

STIGAND, BISHOP OF CHICHESTER.

A NOTE ON THE DATE AT WHICH THE SEAT OF THE SUSSEX
DIOCESE WAS REMOVED FROM SELSEY TO CHICHESTER.

BY HAMILTON HALL, F.S.A.

WHILE recently engaged in examining the precise date of one of the Battle Abbey Charters, it appeared that if the charter was genuine the removal of this See could not have occurred at the date usually assigned for that event. No special research has been expended in the present investigation, but nearly all the references hitherto quoted in this connection have been consulted, and in view of the uncertainty which exists as to the actual date of many early Norman occurrences, it may be useful to point out what appear to be sundry inaccuracies of statement in certain standard works of reference as to the year in which this change of place was effected.

Le Neve's "Fasti"¹ is the book which would most usually be consulted upon such a point. This valuable authority says: "Stigand, the King's chaplain, was appointed by the King at Whitsuntide, 1070. He removed his seat from Selsey to Chichester about the year 1085, and became the first Bishop of Chichester."² Le Neve also quotes William of Malmesbury's "De Gestis Pontificum," Lib. II., that Stigand was not he of the same name who was 'afterwards' Bishop of Winchester and Archbishop of Canterbury. ". . . . Stigandus, non ille qui postea³ fuit episcopus Wintoniensis

¹ "Fasti Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ." Ed. T. Duffus Hardy, 1854.

² Vol. I., p. 238.

³ *Postea*: That Stigand, however, was deprived of both bishopric and archbishopric in 1070, viz., in the same year this Stigand was appointed to Selsey on the deprivation of Egelric. Godwin, 'de Præsulibus,' quotes this passage with trifling variations and modifies this *postea*: "non ille qui *his temporibus*," &c. (p. 501).

et Archiepiscopus Cantuariensis. Hic Stigandus, a Wilhelmo rege ibi factus episcopus, mutavit sedem in Cicestram, diocesis suæ civitatem, prope mare, ubi antiquitus et Sancti Petri monasterium, et congregatio fuerat sanctimonialium. Huic successit Willelmus.”⁴

The statement, therefore, that the appointment of Stigand was made at Whitsuntide is based on other authority, which Le Neve quotes simply as ‘Flor. Wigorn.’ “Die autem Pentecostes rex dedit Stigando capellano suo episcopatum Suthsaxonum qui mutavit sedem in Cicestram.” This quotation is a compression of the text of Florence, who indicates that the elevation of Stigand was on or after the morrow of Pentecost, doubtless within the octave: “Die autem Pentecostes rex apud Windesoram . . . Walcelino . . . dedit præsulatum. . . . in crastino . . . Hermenfridus synodum tenuit . . . In qua synodo Agelricus Suthsaxonum pontifex . . . [cum aliis] . . . degradatur. . . . Quibus degradatis, rex suis capellanis, . . . [aliis alia] . . . et Stigando Suthsaxonum dedit episcopatum qui Stigandus mutavit sedem in Cicestram diocesis suæ civitatem . . .”⁵ Symeon of Durham⁶ copied Florence verbatim as to all this Council, a blank occupying the position of the mention of the change of place.

Le Neve also quotes the “Monasticon,” which, however, dates the removal of the see in 1075, and has nothing in support of the year 1085. The reference is doubtless to Vol. VI., pt. 3, p. 1159 of the edition of 1830 under Chichester, where the date is given 1075, as again in Vol. II., p. 52, under Selsey, whereat appears this quotation from Tanner’s “Notitia”: “The episcopal seat was fixed and remained here until Bishop Stigandus translated it (by virtue of the constitution made at the Synod of London, A.D. 1075) from this village to the

⁴ Lib. II., sec. 96, p. 205 of the ‘Rolls Series’ text, edited by N. E. S. A. Hamilton, Esq., of the MSS. Department of the British Museum, 1870. 8vo.

⁵ “Florentii Wigorniensis Monachi Chronicon ex Chronicis.” Ed. Benj. Thorpe, S.A.S., 1849 (8vo.), Vol. II., p. 6.

⁶ “Symeonis Monachi Historia Regum,” sec. 157, p. 193 of the text of ‘Rolls Series.’ Ed. Thos. Arnold, 1885. 8vo.

larger town of Chichester.”⁷ The editors of Dugdale at the same place, under Selsey, add a note: “Compare Jo. Brompt. Script. X. Twysden col. 475” [rectius vero 975], where the date is referred to the year “m.lxxvj, xj Wil. regis;” a combination which is an impossibility at Whitsuntide, to say no more, as Whitsuntide m.lxxvj was in x Wil. I., any style; “& Gervase Cant. ibid. col. 1654,” at which last reference, however, no date is given.

