the Conqueror (p. 86), and that Charters both of Edred and of William are referred to in that of Henry I., dated A.D. 1114, and inserted (p. 121) in the so-called *Continuation* of Peter of Blois. The Charter of William—which, as is usual with the fabricated Saxon Charters, forbids "that any person under his rule shall presume rashly to molest the monks of Croyland, lest he perish by the sword of excommunication, and, for such violation of ecclesiastical rights, suffer the torments of hell"—is probably as fictitious as its predecessors; but as that of Henry I., which mentions Charters of Edred and William, has apparently some fair pretensions to be considered genuine, it seems not improbable that Charters of Edred and William once *did* exist: and, perhaps, equally within the limits of probability, that a copy of Edred's Charter, falling into the hands of the compilers of the *History*, served as a basis for the enlarged Charter of Edred as there set forth.

The more effectually, to all appearance, to disarm suspicion, the compilers have placed in juxtaposition with the Charters of Edred and Edgar, though it has nothing whatever to do with the context, that of Edgar to the Abbey of Medeshamsted, or Peterborough; a document which we *know for certain* to have been subjected to the self-same treatment which we have just suggested that a genuine Charter of Edred may possibly have undergone. This Charter, as it appears in Ingulf's *History*, and in one of the Peterborough

Chronicles, is so replete with allusions and expressions peculiar to the feudal times, that the learned Hickes (*Thesaurus*, Pref., p. xxix.) is inclined to condemn it as fictitious; and, therefore,—a thing we should hardly expect in *his* case, of all men,—must have been unaware of the fact that the nucleus of it is preserved in the *Saxon Chronicle* (pp. 392, 393, *Monumenta Histor. Brit.*); genuine, no doubt, but divested of its grandiloquent recitals, and its allusions to usages of a later age. The mention in it of "Courts Christian," and of "parsons," and the fact that the sovereign is, in no less than six instances, made to speak in the plural number (a mode of expression not to be found before the time of Richard I.), indicate clearly enough that it has been tampered with; though probably by other hands than the fabricators of the Charters and History of Ingulfus. The first eleven attestations given in the *History* of Ingulfus correspond with those in the *Saxon Chronicle;* the additional nineteen, to all appearance, are spurious.

It now only remains for us to inquire, what are the sources from which such portions of Ingulf's *History*, as bear any marks of borrowed authenticity, are compiled? a question which, without the expenditure of an amount of research which it would hardly seem to deserve, it would be impossible to answer satisfactorily in every respect.

The basis of the *History of Ingulfus* throughout, there can be little doubt, is Chapter 17 of the Fourth Book of the *Ecclesiastical History* of Ordericus Vitalis; not a line hardly of whose narrative—the result of a visit paid by him to the Abbey of Croyland early in the twelfth century—has not been carefully made available by the fabricators; and, in combination therewith, the *Chronicle* of Florence of Worcester. To these sources may be added, in all probability, the *Life of Saint Guthlac*, by the Monk Felix; William of Malmesbury's *History of the Kings*; the *Life of Edward the Confessor*, by Ailred of Rievaux; the *Chronicle* of Simeon of Durham; the *History of the English*, by Henry of Huntingdon; the *Chronicon Angliæ* of John of Peterborough; *Domesday Book;* and, possibly, the *Gesta Herewardi*. The minute details of abbey life and descriptions of conventual buildings and usages, with which the work abounds, are probably derived from the *Rules of Saint Benedict*, and those of other religious Orders; while, for several of their more uncommon

words, the compilers seem to have been indebted to the *Catholicon* of John of Genoa, an important Glossary of the latter part of the thirteenth century.

To descend, however, to somewhat of detail ; so far as our restricted limits, and a comparatively cursory examination of Ingulf's narrative, will permit.—

The Procœmium (p. 1) is of course the composition of the compilers, the remainder of the page being occupied by a summary from the early chroniclers. The story of Ethelbald and Saint Guthlac is an amplification of the narrative of Vitalis, and perhaps of the *Life of Saint Guthlac*, by Felix. The poetry in page 4 is evidently of the average execution of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; the latter part of the page, in reference to the derivation of the name Croyland, or Crowland, which Hickes (*Thesaurus*, Pref., p. viii.) has somewhat singularly suggested to be spurious, being borrowed almost *verbatim* from Vitalis. The Charter of Ethelbald, as already mentioned, was in all probability suggested by the narrative of Vitalis. The immediately succeeding pages, when not occupied by the Charters, are, no doubt, a compilation from the chronicles ; the compilers taking good care (as indeed is asserted in page 20) that their context should be able to receive confirmation therefrom. Accordingly, we find the mention (pp. 18, 19) of King Burghred being at Nottingham in A.D. 868 (where he is represented as signing his Charter to Croyland), confirmed by the Saxon Chronicle, by Simeon of Durham, and by Florence of Worcester.

