

D.H.C.

The Use of Medieval Chronicles

by
John Taylor

all41007



Bg^{4°}
99998
(10)

Helps for Students of History No. 70

PUBLISHED BY
THE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

1965

40 Bg 99958-10

THIS PAMPHLET IS No. 70 IN THE SERIES
OF HELPS FOR STUDENTS OF HISTORY
PUBLISHED BY
THE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

First published 1965

© *The Historical Association, 1965*

*Price 5s. od. net, 3s. 6d. (post free) to members of the
Historical Association. Obtainable only through
booksellers or from the Offices of the Association,
59A Kennington Park Road, London, S.E.11
from whom a full list of current publications is
available*

The Monk Eadwine writing

The front cover is based on the self portrait of a monk of Christ Church, Canterbury c.1165. It is reproduced as one of the eight plates in colour included in *English History in Pictures—The Early Middle Ages* published for the Association by Routledge and Kegan Paul. 12s. 6d. net (members 8s. 6d.).

The Use of
Medieval Chronicles

by
JOHN TAYLOR

WITHDRAWN

HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION
London

071341.

MONUMENTA
GERMANIAE

1875

Philosophical Opinions

JOHN TAYLOR

HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL

London

1875

THE USE OF MEDIEVAL CHRONICLES

(i)

MEDIEVAL chronicles were for the most part a product of the religious life. Written as the majority were within the religious houses they reflect the continuing interest of English monasticism in the recording of historical events. Among the Religious Orders the Benedictines were pre-eminent in this field. In Bede they had produced the first historical scholar of repute, and in William of Malmesbury the most renowned historian of the Anglo-Norman state. By the beginning of the thirteenth century the Benedictine houses were old and wealthy communities, and their possession of the relics of saints, whose *Lives* they often wrote, provided an immediate cause for enquiry into the past. By comparison with the Benedictines members of other Orders wrote history on a smaller scale. Cistercian houses, for example, were never great, autonomous foundations, and they lacked both the resources and the traditions to set down a continuous view of the history of their day.

The regular clergy were not the only authors of chronicles. During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the period with which this essay is particularly concerned, chronicles were written by members of the secular clergy and occasionally by laymen. Important chroniclers of this time include Adam Murimuth, a canon of St. Paul's, Robert of Avesbury, a registrar of the court of the archbishop of Canterbury, and Geoffrey le Baker, a secular clerk of Oxfordshire. The majority of chronicles nonetheless continued to be written inside the religious houses, and the monastic chronicle was undoubtedly the dominant type of historical writing.

Like other aspects of medieval monasticism the chronicles reveal the influence of the classical world. Latin, the language in which they were written, was an inheritance from Rome, and monks not uncommonly modelled their writings upon the histories of the Roman age. Chroniclers knew, often at first hand, the work of ancient historians, and, for example, Suetonius' *Lives of the Caesars* influenced the form of more

than one chronicle. Yet despite the influence of antiquity the majority of chronicles reflected predominantly the very different conditions of the monastic scriptorium. They were compiled from an ecclesiastical viewpoint, and intended for a clerical audience. The chronicler's aim was not so much to interpret history as to establish a sound chronology. His chronicle which may have been known only to the inmates of his own religious house drew upon the resources of the monastic library among which the Bible and its commentaries formed the most important texts.

In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the chronicles include a variety of narratives. Within the category of the chronicle are contained the universal history of Ranulf Higden, the great contemporary chronicles of Wendover and Matthew Paris as well as the jejune and annalistic compilations of innumerable religious houses. Universal history was a common concern of the monastic writer. In one sense during the Middle Ages all history was universal history, for under the Christian dispensation God was the God of every nation, and Christian historiography had to do with the fate of all peoples. Universal histories which ranged through the four empires and the six ages were common in Europe, and the humblest annalist and chronicler frequently began his historical labours with an account of the origins of the world. Yet although chroniclers might begin their work at the Creation, in the later Middle Ages most writers hastened through their account of the origins of the world in order to concentrate more fully upon the history of their times. During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries most chroniclers dealt with contemporary history, and indeed it has been said that no reign until we come to the age of the newspapers has been more minutely chronicled than that of Henry III.

During this period a part of the value of the chronicles lies in their expression of contemporary opinion. Medieval England had no royal histories similar to the chronicles of St. Denis in France, and chroniclers were free to express a corporate viewpoint. For two centuries the St. Albans chronicles reveal a baronial and anti-curialist bias, and the St. Albans writings set the tone of other histories. During these centuries chronicles were frequently written from a baronial viewpoint, and chroniclers eulogized the persons of Simon de Montfort and Thomas of Lancaster. These expressions of political opinion derived from the sympathies of a particular religious house, the outlook of its abbot, or the prejudice of its lay patron. Occasionally, however, the chronicle might express the individual viewpoint of the monk who

wrote it. At times differences of opinion within a religious house were also reflected in its narrative.

The chronicles were, however, predominantly contemporary histories and they provide a valuable record of current events. Chroniclers were often well informed on the political events of this period, and were themselves occasionally spectators of particular incidents. Thus Thomas Walsingham, the St. Albans chronicler, alone describes in detail Wyclif's appearance at St. Paul's in 1377, while Adam of Usk, a secular cleric, saw at first hand what transpired in several parliaments of the fourteenth century. Although through ignorance, carelessness, or even partisan bias, chroniclers might occasionally misrepresent certain incidents, the majority of writers struggled for accuracy, and, to take one example, the Westminster chronicle, which is an important source for the reign of Richard II, gives on the whole a true and authentic account of events during that period.

Though much labour was expended on monastic history, and chronicles were liable to be examined by the king or his commissioners, few were written with an outside audience in mind. The majority of chronicles survive now only in one or two manuscripts, and were intended simply as a record for a monastery or a cathedral church. Occasionally, however, the work of a chronicler attained a certain popularity either among houses of his own Order, or among neighbouring monasteries, and his chronicle may survive in several copies. Only very occasionally and usually during the later Middle Ages did a history such as the *Polychronicon* of Ranulf Higden, which survives in over a hundred manuscripts, appeal to the widest possible medieval audience consisting of the secular clergy and literate laity as well as the religious houses.

In recent years much work has been done upon the texts of chronicles. Their evidence has been checked against that of the administrative records and their sources have been carefully investigated. In particular the St. Albans chronicles for this period have been re-examined, and for the latter part of the fourteenth century have been found to be the work of one man, Thomas Walsingham.¹ Yet much work remains to be done. We require new editions of certain chronicles and in other cases we need a more detailed examination of printed texts. Only when this critical revaluation has been completed will it be possible finally to evaluate the chronicles, and utilize to the full their historical material.