Going next to other works of reference, Courthope⁸ dates the transfer “circa 1085.” This work was based upon Sir N. Harris Nicolas’ “Synopsis of the Peerage of England,” which gives the date⁹ 1082. Woodward and Cates say:¹⁰ “seat of bishopric 1078,” and so Townsend’s “Manual of Dates”¹¹ “removed in 1078.” Overall’s “Dictionary of Chronology”¹² says, “removed to Chichester 1070.” Hadyn’s “Dictionary of Dates” has varied it from time to time, “1070,”¹³ “about 1082,”¹⁴ etc. Trusler’s “Chronology”¹⁵ says “removed to Chichester 1071.” Toone’s “Chronological Historian”¹⁶ mentions the removal under 1070. Salmon’s “Chronological Historian”¹⁷ had mentioned it under the same date in the same words, and so had the “British Chronologist”¹⁸ also under 1070. In the General Index¹⁹ to the first twenty-five volumes of the “Sussex Archaeological Collections” is a chronological list of the Bishops of Chichester, beginning “Stigand 1085—1087.” The Revnd. Precentor Walcott, F.S.A., in his scientific paper on the Bishops of Chichester, in the twenty-eighth volume, quotes a number of references relating to Stigand. The extract from the ‘Cathologus’ of Bishop Rede [bishop from 1369 to 1385] leaves a blank at the date of the transfer; and in the remaining authorities quoted, although the Council of London is mentioned there is nothing on the

⁷ “Notitia Monastica.” Ed. James Nasmyth, M.A., 1787. Sussex, sec. XXXVI.

⁸ “Historic Peerage of England,” 1857, p. 540.

⁹ Edition of 1825.

¹⁰ “Encyclopædia of Chronology,” 1872.

¹¹ Fifth Edition, 1877.

¹² Edition of 1870.

¹³ Eleventh edition, 1863.

¹⁴ Twenty-first edition, 1895.

¹⁵ Tenth edition, 1782.

¹⁶ Edition of 1826.

¹⁷ Third edition, 1747.

¹⁸ Edition of 1775.

¹⁹ p. 79.

date of the removal. The Revnd. Prebendary Stephens, in his "Memorials of the South-Saxon See" refers the removal to the Council of London 1075, and regards the bishop and earl as being allied in the work of settling the new government. Dallaway gives the date of removal 1075, with scarcely anything further; and Horsfield under the same year has a few vague words on the Conqueror's "plans."

Domesday²⁰ says "Episcopus de Cicestre" held certain lands, and as this record was completed in the year 1085 it is possible that here is the foundation for the guarded statement that the see was removed "about 1085." No particular evidence has been noticed for the date 1078, or for 1082. 1071 is, perhaps, by mis-correction of 1070 to the supposedly true historical year. The basis for the reference to 1070 may have been by confusion with the date of Stigand's elevation to the episcopate; and the date 1072 may perhaps primarily have been due to some misapprehension as to the Councils of 1072 and 1075, or by a literal reading of a passage quoted by William of Malmesbury, as will presently appear.

Bishop Godwin,²¹ as before mentioned, gives the first quoted passage from William of Malmesbury's "De Gestis Pontificum." In a foot-note he or his editor adds simply "anno 1075." This presumably was also derived from the same source in the passage on the Council of London, 1075. "Anno Incarnationis Dominicæ M° LXXV, regnante Willelmo anno nono,²² congregatum est concilium in Lundonia, præsidente Lanfranco archiepiscopo Dorobernensi, considentibus secum Thoma archiepiscopo Eboracensi et cæteris episcopis."²³ Two MSS. mention these other bishops by name, and among them "Stigando Selengensi."²⁴ At

²⁰ f. 16b, col. ij., ll. 13, 14.

²¹ Ob. 1633. "De Præsulibus Angliæ," Ed. 1743, by Rev. Canon Wm. Richardson, S.T.P., Master of Emmanuel, p. 502.

²² 25 Dec., 1074, to 24 Dec., 1075.

