

Richard of Devizes, the Annals of Winchester, and the Chronicle of Richard I: Dates, Composition, and Authorship

Emily A. Winkler

Mediaeval Studies 85 (2023) – accepted version

Long Abstract

This article is the first study to consider together the complete known works of Richard of Devizes. Richard, a monk of St Swithun's cathedral priory of Winchester, was one of the most learned and lively Latin chroniclers of Angevin England. His known historical compositions survive in part in two manuscripts: Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 339 (his autograph copy, late twelfth or early thirteenth century) and British Library, Cotton MS Domitian A XIII (thirteenth century). Best known for his prose chronicle of the times of King Richard I, Richard also composed annalistic works, which remain only partly published, untranslated, and little studied. These annalistic compositions by Richard demand attention, on their own and alongside his prose chronicle. His annalistic and prose works are full of his historical thinking, keen wit, and bold philosophies. Unlike Richard's prose chronicle about the Lionheart, they reveal how he positioned himself in relation to earlier writers of historical works. His annalistic works inspired historical writing in Winchester, across southern England, and in Wales, well into the thirteenth century.

Basic questions about Richard's annalistic works and prose chronicle preserved in these two manuscripts remain troubled by ambiguities: what Richard wrote, when he wrote, and how precisely Richard's compositions differ from the works collectively known as the "Annals of Winchester." In addressing these questions, the article employs close readings of Richard's Latin for content, style, form, and development of ideas; palaeographic and codicological evidence from the manuscripts; and an assessment of the nature of textual transmission. This article re-sets the parameters of the discussion by identifying and explaining the sources of ambiguity and confusion in the existing literature. To the basic questions about Richard's works, it offers answers where these can be demonstrated; working theories where the evidence is suggestive; and more accurate parameters for discussing the questions where the evidence is limited.

The article advances a framework for naming Richard's works, to permit discussion and analysis of them independently of the manuscripts and of the umbrella term "Annals of Winchester." It establishes more definitively what annalistic material Richard originally wrote. It presents a revised theory about the real date ranges in which he worked on his annalistic and prose compositions, on the composition and coherence of their content, and on how the projects relate. Based on this analysis, the article confirms Richard's identity as an author in relation to his compositions—lost, surviving, and directly or indirectly witnessed—and locates him more precisely in his historical moment. The article makes it possible to investigate more accurately, and in more depth, the situation of Richard's composition and the content of Richard's ideas. It advances our understanding of the relationship between the writer and his works.

The article will be the essential starting point for scholars working on the annalistic works of Richard of Devizes, on the tradition of chronicling at Winchester and southern England, and on the reception of historical works from Winchester within England and beyond in the high and late Middle Ages. It will be the key reference guide for scholars working on Richard's well-known "Chronicle of the Time of King Richard I," because it provides a more accurate description of the time and events the chronicle covers; strengthens the case for its coherence, consistency and purpose; and corrects the parameters on which theories about its real date range of composition have rested since the 1960s. For the first time, the article enables the study of the complete known works of Richard of Devizes, because it identifies and explains stylistic,

thematic, and topical connections between the annalististic works and the prose chronicle. More broadly, the article advances the study of “lost chronicles;” refines a lesser known case of annalistic Brut chronicling; and illuminates the activity of Latin chronicling in twelfth- and thirteenth century Britain.

Introduction

The voice of Richard of Devizes, a Benedictine monk of St Swithun’s cathedral priory of Winchester, is among the most vibrant and vivacious in the surviving historical works of high medieval England.¹ He was likely born in Wiltshire in the mid-twelfth century. He received a splendid education in Latin (it is not known where) and probably spent most of his career at Winchester. A fierce advocate of monks and a keen political observer, Richard wrote in clever and erudite Latin about matters including treachery, valour, crusading, wealth, philosophy, Jews, Christians, the past, and the present. He read everything from ancient works of satire by Horace and Juvenal, to the Alexandrian romances of Walter of Châtillon, to Latin and vernacular historical works about Britain’s past. His was an original mind.