1. See the studies by V. H. Galbraith mentioned in the Appendix and Bibliography.

We may begin by examining the principal chronicles of this period, where they were written, and the main types of history which they represent. During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries St. Albans was the chief centre of chronicle writing, and the first of the St. Albans writers was Roger Wendover, whose *Flowers of History*, started shortly after 1215, began with the Creation and ended in 1235.¹ Wendover's chronicle becomes original only after 1201 where his sources ended, but from 1201 to 1235 it contains an important account of English history. In this part of his work Wendover drew the unsympathetic portrait of John which passed into later legend, while his description of the minority of Henry III gave rise to the 'anti-curialist' tradition of other St. Albans accounts.

Wendover's work was continued and expanded by Matthew Paris who entered St. Albans in 1217.² In his great *Chronica Maiora* Matthew Paris revised Wendover's chronicle as far as 1235, and from 1235 to 1259 he wrote a contemporary history which was as voluminous as the preceding text. Paris's treatment of John, for which his basic source was Wendover, is notable for the additions which he made to the portrait of the king, additions which it has been said are 'as fictitious as Shakespeare's Falstaff'.³ Though Matthew Paris enlarged Wendover's narrative, his own contributions are untrustworthy and were written long after the events themselves. On the period from 1235 to 1259 he wrote of affairs with which he was better acquainted, and his account of the reign of Henry III is of considerable value. Matthew Paris knew many of the leading figures of his day. In 1247 at Westminster during the feast of Edward the Confessor, Henry III took him aside and bade him write a full and accurate account of the events 'lest in the future their memory be in any way lost to posterity'. Though he was not sparing in his criticism of the king, Matthew Paris remained a privileged observer of events in the world of politics and his chronicle contains a detailed survey of contemporary English as well as of European affairs.

Though Matthew Paris wrote within the traditional form of the chronicle he utilized every possible means of expression. His concern

1. The printed editions of the more important chronicles mentioned in this pamphlet are to be found in the Bibliography at the end.

2. On Matthew Paris see Richard Vaughan, *Matthew Paris* (Cambridge, 1958).

3. V. H. Galbraith, *Roger Wendover and Matthew Paris* (Glasgow, 1944), p. 35.

with documents can be seen in his *Liber Additamentorum* or Appendix of Documents. He illustrated his chronicle by sketches, drawing almost in the manner of a modern cartoonist the secular and ecclesiastical subjects of his work. He is the author of maps of England, Scotland, Palestine, and the world, and in addition the *Chronica Maiora* is one of the first heraldic manuscripts of the period. The shields which Matthew Paris drew convey the interest of heraldry to a feudal world which it has been said could 'read a coat of arms better than a book'. It is almost impossible in fact to do justice to the energy and the interests of the St. Albans monk. Apart from the *Chronica Maiora*, Matthew Paris wrote an English history from 1066 to 1253, a *History of the Abbots* which was completed in 1255, and an abridgement of his main chronicle known as the *Flowers of History*. If by the standards of Gervase of Canterbury, Matthew Paris was more of a chronicler than a historian, he was, clearly, the greatest chronicler of his time.¹

Matthew Paris died in 1259. In the years following his death chronicle writing continued on only a much reduced scale at St. Albans but during the second half of the fourteenth century the writing of contemporary history was revived by Thomas Walsingham whose main chronicle opened with an account of the years 1376-7. Walsingham later enlarged his work to start with the times of Matthew Paris, and he continued it as far as the 1420's. His *Chronica Maiora*, as the work is known, has never been printed as a consecutive whole, and its narrative has now to be discovered in various volumes of the Rolls Series edition of the St. Albans text.² Apart from his main chronicle Walsingham also wrote a short history from 1327 to 1422, the *Ypodigma Neustriae* (911-1419) which is an epitome of English history, a *History of the Abbots*, and a treatise on the work of Ovid.

Although the writings of Matthew Paris overshadow those of every thirteenth-century chronicler, other Benedictines wrote histories of some importance. Two narratives which are important for the reign of

1. In the twelfth century Gervase of Canterbury distinguished between histories and chronicles. There are, says Gervase, on the one hand, histories, and on the other hand, annals and chronicles. The historian selects his facts and polishes his narrative. He writes in an elevated and dignified manner whereas the task of the humbler chronicler 'is to get his dates right, and year by year record briefly the acts of kings and princes, and such other events, portents, and miracles as occur from time to time. There are, alas, too many annalists and chroniclers, who swollen with pride make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge their borders'. *Gervase of Canterbury*, ed. W. Stubbs (Rolls Series, 1879-90), I. 87. The quotation comes from V. H. Galbraith, *Historical Research in Medieval England* (1951), p. 2.

2. See Appendix.

Edward I were compiled at Bury St. Edmunds and at Norwich. The Bury chronicle was the work of three authors, John de Taxter who wrote to 1265, and two monks who continued the chronicle from 1265 to 1296, and from 1296 to 1301.¹ Taxter's work is of relatively small historical value, but the first continuation provides elaborate details on the taxation of the abbey, while the second contains a valuable account of events during a part of Edward I's reign. At Norwich a composite chronicle based on the work of the St. Albans writers and of Taxter was compiled by Bartholomew Cotton. Cotton, a monk of Norwich, added a continuation from 1291 to 1298, and like the Bury chronicle his work is an important source for Edward's reign.

In the fourteenth century a consistent tradition of chronicle writing is found within the royal foundation at Westminster. Chronicles written here at this time include the work of Robert of Reading, John of Reading, and the account (1381-94) of the anonymous Monk of Westminster which contains one of the best descriptions of Richard II's reign. Among Benedictine writings of this period none is more interesting than the *Anonimale Chronicle* of St. Mary's, York, which is a continuation in French of the popular *Brut* history. Its greatest value lies in the final section from 1376 to 1381, where the author described the Good Parliament of 1376, and the Peasants' Revolt of 1381. So detailed are these passages and so familiar was the author with London topography, that scholars have suspected that a missing London source may lie behind this part of the narrative.²

Although their works are scarcely comparable to Benedictine compilations Cistercian chroniclers were also writing during these centuries. Few Cistercian houses produced chronicles which covered the whole period we are discussing, and they were concerned more with the local fortunes of their house than with the wider issues in Church and State. In the thirteenth century, however, the monks at Waverley wrote an important account of the reigns of John and Henry III, while the chronicle of Melrose contains a valuable description of northern events. At the end of the fourteenth century brief though highly informative accounts of political history were also compiled at Dieulacres and at Kirkstall,³ yet in many respects the most interesting

1. An edition of the Bury chronicle has recently been printed in the Nelson's Medieval Classics (1964).

2. The *Anonimale Chronicle* is edited by V. H. Galbraith (Manchester, 1927). See A. F. Pollard, 'Authorship and Value of the *Anonimale Chronicle*', *E.H.R.*, liii (1938).

3. An account of the Dieulacres and Kirkstall chronicles is found in M. V. Clarke, *Fourteenth Century Studies* (Oxford, 1937), pp. 53-114.