²³ Lib. I., sec. 42, pp. 66-67 of the 'Rolls Series' text.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 66-67, note.

this council the Conqueror, with his customary legalism, caused to be brought forward certain ancient ordinances, then already upwards of seven centuries old, by way of justification for removing sundry episcopal sees. The Historian continues: "Ex decretis summorum pontificum Damasi et Leonis,²⁵ necnon ex conciliis Sardicensi et Laodicensi,²⁶ in quibus prohibetur episcopales sedes in villis existere, concessum est regia munificentia et sinodali auctoritate, episcopis de villis transire ad civitates, Herimanno de Siraburna ad Serisberiam, Stigando de Selengeo ad Cicestrum, Petro de Licitfelde ad Cestrum."²⁷

It has doubtless been assumed that William's fervid zeal for the punctual observance of these ancient canons was of a nature to brook no delay in the execution of the ordinations of the synodal authority suffered by the royal bounty, and the fact that the sees were moved as prescribed has no doubt been taken as proving that the changes were carried out forthwith, namely, in the same year that the Council made the order, 1075. William of Malmesbury does not, indeed, quite say as much. Of Stigand, as has been shown, he states the removal, but not the command. Of Herman he says plainly that it was by reason of these orders²⁷ "Sub quo, [Guillelmo] cum ex canonum decreto edictum esset, ut sedes episcoporum ex villis ad urbes migrarent, tribunal suum transtulit a Scireburna Salesberiam, quod est vice civitatis castellum, locatum in edito, muro vallatum non exiguo." Of Peter he merely says²⁸ ". . . . derelicta Licitfeld, migravit in Cestram" giving no date in any of the three cases.

There is little ground for entertaining any doubt that these removals were immediately carried out, because there is little ground for doubting that the political reason for the removals, so happily supported by the

²⁵ St. Damascus I., Pope, 366-384; St. Leo I. the Great, Pope, 440-461.

²⁶ Council of Sardica in Illyria, May, 347. First Council of Laodicea, on discipline, A.D. 366.

²⁷ Lib. II., sec. 83, p. 183 of same text.

²⁸ Lib. IV., sec. 172, p. 308 of same text.

ripe authority of these ancient canons, was that certain of the higher ecclesiastics had availed themselves of their facilities for aiding projects of opposition to the Norman rule. Several bishops and abbots had been deposed in consequence or in anticipation of such action, and Thierry,²⁹ whose anti-clerical bias is sufficiently manifest, represented Lanfranc as having offered to the Conqueror the somewhat obvious counsel that to have any effectual means of preventing the like, it was necessary that there should be but one head of the Church. Whether the alien bishops now needed the protection of castle and town-wall, whether the object was to keep the bishops under closer observation, whether or not the transfers of the sees were instantly carried out, it is made fairly plain by charters that these changes did in fact take place, if not immediately, within a very short time, and the canonical error was not suffered to endure for another ten years till 1085.

Stigand, it seems, is a character of whom it is not easy to learn very much. Vitalis in his "Ecclesiastical History" does not appear to mention him, the previously quoted writers have but little to say of him, and his name is not found in the "National Dictionary of Biography." He does, however, occur in a few charters, and he began a long dispute with the extra-diocesan Abbot of Battle. One of the Battle Abbey Charters, number X.,³⁰ begins "Willielmus Dei gratia rex Anglorum Lanfranco archiepiscopo Cantuariensi, Stigando episcopo Cicestrensi salutem." The King notifies them that he had appointed Gausbert abbot of Battle, and again, "Qui igitur Deo annuente canonica fratrum electione abbas substitutus fuerit ibidem absque venalitate omni benedicatur sicut primum abbatem Gausbertum in eodem monasterio de Bello Stigandus episcopus Cicestrensis benedixit." The first two witnesses are the prelates of the other removed sees. "Teste Petro

²⁹ Norman Conquest of England, p. 98, of third English from fifth Paris edition, where he quotes as his authorities:—Tho. Stubbs; Hist. Angl. Script. (Act. Pontif. Ebor.) II., 1706, ed. Selden.—Lanfranci opera, p. 378.

³⁰ "Monasticon," Vol. III., p. 245 in edition of 1821; Vol. I., p. 318, in edition secunda of 1682.

episcopo Cestriæ. Hermano episcopo Sarisberiaë . . . et Gausberto nunc ejusdem loci abbate." This charter is not dated, but these words applied to Gausbert indicate, as does also the subject matter of the charter, that it was granted when Gausbert had only recently been appointed abbot there, that is to say, about the year 1076.