The basis of the story of the Danish ravages at Croyland, A.D. 870 (pp. 20—24), is probably to be found in the account of the destruction of the Monastery of Medeshamsted, given in the *Chronicle* attributed by Sparke to Abbot John of Peterborough ; considerable additions being made, the inventions, in all probability, of the compilers. Among these additions is the mention of the body and scourge of Saint Guthlac as being saved ; also, the saving of the gifts of King Wichtlaf, and, most important of all, of the Charters of Ethelbald and the other Kings ; together with all the minute particulars of the destruction of Croyland by the Danes—nearly every word, in fact, of page 22. Brother Turgar, who, in Ingulf's *History*, is made to be an inmate of Croyland and a child ten years of age, and is then reserved to figure as one of the Sempects and to die at the age of 115 years, is in reality a monk of

Medeshamsted, as shown by a passage in the Peterborough *Chronicle*, which the Croyland compilers have thought proper to omit. A considerable portion of pages 23, 24, also giving an account of the barbarities inflicted upon certain of the Croyland monks, by name, is equally a fiction, invented by the compilers, no doubt, and interpolated by them in the extract thus borrowed from the Peterborough *Chronicle*.

For the story of Saint Cuthbert's appearance to Alfred, the compilers, to all appearance, are indebted to William of Malmesbury ; the same too with reference to the account of Alfred's visit to the Danish camp in disguise ; which is told by Malmesbury alike of Alfred and (§ 131) of Olaf's visit to Athelstan's tent, in a minstrel's garb.

Turketul is made to be a kinsman not only of King Edred (p. 30), but of Osketul, Archbishop of York (p. 41) ; both in conformity with the account of Vitalis. The names of the six manors given by Turketul to Croyland are the same as those mentioned by Vitalis : who also draws attention to Edgar's Charter of Confirmation (p. 42), and the fact of Dunstan having denounced those who should deprive the Church of Croyland of its possessions.

Eilward, or Ethelward (pp. 30, 36), brother of Edward the Elder, is adopted by the compilers as the father of Turketul. He is mentioned by Florence of Worcester, and from him probably the name is borrowed : his relationship to Turketul is a fabrication, no doubt. The account of the Battle of Brunford (p. 37), or Brunenburgh, from the striking resemblance in magniloquence of style, is apparently an amplification of the narrative of Henry of Huntingdon, who equally expatiates upon the prowess of the men of Mercia and of Wessex.

The great intimacy (p. 41) that existed between Dunstan and Turketul, is also mentioned in the narrative of Vitalis.

The use of the out-of-the-way word "*Sempecta*" (p. 49), as applied to a monk of the Convent when past the fiftieth year of his profession, was in all probability suggested to the compilers by the occurrence of it in the *History* of Vitalis (B. viii., c. 11) ; though in what sense, it seems difficult exactly to determine. It is also to be found, under the form "*synpœcta*," as applied to a class of monks, in the *Rules of Saint Benedict ;* and an early use of it, though apparently in

another sense, is to be met with in the *Lausiac History* of the Eastern Solitaries, by Palladius, a Christian Bishop.

The succession of the Elder Egelric (p. 52), on the death of Turketul, and his relationship to the deceased Abbot (pp. 32, 51), are mentioned by Vitalis. The same too with the succession of the Younger Egelric (p. 53), and his relationship (p. 40) to the Elder Egelric, his predecessor.

The story of the removal of the relics of Saint Neot to Croyland (p. 55) from Elnophesbyry (or Eynesbury), in Huntingdonshire, is also related by Vitalis; though the compilers have added the fact, that the body had been exposed there to the ravages of the Danes.

The successions of Abbots Osketul (p. 54) and Godric (p. 55) are probably borrowed from Vitalis; and the story of the atrocities committed by Sweyn, father of Cnut (p. 56), is, to all appearance, closely copied from the narrative of Florence of Worcester.

The mention (p. 57) of Norman, brother of Earl Leofric, as the "greatest of the satellites" of Duke Edric Streona, there can be little doubt is suggested by the pages of Florence, who implies as much; though the assertion that Edric's body was thrown into the Thames is borrowed from another source—William of Malmesbury, or, possibly, Roger of Wendover.