Cistercian compilation of the period was the Meaux chronicle written at the end of the fourteenth century by Abbot Burton, the nineteenth abbot, who after resigning his abbacy compiled the first book of chronicles of the abbey. His work, which was constructed around the history of Meaux, consists of a section upon general history following an account of the tenure of each abbot.

More important as centres of chronicle writing were the wealthy houses of Austin canons. In the thirteenth century Thomas Wykes, an Austin canon of Osney, wrote a chronicle which extends to 1289, and which contains a valuable description of the campaigns of Lewes and Evesham. At the end of the thirteenth century Walter, an Austin canon of Guisborough, wrote an important account of Edward I's reign, in which he described Edward's relations with Scotland, the baronage, and the Church. Although that part of his chronicle for which he is best known, namely his account of the domestic crisis of 1296-7, has many inconsistencies, it gives on the whole a valuable picture of northern history. In his chronicle Walter of Guisborough included a number of documents which also add to the interest of his text.¹ Different in kind from the chronicle of Walter of Guisborough is the rhyming chronicle of Peter Langtoft, an Austin canon who had contacts with the world outside the cloister. Between 1271 and 1286 Langtoft acted as attorney on behalf of the Prior of Bridlington in Yorkshire, at Westminster, and elsewhere, and his chronicle which was written in French was known to the laity. Langtoft himself has been described as 'one of the most violently Scotophobe historians of all time'.² In the final section of his work where he dealt with the reign of Edward I he spoke of the Scots with extreme bitterness which was probably representative of a good deal of contemporary feeling.

The compiler of the *Gesta Edwardi De Carnavan*, whose work describes northern history during the early years of Edward III, was another Austin canon who wrote during the early part of the fourteenth century, but no history by a member of this Order is of greater interest than the chronicle of Henry Knighton. Knighton, a canon of St. Mary's, Leicester, who lived during the second half of the fourteenth century, wrote an account of the reign of Richard II which he later enlarged into a history beginning with the Norman Conquest. For the fourteenth century Knighton gives an important though biased

1. See the introduction to the chronicle by Harry Rothwell (Camden Society, 1957).

2. The account of Langtoft in M. D. Legge, *Anglo-Norman in the Cloisters* (Edinburgh, 1950), pp. 70-74, gives an interesting description of his work.

account of Wyclif and the Lollard movement. Leicester was a centre of Lollardy, and Philip Repingdon, an early follower of Wyclif, was abbot of St. Mary's at the time when Knighton wrote. Knighton's hostility to Wyclif was hard to reconcile with his warm regard for the Duke of Lancaster, who possessed lands around St. Mary's, and who had supported Wyclif and his followers during the early stages of the movement. In Knighton's pages therefore Gaunt appears as the deluded though high-minded magnate.

Mendicants made only a small contribution to chronicle writing. In the thirteenth century Thomas of Eccleston, a Minorite, compiled a treatise on the arrival of the Franciscans in England, while during the fourteenth century Nicholas Trivet, a Dominican who was familiar with the court of Edward I, wrote an important account of that reign. The historical labours of the Franciscans are revealed by the Lanercost chronicle, a Franciscan work which extended to 1296, and which was revised by the Austin canons of Lanercost, and then continued down to 1346 by another Franciscan writer.¹ The most interesting Mendicant compilation is undoubtedly, however, the Carmelite work known as the *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, which consists of a collection of documents concerned with Lollardy and the Mendicant Orders, joined by a narrative describing the activities of the Oxford followers of John Wyclif.² Although the work as we have it was compiled during the 1430's, probably at the London Whitefriars for John Keninghale, Prior Provincial of the Carmelite Order, the connecting narrative belongs to the fourteenth century, and it preserves an almost contemporary account of the academic phase of Lollard history.

Members of the Religious Orders, who wrote innumerable minor annals in addition to the chronicles just described, were not the only writers of history. Geoffrey le Baker, a secular clerk of Oxfordshire, wrote a valuable narrative of Edward II's reign, while the *Vita Edwardi Secundi* of the so-called monk of Malmesbury, was probably the work of a clerk to the Earl of Hereford. Robert of Avesbury, a registrar at the court of the archbishop of Canterbury, and Adam Murimuth, a canon of St. Paul's, both wrote histories of the opening phase of the Hundred Years War. At the end of the fourteenth century Adam of Usk, an ecclesiastical lawyer, compiled one of the best accounts of the close of Richard II's reign. In his chronicle Usk described a visit to Richard in the Tower in 1399 during which the

1. A. G. Little, *E.H.R.*, xxxi (1916), 269-79.

2. J. Crompton, 'Fasciculi Zizaniorum', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, XII (1962).

king sat and bemoaned his fate in a manner very different from the account in the Parliament Roll where he is said to have resigned '*hilari vultu*', 'with a smiling face'.

Ecclesiastics, whether regulars or seculars, formed the main body of chronicle writers. During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries lay histories were rare, and the lay historian was only just beginning to emerge. The chronicles of London, which are important during the fifteenth century when they were written in English, are represented in the thirteenth century by the annals of St. Paul's, and by Arnold Fitz Thedmar's chronicle of the mayors and sheriffs of London. In the fourteenth century the *Annales Londonienses* and the *French Chronicle of London* continue London history though they lack the importance of the later London accounts. The first layman to write history was Sir Thomas Gray whose *Scalacronica*, which is valuable for Border history, was compiled when he was imprisoned at Edinburgh in 1355. Among chronicles which may have a lay origin none was more popular than the *Brut*, an Anglo-French compilation which derived its opening from Geoffrey of Monmouth. In its earliest versions the *Brut* extended to 1333, and if it was a lay chronicle it was the best-known and most influential lay history of the time.

In almost all cases the chronicles which have been described dealt with contemporary history. In England apart from Marianus Scotus no chronicler wrote a major account of world history until the fourteenth century when Ranulf Higden, a monk of St. Werburgh's, Chester, compiled a universal chronicle in which he dealt at length with the early history of the world. The *Polychronicon*, as his work was known, was an immediate and unprecedented success. It gave to the most educated audience of fourteenth-century England a clear and comprehensive picture of world history, and in his chronicle Higden included a lengthy description of the Roman world. The *Polychronicon* circulated in many copies, and during the latter part of the fourteenth century was furnished with a number of continuations which include several of the most important chronicles of Richard II's reign.

The success of Higden's work represents a widening of historical interest among the educated clergy who read the chronicles. In his work Higden was not attempting to rival the descriptions of contemporary history which are to be found in the narratives of Matthew Paris and Thomas Walsingham, and his chronicle possesses a greater literary and antiquarian appeal. Although other writers attempted to copy his

encyclopaedic style of writing only Higden possessed the industry and skill necessary to compile a work of this nature and his chronicle remains in many respects unique. Partly because of its novelty the *Polychronicon* was read for two centuries, and although in the course of time Higden's narrative became outmoded the universalising trend in historical thought which it represented was to survive into a later age.