The date of Gausbert's elevation is not known, and it was already forgotten at the time of the writing of the 'Chronicle of Battle Abbey,' or, more precisely, the writer of that chronicle plainly did not know it. The text of this chronicle, as printed,³¹ mentions his consecration before the altar of St. Martin of Battle 'about the year 1076.'³² This point of consecration in his own church was the first occasion of dispute between the abbot and the diocesan, by whom he had been desired to come to Chichester for the ceremony. When the same chronicle came to mention Gausbert's death it was not known how long he had been abbot. He is therein stated³³ to have died on the sixth of the kalends of August [27 July] after ruling the abbey "quatuor fere fortunate consummatis lustris," and his successor was appointed "M.xc.vi. iij° idus Junii," 11 June, 1096. 'Nearly four lustra' might, of course, mean anything approximating to twenty years, and the expression has all the general air of a rhetorical flourish introduced to conceal the absence of more precise information. That he must have been abbot for about twenty years is proved by the signature of Herman to this charter, because Herman died within a year or two of 1076, if not that same year.

Herman's removal of his see from Sherburne to Salisbury is by Le Neve³⁴ dated 1072. If the transfer was not ordered till 1075, as already shown, that can hardly be a correct statement. The point of present interest, however, is the date of Herman's death. This

³¹ Anglia Christiana Society. "Chronicon. Monast. de Bello."

³² "circa m.lxxvi." *Ibid.*, p. 9.

³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 43, 44.

³⁴ "Fasti," Vol. II., p. 594.

is variously stated by different ancient writers. Godwin,³⁵ after quoting William of Malmesbury³⁶ and interposing the quaint verses in which "Poeta quidam," supposed³⁷ to be Peter of Blois, criticised the site—

"Est ibi defectus aquæ, sed copia cretæ,
Sæviti ibi ventus, sed Philomela silet."

finishes with the mention of Herman's death. "Illic [tamen Hermannus] inchoata novi operis ecclesia, morte senili tempus dedicationis prævenit."³⁸ In a foot-note Godwin's editor adds: "De tempore mortis hujus Episcopi hoc modo discrepant Historici. Decessit anno 1076 Bromt.³⁸—1077 Wykes³⁹: 'Chron. Saxon.'⁴⁰—1078

³⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 336.

³⁶ "De Pontificum," Lib. II., sec. 83, p. 183 as before.

³⁷ See "Vet. Regr. Sarisb." Introduction, Vol. II., p. xx., "Est in ibi."

³⁸ Bromt. Twysd. "Decem Script." col. 976. But he had also narrated the council of London and the decree of removal in that year, more or less, as already mentioned, therefore this date need not be held to carry much weight. It is to be noted that he says Osmund occupied this see twenty-four years.

³⁹ Wykes' "Chronicon vulgo dictum Chronicon Thomæ Wykes." 'Rolls Series.' ('Annales Monastici' ed. H. R. Luard, M.A., Vol. IV., p. 10). But this chronicle alone of this series dated the death of Herman's successor Osmund in 1098, all the others referring that event to 1099, wherein they appear clearly to have been correct. Similarly "Wykes" referred Roberts' rebellion (viz., the battle of Gerberoi) to 1078, whereas the Winton Chronicle mentions that event "patrem vulneravit" in 1079, of which last date charter-evidence has also been advanced. It is therefore not unlikely that here 'Wykes' should be read as dating Herman's death in 1078 historical year.

⁴⁰ "Chron. Saxon." 'Rolls Series,' p. 351. (Ed. Benj. Thorpe, F.S.A.) "And Hereman b. eac forthferde on tham dæge x. Kl. Mar." This statement that Herman died 20 February is made under the year 1077, historical year, 1076-7 if so written. It is represented as being the same year in which Egelwig abbot of Evesham died on S. Juliana, 14 Kal. Mart. 16 February. The year in question is fixed by the statement that the moon was eclipsed three nights before Candlemas (2 Feb.), i.e., on the night of 30-31 January. I do not know how to calculate such an eclipse, but the statement admits the extension the moon was full on that night, which implies a new moon about 14 or 15 January. The golden number for 1077 was XIV., that is to say new moon 30 January, which might happen to coincide with an eclipse of the sun, but would make an eclipse of the moon that night impossible. The historical year 1078 [1077-8] appears to be the only year about this date when an eclipse of the moon on or near 30 January may have been physically possible, whether it so occurred or not. It is also to be observed that the A.S. Chronicle records nothing under the year 1078, a circumstance which may permit of the surmise that the events of two years are, wholly or in part, given under the date 1077.

With this text of the A.S. Chronicle is a translation, also by Mr. Thorpe. This passage is there [p. 183.] rendered "And Bishop Hereman also died on the day the kal. of March (Mar. 1st.)^a"; ^a referring to a note "E" (viz., the Bodleian MS. Laud. 636, formerly E80). The Bodleian MS. may so express it, but the text selected for the purposes of this edition is on general grounds likely to be the better worthy of confidence, and on the whole it seems that the intention of this chronicler was to assert that Herman died 20 Feb. 1078 new style.