The story also (p. 57) of Leofric having replaced his brother Norman, and of his being in high favour with Cnut, is probably borrowed from Florence of Worcester; the mention of him being inserted merely for the purpose of showing, why the Manor of Baddeby was not in the possession of the Abbey of Croyland at the time of the compilation of *Domesday* (pp. 57, 85).

The succession of Abbot Brithmer (p. 58) is apparently derived from Vitalis; and in the next page the compilers have followed the Saxon Chronicle, Florence of Worcester, and others of our early chroniclers, in erroneously placing the visit of Cnut to Rome in A.D. 1031, instead of 1027, as correctly stated by Wippo. Cnut's Letter to the Prelates and People of England (pp. 59—61) is probably copied from the pages of Florence.

The account (p. 61) of Cnut's landing at Sandwich, A.D. 1032, on his return from Rome, is a fiction evidently; and equally so, no doubt, is the story of Abbot Brithmer has-

tening thither to present him with three palfreys. The fiction is apparently based upon the narrative of the *Saxon Chronicle*, which *implies* that Cnut landed at Sandwich, A.D. 1029; upon which occasion he bestowed certain privileges upon Christ Church at Canterbury.

The succession of Wulgat (pp. 62, 63), Abbot of Pegeland, to the Abbacy of Croyland, on the death of Brithmer, and the story of his sufferings, are apparently a fanciful amplification of the narrative of Vitalis.

The mention (p. 64) of the earthquake in 1048 is derived probably from Simeon of Durham, or from Florence of Worcester; but a clerical error has been committed in substituting the "Calends of March," for the "Calends of May."

The attesting witnesses to Edward the Confessor's spurious Charter of Confirmation (p. 64) are Archbishops Edsy and Alfric, and Earls Godwin, Leofric, and Siward. The whole of these five identical personages, and no others, are named together by Simeon of Durham and Florence of Worcester, *s. a.* 1043.

The succession of Wulketul, a monk of Peterborough, to the Abbacy of Croyland (p. 65), is probably derived from Vitalis.

The words (p. 66) "*per vim suum Comitatum recuperavit*," in reference to Earl Algar's outlawry and return, are identical with those given in their account of the same transaction by Simeon of Durham and Florence of Worcester.

The Latin Leonine lines (p. 68), on the Comet that appeared A.D. 1066, are probably borrowed from Simeon of Durham or Henry of Huntingdon; as they are not to be found in Florence of Worcester. The account of the Battle of Hastings (p. 69), on the other hand, would seem to be abbreviated from Florence of Worcester, or Simeon of Durham.

The account of Earl Waltheof's execution (p. 72), though expanded, closely follows that of Vitalis; who also mentions his gift to the Abbey, here noticed, of the vill of Barnack, in Northamptonshire.

The story of the deprivation of Abbot Wulketul, A.D. 1075 (pp. 73, 79), is probably borrowed from Vitalis; who merely states, however, that he was deposed, and confined at Glastonbury. The improvement upon his narrative, in reference to Abbot Thurstan, has been already noticed.

The notion of the pilgrimage of Ingulf to Jerusalem (p. 74) is probably borrowed from the account of that of Theodoric, first Abbot of Saint Evroult, in the *History* of Vitalis (B. iii., c. 4); the "Bishop of Mayence," whom Ingulf is represented as accompanying, representing the "Chief Bishop of the Bavarians," in whose train Theodoric travelled.

The story of Ingulf exercising his influence with King William in behalf of Wulketul (pp. 78, 79), is probably amplified from the account of Vitalis, who briefly states to the same effect. The narratives vary, however, as to the day of the month on which Wulketul died.

The account (p. 102) of the translation of the body of Earl Waltheof from the Chapter-house to the Church of Croyland is related, to a considerable extent, in the very words that are used by Vitalis in narrating the same transaction.

As already mentioned, these enquiries might probably be considerably extended, with equally satisfactory results, in proof that, as a compilation of a comparatively late period, the *History* of Ingulfus has no pretensions to genuineness or authenticity whatever. Enough, however, has perhaps been said to leave little room for doubt, in the minds even of the most credulous, that such is the fact.

Had the object of this "pious fraud" been really a harmless one, other in fact than it undoubtedly was, the compilers might have deserved some, perhaps considerable, commendation for the research and inventiveness displayed in the fabrication of their romance, and for the skill which, in the days of typography even, for at least a century succeeded in hoodwinking the eyes of the learned. There is too abundant proof, however, that under the transparent veil of promoting the cause of religion, their purpose was selfish, and their conduct, oppressive and mendacious. Stripped of its pretensions, their plausible and by no means uninteresting compilation must be content to take its humble place among the items of our later medieval literature, as nothing more than the "Story of the Pseudo-Ingulf."