If Higden's work represents one aspect of chronicle writing, yet another is to be found in those chronicles which were concerned with domestic affairs. The *Histories of the Abbots* compiled at St. Albans have already been mentioned and other narratives which were concerned mainly with the domestic history of their house include the first continuation of the Bury chronicle, the thirteenth-century chronicle of St. Mary's, York, and William Thorne's chronicle of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, which extended to 1397. Apart from these works, historical writing of another variety is to be found in tracts upon the origins of monasticism which also flourished during this period.¹

Whatever their subject matter, the majority of chronicles were written in Latin. Latin was the language of the Church, and the only possible language of learning. Nor for several centuries could the rising vernacular cover the intellectual fields dominated by Latin. Occasionally, however, chronicles were written in French and in English. Langtoft's chronicle was written in French as was the *Anonimale Chronicle* of St. Mary's, York. The fourteenth century was the period when Jean le Bel and Froissart wrote their accounts in French of English history. A few chronicles were written in English. Among these must be included the rhyming chronicle of Robert of Gloucester, compiled during the reign of Edward I, and the chronicle of Thomas of Castelford, composed by a Yorkshire cleric towards the end of the 1320's. In addition a number of chronicles were translated into English from French or Latin. In 1338 Robert of Brunne translated parts of Langtoft's chronicle, the *Brut* appeared in an English version towards the middle of the fourteenth century, and in the 1380's Trevisa translated the *Polychronicon* into English. Yet the importance of these translations should not be exaggerated, and in the case of Trevisa's translation, the English text in no way rivalled the popularity or prestige of the Latin original.

1. W. A. Pantin, 'Some Medieval English Treatises on the Origins of Monasticism', *Medieval Studies Presented to Rose Graham* (Oxford, 1950).

What is the value of the chronicles to the student today? In the period before the study of record sources chronicles formed the principal materials of the medieval historian. Victorian writers of history quoted the chronicles and were often influenced by the chronicler's judgements. For his description of thirteenth-century history Stubbs used the work of Wendover and Matthew Paris, and his view of Lancastrian constitutionalism came in part from the St. Albans accounts.¹ J. R. Green in his *Short History of the English People* repeated Wendover's views on John, while his description of events at the time of the Peasants' Rising was little more than a recapitulation of Froissart's narrative. Today, however, the chronicles no longer form the sole or even the principal materials of the medieval historian. Record sources supplement the chronicler's narrative, and certain aspects of medieval history, such as the development of the central administration, can be written only from the record sources. Yet whatever the importance of the records the student is still dependent upon the chronicler's account, and the chronicles continue to provide him with a valuable picture of contemporary events.

Much of the value of the chronicles in this period lies in fact in their description of political history. In the chronicles of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the relations between king and barons, the 'politics' of the medieval world, occupy an important position. Matthew Paris described Henry III's relations with the barons, speaking for example of the king's repeated attempts to raise money, by summoning the barons, at different times, into his private chamber, 'like a priest summoning penitents to confession'. Several writers including the annalists at Tewkesbury and Winchester narrated the course of the Barons' War, while at the end of the thirteenth century the conflict between Edward I and the magnates formed an important topic in many chronicles. During the fourteenth century the political struggles of the beginning and the end of the century were also described by chroniclers including the author of the *Vita Edwardi Secundi* and Thomas Walsingham.

These accounts of political history were the work of ecclesiastics who in several cases had access to private sources of information. Geoffrey le Baker's account of the deposition of Edward II owes

1. H. Cam, 'Stubbs Seventy Years After', *Law Finders and Law Makers in Medieval England* (London, 1962), pp. 188-211.

much of its value to the fact that his patron, Sir Thomas de la More had himself witnessed the events of 1327. Walsingham had informants who reported incidents in London during the 1370's, while Adam of Usk sat in the final parliaments of the century and was a member of the commission which met in 1399 to decide the succession to the throne. Not all chroniclers enjoyed these advantages, however, and partly because of his distance from London a north-country writer such as Walter of Guisborough is not always a reliable guide to what occurred in the south of England during the reign of Edward I.

In the case of writers who had access to privileged sources of information or who were themselves spectators of particular incidents, this knowledge lends an obvious importance to what they wrote. Adam of Usk's description of the parliament of 1397 in which Richard took his revenge upon the Lords Appellant is valuable mainly because it is the account of an eye-witness. 'Richard, earl of Arundel was put on his trial, clad in a robe of red with a hood of scarlet. And straight-way the duke of Lancaster said to the Lord Nevill: "Take off his belt and hood," and it was done. And when the articles of accusation were unfolded to the earl he boldly declared that he was no traitor, and claimed the benefit of his pardon granted aforetime, declaring that he would never withdraw him from the king's grace. But the duke of Lancaster said to him: "Traitor! that pardon is recalled." The earl answered, "Verily, thou liest! never was I traitor!" Again the duke said: "Wherefore didst thou then get the pardon?" And the earl answered: "To close the mouths of mine enemies, of whom thou art one."'¹

The political struggles of Richard II's reign had, in the main, their setting in parliament, and, as this passage reveals, chroniclers often knew what took place there. From the middle of the century chroniclers took an increasing interest in parliament.² Because of descriptions found in the chronicles the Good Parliament of 1376 is the best known of all these medieval assemblies. Apart from the parliament roll its proceedings are described by Walsingham and by the author of the account found now in the *Anonimale Chronicle*. In his narrative Walsingham mentions the committees which were set up, the election of Peter de la Mare as Speaker, and Gaunt's words against the Commons.³ In the *Anonimale Chronicle* the description of the proceedings

1. *Chronicon Adae de Usk*, ed. E. M. Thompson (Oxford, 1904), p. 157.

2. T. F. Tout, 'The English Parliament and Public Opinion, 1376-1388', *Collected Papers* (Manchester, 1934), II. 173-90.

3. *Chronicon Angliae*, pp. 68-78.

in this parliament is even more detailed and exact. Almost in the manner of a domestic journal the *Anonimalle Chronicle* records the speeches, questions, answers, and even the interruptions of the members in the critical debates.¹ It mentions the knights of the shire going to the lectern with their muttered grace before and after speaking, the actions of Peter de la Mare, and his refusal to address the Lords until the Commons had been admitted. Although the description in the *Anonimalle Chronicle* is unique, all the main parliaments of Richard II's reign are mentioned in the chronicles, and for a detailed study of the Wonderful Parliament of 1386, the Merciless Parliament of 1388, and the Revenge Parliament of 1397 we have to consult the chroniclers' narratives in addition to the parliament rolls.