‘Chron. S. Crucis.’”⁴¹ On merely general grounds the ‘Chronicle of Sarum’⁴² might be the best authority on the point. Unfortunately however it does not mention the date either of Herman’s death or of Osmund’s succession.

The year 1078, it seems, is the latest in which Herman could have been still Bishop of Salisbury, for his successor Osmund is mentioned as Bishop in 1078 and officiating at the removal of the relics of St. Aldhelm, first Bishop of the Diocese, as Godwin⁴³ quotes: “Episcopus fuit Sarisburiensis anno 1078, quo ossa Aldhelmi primi hujus dioeceseos episcopi translata fuere. Ita W. Malmesb. in vita Aldhelmi.”⁴⁴ Also the editor of the “Vetus Registrum Sarisberiense,” in the introduction, after quoting the allegation that Osmund was a son of Henry, Count of Seez, by his wife Isabella (daughter of Robert the Devil), adds in a foot-note⁴⁵ that Osmund was consecrated Bishop by the authority of Pope Gregory VII.⁴⁶ and ruled the church of Salisbury twenty-four years and three months, and died 3 December, 1099. These figures would date his episcopate of Salisbury from about the beginning of September, 1075. If that date can be depended upon, then this charter No. X. of Battle Abbey, of which the date is limited to the time

⁴¹ The chronicle of this abbey at Edinburgh is printed in Wharton’s “Anglia Sacra,” vol. I. At p. 159 Herman’s death is mentioned in 1078, and though the chronicle here is but meagre, it is probably correct as to this date. The “Annales de Winton” (“Annales Monastici,” vol. II., p. 32) also state Herman’s death in 1078. It thus appears that, positively and inferentially, there is a decided preponderance of testimony in favour of this date.

⁴² “Vetus Registrum Sarisberiense,” ed. W. H. Rich Jones, M.A., F.S.A. ‘Rolls Series,’ Vol. I., p. 336. Here is a list of Bishops of Salisbury, and after St. Osmund’s name a statement of his death in 1099, in which many chronicles and his reputed gravestone [Jour. Arch. Assoc., XV., 129] concur. The chronicle itself does not appear to affirm that St. Osmund held this diocese for twenty-four years, as Bromton has been seen to assert. The editor of the Sarum Chronicle however accepted the statement of the somewhat dubious narrative he quoted in his foot-note. Osmund was at his elevation already William’s chancellor, and may possibly have exercised episcopal functions prior to this preference. The grounds upon which in 1481 his assumption was fixed at 3 Dec. [Courthope and Nicolas say 4 Dec.] may have been sufficiently convincing.

⁴³ *Op. cit.*, p. 336.

⁴⁴ This life of Aldhelm, by Wm. of Malmesbury, is in the “Anglia Sacra,” Vol. II., p. 23.

⁴⁵ Vol. II., p. xxij.

⁴⁶ 22 Apr., 1073—25 May, 1085.

during which Herman could be styled Bishop of Salisbury, was executed during the very brief interval of less than four months from Whitsuntide, 24 May, 1075, to early September of the same year; and further, if it is fairly clear that Herman, whenever he ceased to be Bishop, died in February, 1077-8, or, at any rate, had been replaced by Osmund in 1078, if no earlier, then it appears that Stigand was already described as Bishop of Chichester by some of these dates; and certainly by the time of Gausbert's elevation to the abbacy, in or about 1076; very possibly as early as the summer of 1075.

Stigand also appears as a witness to a charter in the year 1075, under the description of Bishop of Chichester. This, if it could be produced as evidence under his own hand and seal, would be regarded as conclusive, but the circumstances of this 'signature' cannot be called entirely free from difficulty. It is not, perhaps, fair to attribute to the records themselves the divergence which is observed, and one hesitates to attempt an explanation of what candidly one does not fully understand. As, however, the point does not appear to have been hitherto examined, it may not be altogether useless to remark that there is a certain amount of discrepancy in the printed charters relating to the foundation of Sele Priory, near Bramber in this county.