In their accounts of contemporary history chroniclers are frequently the only authority for some particular incident or item of knowledge. Thus the Bury chronicle alone explains the reason for the quarrel between the Lord Edward and the Earl of Gloucester in 1269. A full account of proceedings in the January session of the 1327 parliament is found only in the *Pipewell Chronicle*,² and a chronicle written at Whalley in the fourteenth century is the one source to mention a deposition of Richard II in 1387.³ In several cases this information must be treated with caution. Although Richard may have been deposed in 1387 as the Whalley chronicler says, and although proceedings in the Merciless Parliament are not entirely incompatible with the story, yet at the same time we cannot be sure that what the chronicle says is true.

The limitations of the monastic chronicles are well illustrated in the case of the Peasants' Rising.⁴ The events of 1381 were described by Walsingham and Knighton as well as by the author of the account in the *Anonimalle Chronicle*. Among these descriptions that in the *Anonimalle Chronicle* is by far the most valuable. The author who knew in the greatest detail the sequence of events in London, Kent, and Essex, understood something of the causes of the Rising. His knowledge of London events, suggests that he was someone close to the king, and from his general outlook it is possible that he was a layman. In

1. *Anonimalle Chronicle*, pp. 79-94.

2. The *Pipewell Chronicle* is printed in M. V. Clarke, *Medieval Representation and Consent* (London, 1936), pp. 193-5.

3. M. V. Clarke, *Fourteenth Century Studies*, pp. 91-93.

4. G. Kriehn, 'Studies in the Sources of the Social Revolt in 1381', *American Historical Review*, VII, 254-85.

contrast with his description the accounts of Walsingham and Knighton reveal the limitations of the monastic writer. Though Walsingham outlined in some detail the Rising at St. Albans, and Knighton recounted the course of events at Leicester, both chroniclers gave an inaccurate and misleading picture of the rebellion in London, and in addition both were strongly prejudiced against the peasants. Therefore although the two accounts are valuable contemporary descriptions, neither can be accepted as giving a true picture of the Rising.

Apart from the historical value of their narratives, which may be significant for what they omit as well as for what they include, chroniclers sometimes transcribed documents of some importance. During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries documents of a political nature were circulated on an increasing scale, and in certain cases these documents are found now only in the texts of chronicles. Thus Matthew Paris alone preserves the famous Paper Constitution which is sometimes ascribed to 1244, while a letter written from Oxford in 1258 describing the proceedings of the baronial reformers survives solely in the chronicle of Burton Abbey. The *De Tallagio Non Concedendo*, a valuable document connected with the crisis of 1297, was transcribed by Walter of Guisborough, and during the fourteenth century literature associated with parliament was sometimes copied into the texts of chronicles. Thus a diary describing the proceedings in parliament of 1386 is found now in the chronicle of the monk of Westminster.¹

In addition to their historical information and the documents that they transcribe chroniclers also reveal something of their own outlook. The hatred of taxation which Matthew Paris clearly felt is evident in much of his treatment of governmental and papal action; Langtoft leaves the reader in no doubt of his feeling towards the Scots; while Henry Knighton was far from being an impartial observer of the Lollard movement. It is in the field of politics that the chronicler's attitude is perhaps of the greatest interest, revealing as it often does the outlook of his house. From the time of Wendover the St. Albans chronicles have been described as 'patriotic and anti-curialist'. The views expressed in the St. Albans chronicles were in part determined by the prejudices of Matthew Paris and others, and in part by the material interests of the house. At the time of the Barons' War most chroniclers were Montfordian in outlook, while during the fourteenth century several adopted a Lancastrian position. The long version of

1. *Polychronicon*, IX. 147-58.

the *Brut* which describes the reign of Edward II is, for example, a Lancastrian chronicle, lamenting the fate of Earl Thomas and speaking of the cult which followed his death.¹ Occasionally a chronicler's viewpoint changed. In 1376 Walsingham began his chronicle in a manner bitterly hostile to John of Gaunt, but during the 1380's his opinion changed, and even before the Lancastrian seizure of the throne he revised his narrative omitting the critical references to John of Gaunt and praising the Duke for his patience and moderation.²

There is in the chronicles evidence not only of a political but of a social viewpoint. Whatever the accuracy of Froissart's narrative and however heightened his description of the deeds of kings and princes he conveys the aristocratic ethos of the fourteenth century. Froissart's admiration for the knightly class, and his contemptuous view of the general multitude, was shared to the full by the monastic chronicler, and we search the chroniclers' narratives in vain at the time of the Peasants' Rising for any trace of sympathy with the aspirations of townsmen and peasants. The Lollard movement was described with an equal bias, and although Walsingham is the fullest authority on this period, few would go to his chronicle to discover a true picture of John Wyclif. To Walsingham Wyclif was, 'the instrument of the devil, the enemy of the Church, the confounder of the people, the idol of heretics . . .'³

While the attitude of the chroniclers to the events of their day is of obvious value, their description of the past is also of some interest. In their accounts of early history medieval writers peopled their narratives with legendary heroes who even in Trojan times, 'lived in moated and machicolated castles, bore coat-armour, honoured the Virgin and the saints, and tilted on horse-back'.⁴ Yet the legends and the lack of historical perspective can themselves tell us something about the contemporary outlook. Chroniclers frequently began their account of British history with Brutus, the great grandson of Aeneas who after many wanderings landed in this island to found Trinovantum or New Troy. The Brutus legend, which derived from Geoffrey of Monmouth, had its historical justification. It was an attempt to associate

1. J. Taylor, 'The French Brut and the Reign of Edward II', *E.H.R.*, lxxii (1957).

2. V. H. Galbraith, 'Thomas Walsingham and the St. Albans Chronicle', *E.H.R.*, xlvii (1932).

3. *Historia Anglicana*, II. 119.

4. T. F. Tout, 'The Study of Medieval Chronicles', *Collected Papers*, III. 1-25.

the history of Britain with that of Greece and Rome. In this way the chroniclers aimed to show that the British were not barbarians deservedly left out of the main stream of general history but had their place in the story of the ancient world.¹

On another plane the world histories of this period reveal the accepted picture of the historical process. In these writings history was seen as a linear progression moving through the four empires and the six ages. Men in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries lived, as they believed, in the sixth and final age of history that had begun with the birth of Christ, and would last until the day of judgement. Although a belief in the imminent end of the world had declined somewhat in the fourteenth century, the writings of Joachim of Flora with their apocalyptic view of history were still popular, and chroniclers like others looked forward to a renewal of the Christian world.

When the chronicles have been scrutinised for their historical material and for their evidence concerning the contemporary outlook, there still remain questions to which they supply no answers. Economics and institutional developments were largely beyond their scope, and individual personality also mainly escaped them. Although chroniclers mentioned the 'eccentricities' of individual kings they rarely attempted to explain human motive. Men were viewed externally, and inner changes were seldom noted. Yet interesting descriptions do occur from time to time in the course of the chroniclers' narratives. Trivet's fine description of Edward I conveys the physical appearance of the king, yet it suggests at the same time the character of the man, and we may well conclude these comments upon the value of the chronicles with a brief extract from Trivet's chronicle. 'He [Edward I]', wrote Trivet, 'was of handsome figure, of majestic stature, in which he overtopped ordinary people from the shoulder upwards. His hair in boyhood, from a colour almost silvery, bordering upon yellow, but in youth changing to black, adorned his old age with locks of a swan-like whiteness. His forehead was broad, and the rest of his face likewise except that the drooping eye-lid of his left eye betrayed a resemblance to his father's glance. Although he lisped he had yet no lack of eloquence to persuade when there was any occasion for oratory. In proportion to his body his arms were long and supple; there were no arms to match them for sinewy strength and skill in the use of the sword. His breast was more prominent than his belly, and the length

1. See T. D. Kendrick, *British Antiquity* (London, 1950).

of his thighs when his charger reared and galloped, prevented the rider from ever losing his seat.¹

(iv)

Chronicles were frequently written with only the inmates of the chronicler's religious house in mind. They may survive in several versions, and contain no obvious clue as to where or by whom they were written. A consideration of problems arising from the conditions in which chronicles were composed forms the concluding subject of this essay.

One question which arises in studying chronicles is their date of composition. A contemporary account is obviously of greater value than a narrative which was written many years after the events which it describes. Matthew Paris wrote of the reigns of John and Henry III, but it is only his account of the reign of Henry III that is contemporary, and it is this part of his narrative which is therefore of the greatest value. To decide whether a chronicle is, in fact, contemporary with the events which it describes requires a detailed textual examination. Only occasionally did a chronicler such as the author of the *Eulogium Historiarum* record the year in which he wrote. The date of composition of a chronicle may at times be inferred from the point at which it ends. It is, for example, probable, though by no means certain, that a chronicle which ends in the 1390's was completed somewhere about that time. Often, however, the historian cannot get beyond the supposition that a chronicle was written about a certain time, or between two definite dates. Though handwriting may assist in this matter it cannot be more than an approximate guide, and it is rarely that a scholar can, on palaeographical grounds, assign a manuscript to a particular year or indeed to a period of less than fifty years.

The problem of dating is crucial to the matter of forgery. Although forgery is a problem which more frequently confronts the students of charters, forged chronicles are occasionally found. The history of Croyland by the pseudo-Ingulf gives what professes to be a history of Croyland by the abbot Ingulf who died in 1109. The chronicle which was written to justify the claims of the monks to lands in their

1. The description of Edward is in Trivet, *Annales*, ed. Thomas Hog (1845), pp. 281-2. The translation is based upon that by J. Gairdner in his *Early Chronicles of Europe, England* (London, 1879), p. 266.

possession was, however, compiled during the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, and it contains a number of glaring anachronisms. The author, 'sends dead men on missions to kings and princes; he makes Ingulf on his travels visit an emperor who was not yet an emperor, and a patriarch who was already in his grave. He makes aged monks, driven away by heathen Danes, come back to restore the abbey and resume their monastic routine, and die years afterwards at such ages as 148, 142, and 115'.¹ Forgeries such as the *Historia Croylandensis* are scarcely difficult to detect, yet even today they are occasionally accepted as genuine. Their very existence underlines the need to test the supposed date of composition of a chronicle, and to check the authenticity of its historical information.

Problems of authorship and provenance also arise. While the provenance of a chronicle may explain its particular bias, the question of authorship is also of some interest. By no means all medieval writing was anonymous, and in more than one way chroniclers associated their names with their works. In the *Chronica Maiora* Matthew Paris referred to himself on at least six occasions as 'Brother Matthew Paris', or as 'Matthew, the writer of this'. Adam Murimuth and Adam of Usk left details concerning themselves in the text of their chronicles. During the fourteenth century if a chronicle attained any degree of popularity chroniclers were tempted to associate their names with it, and both Ranulf Higden and Henry Knighton inserted acrostics containing their names into the text of their narratives. Not all chroniclers, however, left evidence of authorship, or wrote in the distinctive script of Matthew Paris, whose handwriting alone identifies several manuscripts as his work. In several cases authorship is unknown or is, at best, a matter of inference. We do not know who wrote the *Annales Londonienses* or the *Annales Paulini*, both of which are important sources for the reign of Edward II. The authorship of the *Vita Edwardi Secundi*, traditionally ascribed to a monk of Malmesbury, is again uncertain; it is possible that it was written by a clerk to the earl of Hereford.²

In those cases where the chronicler's name is known, few details concerning his life may be available. The known facts concerning Matthew Paris are that he entered St. Albans in 1217, went to Norway in 1248 as the bearer of a message from Louis IX of France to King Haakon VII and was invited to reform the Benedictine abbey of St.

1. T. F. Tout, 'Medieval Forgers and Forgeries', *Collected Papers*, III. 117-43.

2. See the introduction to the *Vita Edwardi Secundi* (Nelson, 1957).

Benet Holm. He returned to St. Albans, and died there in 1259. Even less is known about Thomas Walsingham who is first heard of in 1380 when he was precentor of the abbey. In 1394 he left St. Albans to become prior of the cell at Wymondham, and he returned to the monastery at the end of 1396 where he remained until his death shortly after 1420. Among fourteenth-century chroniclers Peter Langtoft and Adam of Usk are two of the best documented. Langtoft, an Austin canon of Bridlington, acted as Prior's attorney in the 1270's, and in 1291 was accused of burning the goods and chattels of Margaret le Clerke. In 1293 he is known to have been absent from Bridlington without leave, pretending that he had the Archbishop's licence to travel. Adam of Usk, an ecclesiastical lawyer, left Oxford to practise law in the court of Canterbury, and, through a connection with the Arundels, saw something of the politics of his time. After the Lancastrian revolution he spent several years in exile suspected of plotting against the throne before he returned to England to seek and obtain the king's pardon.

As important as the question of authorship is that of provenance, for local associations often determined a chronicler's outlook: Knighton's Leicestershire connections partly explain his Lancastrian sympathies. Details in the text often supply clues as to origin. Thus in the Westminster chronicle written during the reign of Richard II, Westminster references, including an account of the loss of the regalia at the time of Richard's coronation, prove that the work was written in that house.¹ A small chronicle written during the middle years of the fourteenth century proclaims its Wigmore origin by innumerable references to events in that monastery. In several cases there is no indication as to where a chronicle was compiled and the long version of the French *Brut*, an important source for the reign of Edward II, contains no clue as to where or by whom it was written.

Problems of authorship and provenance, difficult though they may be, are not the most obstinate problems which confront those who use these sources. Chronicles may survive in more than one version and in a number of manuscripts. The student who uses a chronicle which survives in several copies requires to know the filiation of manuscripts, and must endeavour to establish, so far as he can, the text of the author's original version. Though there may be no autograph copy, nor even an immediate transcript, textual examination will usually establish

1. J. Armitage Robinson, 'An Unrecognized Westminster Chronicler', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, III (1907).

the relationship of one manuscript to another, and will enable the scholar to reconstruct the archetype.¹ In more than one instance editions of medieval chronicles were printed from late transcripts which contain important variations. In these cases only a study of the manuscripts can reveal which particular copy contains the author's original version.