The priory of Sele was founded by William de Braose, lord of the castle of Bramber, and probably vice-sheriff of the rape. It was a cell of his Priory of Briouze in Normandy, which was itself a dependent of the Abbey of St. Florent at Saumur. The foundation of this Priory of Sele is the last known act of this William de Braose, and the date of the foundation charter, fixed by Sir William Dugdale in the year 1075, is the latest date at which he is known to have been still living. There are two quite independent versions of the Sele foundation charters, which, while agreeing verbatim for the most part, differ in sundry details. What may be called the Norman version is to be found in the "Memoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie" in a "Notice sur le Prieuré de

Briouze.”⁴⁷ To this paper there is an appendix giving inter alia the Sele Priory foundation charters in full. Of these No. 2, “Charte de fondation du Prieuré de Briouze (Extrait du Codex albus, quelquefois argenteus, ou Cartulaire-Blanc de St.-Florent-de Saumur, fo. 115r^o)” grants to the Priory various tithes and rights, as presently to be quoted, in Briouze and about Bramber, and has the following signatures: “Hoc Signum Guillelmi regis†. Signum Regine Mathildis†. Signum Hainrici Comitis†. Signum Lanfranci Archiepiscopi†. Signum Stigandi episcopi Cistrensis†. Signum Guillelmi de Braiosa†.” The sole annotation to this No. 2 is simply: “Nota—Nous devons cette pièce à l’obligeance de M. Célestin Port, archiviste de Maine-et-Loire.” The fact that Stigand is called episcopus Cistrensis suggests that there was here no ‘correction’ of Selsey to Chichester, and he could probably have been called ‘Bishop of Chester’ only by a mis-reading or a mis-transcribing of a place-name which as a written word had a similar appearance.

In the same appendix No. 3 relates to the same matter, and No. 4 is described as “Charte de Confirmation de Guillaume-le-Conquérant (Cartulaire-Blanc de l’abbaye de St.-Florent l.l.)” This No. 4 begins with the words: “In veneris die id est sexta feria que tunc temporis tertia erat ante Purificationem sancte Marie in sancti Georgii ecclesia de Baucaravilla annuit et confirmavit Guillelmus rex Anglorum hanc meam elemosinam et Mathildis regina uxor sua eorumque filii ad hanc annuitionem et confirmationem fuerunt hii: Odo consul, Hugo consul de Cestra, Alanus Rufus, Gualterus de Meduana” —and thirteen more names.

The annotation to this charter No. 4 is curious, or rather it counts three in a curious, not to say perverse, way. It reads: “Nota—Dans les anciens titres, on désigne le dimanche par prima feria, et les jours suivants par secunda, tertia etc. feria. D’après cette manière de compter, le vendredi est bien sexta feria.

⁴⁷ 3^e Serie, 2^e Vol. XXII. Volume de la Collection, Paris, juin 1858 (dec., 1856), 4to, p. 119.

L'indication *tertia feria* ante Purificationem nous apprend que la Purification tombait le mardi [*sic*] de la semaine suivante (L'art de Verifier les Dates, Glossaire des dates, p. 55)." It would appear to be sufficiently obvious that the word understood after 'tercia' is 'dies' not 'feria.' It is plain that the sixth feria could not be the third feria under any circumstances, for there was never a time when le mardi was dies Veneris. If Friday was the third, Saturday was the second, and Sunday the first day before the Purification, which, therefore, could not have fallen elsewhere than on the Monday. The writer of this note had evidently not seen the note on the same passage in Dugdale's "Monasticon,"⁴⁸ where the fact that this feast 2 February fell on a Monday is utilised as fixing the date of this confirmation-charter absolutely, 30 January, 1075. That is 1074-5, 1075 historical year, in which year D was the Dominical letter and 2 February fell on a Monday. The day of the month and week only fell so in that one year between 1070, when Hugh Lupus was made Earl of Chester, and 1083, in which year Queen Matilda died. It is not clear why Sir William Dugdale, and also his editors of the present century,⁴⁹ called that year the 10th of William I. in the same note, since 30 January, 10 Will. I., was 30 January, 1075-6, in which year the Dominical letter was C B, viz., for January C, which would give 30 January on a Saturday, not Friday. This confirmation was, therefore, in the ninth, not tenth, of the Conqueror.

Returning, however, to the French note, having reckoned the Purification 2 February, by these means to a Tuesday, that would have given 31 January as a Sunday, which is equivalent to saying that it was in a year of which the Dominical letter was C, that is to say 1076 or 1081. Elsewhere⁵⁰ on other grounds, not very convincing, the date of this confirmation charter had been assigned to the year 1080, of which the Dominical

⁴⁸ Vol. I., p. 581, of the 'Editio Secunda,' 1682.

⁴⁹ Vol. IV., p. 668, 1823.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

letter was E D, and therefore it is a little difficult to be sure what opinion the writer of that paper did hold on this point of the date. As, however, only a couple of pages before he had written without comment "Stigand évêque de Chester" perhaps he had not very greatly laboured these details.

All these charters, as before said, are printed also in the "Monasticon," the earlier and later editions agreeing entirely, and both differing considerably from the Norman version. These three charters, No. 2, No. 3 and No. 4, are in the "Monasticon" all run into one charter, the words beginning No. 4 in Veneris die following straight on the last words of No. 3 with only a comma between. Scriptum hoc "dictavit" ["et linivit" interposed in No. 3] "Primaldus ejusdem Braiosensis Willielmi capellanus, in die Veneris . . ." is how the passage reads in Dugdale's charter, which is expressed to be taken "ex autog. sub sigillo in archivis collegii Magdalenensis Oxonii." The text of M. Célestin Port differs from the text of Dugdale in the last sentence of the No. 2, wherein the churches are mentioned, as in these parallel columns.

Port.

"Ad hoc autem apud Braiosa, Radulfum carpentarium cum tota terra sua tribuo et ecclesiam sancti Nicholai de Castello meo de Brenria et ecclesiam de Wassingatune et Aningatune cum duabus carrucis. Hoc signum Guillelmi regis," etc., as before quoted, and No. 3 begins—

"Hanc elimosinam totam mitto et concedo Sancto Florentio," etc.

Dugdale.

"Ad hoc autem, apud Braiosam et Radulfum carpentarium cum tota terra sua tribuo. In Anglia autem ecclesiam S. Petri de Sela, et S. Nich. de Brenbria, et S. Nicholai de Soraham, et S. Petri de Veteri-ponte, cum omnibus omnino decimis et redditibus et ipsis pertinentibus. Hanc elemosinam totam mitto et concedo S. Florentio," etc.

This mention of Annington church is interesting, as it is doubtless the church there spoken of in Domesday.

It is not noticed in the Monasticon charter at all, and Dugdale does not mention the church of Washington till he follows on, all in the same one charter, with the confirmation of Philip de Braose, under which the whole foregoing is recited; but Mr. Dallaway,⁵¹ who was allowed to examine the Magdalen deeds, describes the "long roll . . . as given in the Monasticon," and the confirmation by Philip de Braose, as separate records. Dugdale does not mention the signatories King William, Queen Matilda, Earl Henry, Lanfranc, Stigand and William de Braose. Until, however, this signature of 'Stigand, Bishop of Chester,' can be invalidated, it goes for what it is worth to show that he described himself as Bishop of Chichester in 1075, and according to the date *die Veneris*, etc., 30 January, 1075, N.S.—that is to say, some four months before the order for removing his see. I regretfully confess my inability to elucidate this mystery.

The general tenour of the combined evidence, then, would seem to show—what, indeed, might have been supposed without much risk of error—that the Conqueror, finding reason to have these sees removed, either for their greater safety or better control or what not, placed one Bishop close to Hugh Lupus; another near William d'Evreux, who publicly claimed⁵² to have been all his life a faithful servant of the Conqueror; and the third by the castle of Chichester, which was in the tenure of Roger de Montgomeri. These are three very notable men and, in addition to their individual prowess, all kinsmen of the Conqueror and stark men of his own type. There is, however, one point against the simplicity of this explanation which requires notice.

The standard text of William of Malmesbury's 'History of the Kings of England'⁵³ is that known by the short name of the 'Rolls Series,' or by the name

⁵¹ "History of the Western Division of the County of Sussex" (Rape of Bramber). Ed. Cartwright, 1830, p. 228.

⁵² *Vitalis*, Lib. XI., cap. x.

⁵³ "Gesta Regum Anglorum," 'Rolls Series,' ed. Rt. Rev. Wm. Stubbs, D.D., Bishop of Chester, 1887.