In the recovery of the author's first version, expurgation may present one problem. Matthew Paris deleted passages from the later versions of his chronicle. 'Qualms of conscience,' it has been said, 'may well have afflicted a Benedictine monk who had recorded that "the papal court stinks to the high heavens", and who had cast so many aspersions on his king and archbishop'². Walsingham's contemporary history provides another example. As already stated Walsingham began his historical labours with an account of the years 1376-7, and in this part of his chronicle he wrote favourably of the young king but was bitterly hostile to John of Gaunt. Walsingham removed this part of his narrative from the later versions of his chronicle and the return of his early history to its original position in the text has been the work of modern scholarship. Three manuscripts supply the missing portion of Walsingham's history, and the finding and reconstruction of the text by Maunde Thompson has been described as 'an example of the finest detective work in scholarship'. The reconstructed text is of some historical interest, for it contains Walsingham's description of the Good Parliament, as well as his views on John of Gaunt.

If expurgation is one difficulty, interpolation may be another. The text of a chronicle may contain passages which were the work of a later scribe. Such is the case with the chronicle of Walter of Guisborough where the well-known passage which describes Earl Warenne and his 'rusty sword' was not the work of Walter of Guisborough, but was added to later manuscripts of the chronicle. During the later Middle Ages chronicles may survive in manuscripts which were written some considerable time after the original was composed, and in these cases it is not easy to distinguish between the original text and parts which a copyist may have added.

Different in kind is the problem of sources. Chronicles were seldom original for the whole length of their narrative. Chroniclers copied from other writings, and the task of tracing a chronicle's sources may be one of the greatest difficulty. For its account of the Good Parliament

1. See the introduction to the chronicle of Walter of Guisborough, ed. H. Rothwell (Camden Society, 1957).

2. Richard Vaughan, *Matthew Paris*, p. 124.

and the Peasants' Rising the *Anonimale Chronicle* appears, for example, to have used a missing London narrative. Knighton copied the early part of his history from the seventh book of the *Polychronicon*, and from the account of Walter of Guisborough though he failed to acknowledge his debt to the work of the latter. Occasionally a chronicler mentioned his sources. Higden named his authorities in the course of his narrative, yet even he was not averse to giving under his own name passages which were the work of another.

Informative as the chronicler is his narrative must be controlled by the record sources. Though at times chroniclers might be privileged observers, on other occasions they were ignorant of the true drift of political events. Through ignorance, carelessness, and even deliberate misrepresentation they may provide a distorted picture of what transpired. Thus Walsingham's hatred of John of Gaunt distorts his picture of the Good Parliament, while Matthew Paris was capable of deliberate falsification. In the *Chronica Maiora* Matthew Paris wrote that Henry III 'extorted' a scutage which the barons had, in fact, agreed to in 1242, and elsewhere he clearly failed to understand the nature and purpose of the baronial reform movement.¹ Because of imperfect knowledge, error, and bias, the chronicler's narrative must, wherever possible, be corrected and supplemented by other sources.

Those who use the chronicles for the first time usually read them in the printed editions of the Rolls Series. Though these volumes have proved of the utmost value to historical scholarship they occasionally provide their own hazards for the historical enquirer. In some cases editors printed their texts from late transcripts, and in certain editions they made errors both in the text and in their critical comments.² In the case of the Westminster chronicle the printed edition tells us that in 1384 a Carmelite friar approached Richard and told him that his uncle the duke of Lancaster was plotting against his life. As the text is printed and often quoted, 'Richard, nervous and highly strung at all times, now completely lost self-control. He behaved like a madman, took off his hat and shoes, and threw them out of the window.' Unfortunately for those who have used this incident to illustrate the king's unstable nature, the editor misread his chronicle. From an examination of the manuscript at this point it is clear that the scribe transposed certain passages. When the narrative is rearranged it appears that it was not the king, but the Carmelite friar

1. See the comments of Richard Vaughan, *Matthew Paris*, pp. 139-40.

2. See Appendix.

who shammed insanity, taking off his cap and shoes, and throwing them out of the window.¹

More serious than this slip are the fundamental errors contained in the Rolls Series editions of Knighton and Walsingham. In the edition of Knighton the editor failed to detect the chronicle's debt to the work of Walter of Guisborough, and in addition he assigned the chronicle to two authors, one of whom wrote a history from the Norman Conquest to 1366, and the other, a 'pseudo-Knighton', who wrote the valuable account from 1377 to 1395. A detailed examination of the chronicle reveals, however, that there was but one author, Henry Knighton, a canon of St. Mary's, Leicester, who wrote a narrative from 1377 to 1395, which he later enlarged to include an account of English history from the Norman Conquest to his own times, and which he never completed.²

The edition of the St. Albans chronicle for the latter part of the fourteenth century is, if anything, a work of greater confusion. The editor supposed that what was in fact the work of a single author, Thomas Walsingham, was the product of several monks who wrote at St. Albans towards the end of the fourteenth century. In addition he printed the chronicle from a late transcript, and in the printed volumes the text of Walsingham's Main Chronicle and of his Short Chronicle are hopelessly confused. The text of the two versions can now be discovered only by moving backwards and forwards between the printed volumes of the *Chronicon Angliae*, the *Historia Anglicana*, and the *Annales Ricardi Secundi*. Even so parts of Walsingham's short chronicle remain unprinted.³ Difficulties such as this have to be recognized and overcome before full use can be made of the texts of chronicles.

1. H. L. Hector, 'An Alleged Hysterical Outburst of Richard II', *E.H.R.*, lxxviii (1953), 62-65.

2. V. H. Galbraith, 'The Chronicle of Henry Knighton', *Fritz Saxl Memorial Essays* (1953), (London, 1957).

3. See Appendix.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank Mr. P. H. Sawyer for reading this essay and for suggesting several improvements.

J.T.

APPENDIX

Standards of Editing in the Chronicles

The Rolls Series still contain the main printed editions of our chronicles. David Knowles has described the origins of this series in *Great Historical Enterprises* (Nelson, 1963), pp. 101-34. The standards of editing in the Rolls Series vary considerably. The editions of Luard and Stubbs are admirable, and Stubbs in particular did some of his best work in the introduction to the chronicles. Among other editors, E. Maunde Thompson, Joseph Stevenson, and Sir F. Madden produced useful texts. Certain publications, however, are not so satisfactory, and to name only the most obvious examples, the editions of Wendover, Knighton, Walsingham, and the *Fasciculi Zizaniorum* require to be replaced.