of its editor, the distinguished historical scholar who himself formerly ruled, in its post-reformation shape, one of these dioceses. This text mentions the three bishoprics⁵⁴ and in each case names the place whence the see had been removed as well as the place in which it had been re-established, and again in the third book⁵⁵ mentions the removal of these sees, together with other changes. But just previously, in the section⁵⁶—*Quod Eboracensis archiepiscopus, et omnes sibi subjecti, archiepiscopo Doroberniæ subjiciantur*—William of Malmesbury quoted the decision to which Thomas, archbishop of York, was forced to submit himself. The text reads: “*Generale concilium regni Anglorum de jure et primatu Dorobernensis sive Cantuariensis ecclesiæ. Sec. 298. ‘Anno ab incarnatione Domini nostri Jesu Christi millesimo septuagesimo secundo, pontificatus autem domini Alexandri papæ undecimo,⁵⁷ regni vero Willelmi gloriosi regis Anglorum et ducis Normannorum sexto,’*”⁵⁸ and the instrument purports to be signed at Windsor about Whitsuntide.⁵⁹ “*‘Postea in villa regia quæ vocatur Windlesor, ubi et finem accepit in præsentia regis, episcoporum, abbatum diversorum ordinum, qui congregati erant apud curiam in festivitate Pentecostes. Signum Willelmi regis. Signum Mathildis reginæ. Ego Hubertus, sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ lector et domini Alexandri papæ legatus, subscripsi.’*” and many other signatories follow, among whom “*‘Ego Stigandus Cicestrensis episcopus consensi.’*”⁶⁰

This instrument would by itself show that Stigand was already Bishop of Chichester by Whitsuntide, 1072.

⁵⁴ Lib. I., sec. 100, 101, Vol. I., p. 100.

⁵⁵ Lib. III., sec. 300, Vol. II., p. 353.

⁵⁶ Sec. 298, Vol. II., p. 349. The text edited by Sir T. Duffus Hardy, sec. 298, Vol. II., p. 474, agrees.

⁵⁷ 30 Sept., 1071—29 Sept., 1072.

⁵⁸ 25 Dec., 1071—24 Dec., 1072.

⁵⁹ Whit-Sunday in 1072 was 27 May.

⁶⁰ Vol. II., p. 352. Dr. Stubbs' text also gives a note: “This important document is printed in the ‘*Concilia*,’ Wilkins, I. 324, from MS. Cotton. ‘*Domitian A. 5*,’ and other sources. [Here also “*Stigandus Cicestrensis episcopus*.”] It occurs without the attestations in the ‘*Gesta Pontificum*,’ Lib. I., sec. 27.”

This date has by some been accepted, as already mentioned, and it recalls Le Neve's statement previously noted that the removal of Herman's see from Sherborne to Salisbury was in 1072. He signs this instrument "Ego Hermannus Scirburnensis episcopus subscripsi." It is possible that here is the origin of that date, for it would not be a strange thing if a modern writer should for a moment confuse the Anglican Council of 1072 with the Council of London held in 1075. But as the fact appears clearly to be that the removal of the Sussex bishopric was not ordered till the year 1075, it is difficult to accept this signature of 'Stigand, Bishop of Chichester' in 1072, and as two most highly competent editors give the text of William of Malmesbury so, then it must be agreed that William is inconsistent with himself in two precise details, and consequently one statement must be an error. In this passage on the Anglican Council William is quoting another's account of events which happened some score of years or more before his own birth. A reasonable explanation would seem to be that he himself, or the copyist on whose authority he was quoting this instrument, had involuntarily or by way of emendation converted Selesiensis into Cicestrensis. Intentionally or inadvertently it might be called a trifling variation, but I should not venture to suggest this as an explanation by way of getting rid of this inconvenient date, were it not for the fact that the same variation or error had already been made just before in the preceding paragraph, also, it is to be noted, a quotation, doubtless from the same source.⁶¹

Æthelric, or Egelric, or Alric, was unquestionably Bishop of Selsey, and not Bishop of Chichester. This prelate had been deprived, as has already been quoted from Florence of Worcester, the lawfulness of his deposition had been disputed, and representations had been made upon the matter. William of Malmesbury quoted a letter in this connection from Pope Alexander to King William, in which the pontiff seems rather to

⁶¹ Lib. III., sec. 297, p. 347, Dr. Stubbs. p. 473, Sir T. D. Hardy, "definiendam."

have begged the question: "Alexander Willelmo regi Anglorum. Sect. 297. 'Causam Alricii, qui olim Cices-trensis ecclesiæ dictus est episcopus, diligenter retrac-tandam, et diffiniendam, fratri nostro episcopo Lanfranco commisimus.'" etc. Since here Æthelric is called Bishop of Chichester, which he certainly never was, it seems a reasonable supposition that Stigand, in the next section is called Bishop of Chichester three years before he really was so. No other instances have been observed in which the removal of this see has been thus, so to speak, ante-dated; and, as it stands, this particular 'signature' of 'Stigand bishop of Chichester' appears to lack the characters necessary to make it a sufficient proof that he was not until the year 1075 Bishop of Selsey. That he was in and from Whitsuntide of the year 1075 properly described as Bishop of Chichester is perhaps shewn to be reasonably certain.