The printed text of Walsingham's chronicle illustrates the confusion found in certain volumes of the Rolls Series. The St. Albans publications of this period include the *Chronicon Angliae*, the *Historia Anglicana*, the *Annales Ricardi II et Henrici IV*, the *Ypodigma Neustriae*, and the *Gesta Abbatum*. The relationship of the main St. Albans manuscripts has been worked out by V. H. Galbraith, 'Thomas Walsingham and the St. Albans Chronicle', *E.H.R.* xlvii (1932), and in addition he printed a part of Walsingham's main chronicle in the *St. Albans Chronicle, 1406-1420* (Oxford, 1937). As a result of this work it is now clear that the text of Walsingham's main chronicle is scattered throughout several volumes in the Rolls Series. The contemporary portion is printed:

1376 (Good Parliament) to 1382 in the *Chronicon Angliae*, pp. 68-354.

1382 to 1392 in the *Historia Anglicana*, vol. ii. 70-211.

1393 to 1406 as the *Annales Ricardi II et Henrici IV* in Trokelowe, pp. 155-420.

1406 to 1420 in the *St. Albans Chronicle, 1406-1420*, ed. V. H. Galbraith.

The text of Walsingham's short chronicle from 1327 to 1422 which was an abbreviated version of his *Chronica Maiora* is found:

1328-76 in the *Chronicon Angliae*, or 1343-77 in the *Historia Anglicana*.

1382-88 in the *Chronicon Angliae*, pp. 355-87.

1392-1422 in the *Historia Anglicana*, vol. ii. 211 seq.

The text for the years 1327, 1377-82, 1388-92 has never been printed.

In addition to texts such as this in the Rolls Series, nineteenth-century editions of chronicles found in the early volumes of the Camden Society and the English Historical Society also require to be replaced. We need new editions of the *French Chronicle of London* and of Trivet's chronicle. Certain chronicles are still found only in eighteenth-century editions. The *Vita Ricardi Secundi*, a popularised form of Walsingham's text, has not been re-edited since Hearne's edition of 1729.

SHORT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PRINTED TEXTS

- Annales Monastici*, ed. H. R. Luard, 5 vols. (Rolls Series, 1864-9). For Tewkesbury, Winchester, Waverley, Wykes.
- Anonimale Chronicle*, ed. V. H. Galbraith (Manchester, 1927).
- Baker, Geoffrey le. *Chronicon*, ed. E. M. Thompson (Oxford, 1889).
- Brut or the Chronicles of England*, ed. F. W. D. Brie (Early English Text Society, 1906-8). A medieval English version of the original French text.
- Bury St. Edmunds Chronicle*, ed. A. Gransden (Nelson, 1964). The chronicle is printed from 1212. Latin text and translation.
- Chronica Johannis de Reading et Anonymi Cantuariensis, 1346-67*, ed. J. Tait (Manchester, 1914).
- Chronicle of St. Mary's Abbey, York*, ed. H. E. Craster and M. E. Thornton (Surtees Society, 1934).
- Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and II*, ed. W. Stubbs, 2 vols. (Rolls Series, 1882-3). This contains the *Annales Londonienses*, the *Annales Paulini*, and the *Gesta Edwardi de Carnavan*. The *Vita Edwardi Secundi* which is found in this volume has been reprinted in the Nelson Series.
- Cotton, Bartholomew. *Historia Anglicana*, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1859).
- Eccleston, Thomas of. *De Adventu Fratrum Minorum in Angliam*, ed. A. G. Little (Manchester, 1951).
- Eulogium Historiarum*, ed. F. S. Haydon, 3 vols. (Rolls Series, 1858-63).
- Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, ed. W. W. Shirley (Rolls Series, 1858). See J. Crompton, *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, XII.
- French Chronicle of London*, ed. G. J. Aungier (Camden Society, 1844).
- Guisborough, Walter of. *Chronicle*, ed. H. Rothwell (Camden Society, 1957). An interesting introduction dealing with the manuscript problems and the historical value of the chronicle.
- Ingulf. A text of his chronicle is found in Sir Henry Savile, *Scriptores Post Bedam* (London, 1596). Birch's edition of 1883 was printed in a limited number of copies.
- Knighton, Henry. *Chronicon*, ed. J. R. Lumby, 2 vols. (Rolls Series, 1889-95). See V. H. Galbraith, 'The Chronicle of Henry Knighton', *Fritz Saxl Memorial Essays* (London, 1957).
- Lanercost Chronicle*, ed. J. Stevenson (Edinburgh, 1839). There is a translation by Sir Herbert Maxwell (1913). See the analysis by A. G. Little, *E.H.R.*, xxxi (1916), 269-79.

- Langtoft, Pierre de. *Chronicle*, ed. T. Wright, 2 vols. (Rolls Series, 1866-8). See the comments of M. D. Legge, *Anglo-Norman in the Cloisters* (Edinburgh, 1950), pp. 70-74.
- Liber de Antiquis Legibus*, ed. T. Stapleton (Camden Society, 1846). Arnold fitz Thedmar, Chronicle of the mayors and sheriffs of London.
- Meaux, *Chronicle*, ed. E. A. Bond, 3 vols. (Rolls Series, 1866-8).
- Melrose Chronicle*, ed. A. O. and M. O. Anderson (London, 1936). A facsimile edition.
- Murimuth, Adam. *Continuatio chronicarum 1303-47*, Robert of Avesbury, *De gestis mirabilibus regis Edwardi tertii*, ed. E. M. Thompson (Rolls Series, 1889).
- Paris, Matthew. *Chronica Maiora*, ed. H. R. Luard, 7 vols. (Rolls Series, 1872-84). The standard edition. See Richard Vaughan, *Matthew Paris* (Cambridge, 1958).
- Polychronicon, Ranulphi Higden*, ed. Churchill Babington and J. R. Lumby. 9 vols. (Rolls Series, 1865-86). Vol. IX contains the chronicle of the monk of Westminster.
- Scalacronica*, ed. J. Stevenson (Edinburgh, 1836).
- St. Albans Chronicle, 1406-1420*, ed. V. H. Galbraith (Oxford, 1937). The introduction contains an important account of Walsingham's writings.
- Trivet, Nicholas. *Annales*, ed. T. Hog (English Historical Society, 1845).
- Usk, Adam of. *Chronicle*, ed. E. M. Thompson (Oxford, 1904). Contains a translation.
- Vita Edwardi Secundi*, ed. N. Denholm-Young (Nelson, 1957). The introduction discusses the problem of authorship. Latin text and translation.
- Walsingham, Thomas. *Chronicon Angliae*, ed. E. M. Thompson (Rolls Series, 1874). *Historia Anglicana*, ed. H. T. Riley, 2 vols. (Rolls Series, 1863-4). See Appendix.
- Wendover, Roger. *Flores Historiarum*, ed. H. G. Hewlett, 3 vols. (Rolls Series, 1886-9). Omits everything before 1154.