At Winchester he composed historical works in Latin prose.² These survive in part in two manuscripts: Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 339 (his autograph copy) and British Library, Cotton MS Domitian A XIII. The most famous of Richard’s compositions is his 1190s book, a chronicle of present times which he called *cronica* (chronicle) and *libellum* (little book), later known as the Chronicle of Richard of Devizes or *Gesta Ricardi I*.³ This chronicle covered anecdotes about life and trade in Winchester, disastrous encounters between monks and bishops, Count John’s scheming, William Longchamp’s stewardship, Queen Eleanor’s diplomacy, and King Richard’s exploits in the Holy Land.⁴ The accepted description of the textual date range

¹ [Acknowledgments.] All translations in this article are my own. “Richard of Devizes” will hereafter be referred to as “Richard,” unless disambiguation or emphasis is required; the king of England of the same name will be named by a distinguishing epithet (e.g. the Lionheart, King Richard I, the king of England).

² For the standard overviews of Richard’s career and works, see Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing in England, c. 550 to c. 1307*, vol. 1, 2 vols. (London, 1974); G. H. Martin, “Devizes, Richard of (c. 1150–c. 1200), Benedictine Monk and Chronicler,” in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004, updated 2015), book subsequently cited as ODNB.

³ The editions of this work are *Chronicon Ricardi Divisiensis De Rebus Gestis Ricardi Primi Regis Angliæ*, ed. Joseph Stevenson (London, 1838); Richard Howlett, ed., *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, vol. 3, 4 vols. (London, 1886); *The Chronicle of Richard of Devizes of the Time of King Richard the First*, ed. John T. Appleby (London, 1963), hereafter cited as CRD.

⁴ For a historical study of this work, see Michael Staunton, *The Historians of Angevin England* (Oxford, 2017), chap. 8; literary studies focussed on this work include Nancy F. Partner, *Serious Entertainments: The Writing of History in 12th-Century England* (Chicago, 1977); Patricia Allin, “Richard of Devizes and the Alleged Martyrdom of a Boy at Winchester,” *Transactions & Miscellanies (Jewish Historical Society of England)* 27 (1978): 32–39; Gerd Mentgen, “Richard of Devizes und die Juden: Ein Beitrag zur Interpretation seiner ‘Gesta Richardi,’” *Kairos* 30–31 (1989): 95–104; Anthony P. Bale, “Richard of Devizes and Fictions of Judaism,” *Jewish Culture and History* 3 (2000): 55–72; Heather Blurton, “Richard of Devizes’s *Cronicon*, Menippean Satire, and the Jews of Winchester,” *Exemplaria* 22 (2010): 265–84; Nancy Partner, “Richard of Devizes: The Monk Who Forgot to Be Medieval,” in *The Middle Ages in Texts and Texture: Reflections on Medieval Sources*, ed. Jason Glenn (Toronto, 2011), 231–44; Bele Freudenberg,

narrated by the chronicle, and the accepted hypothesis about when the chronicle must have been written, have remained unquestioned since the 1960s.⁵ The chronicle's content, purpose, narrative structure, and manuscript evidence show that new theories about the chronicle's composition are required.

Richard's annalistic historical writing is less well known.⁶ Mostly unpublished and little studied, these annalistic works remain partly hidden by several things: underdeveloped arguments about Richard's authorship that have left the attribution open to attack; cursory comparisons to his better-known chronicle; highly selective printing that has bred confusion about the whole; and their tendency to vanish into the nebulous umbrella term "Annals of Winchester."⁷ The annalistic works of Richard, as he composed them, are not only valuable in their own right. Knowledge of these annalistic works and their composition—from their situation and historical moment, to their form and ideas—is essential for understanding the creative urge behind chronicling, as well as how it worked in practice. This knowledge includes that of lost texts: those that do not survive, survive in part, or are only indirectly witnessed.⁸ This kind of inquiry can add to our knowledge about why, and for whom, annals and chronicles were composed; refine what we know about the tenor of cultural, ecclesiastical, and political debates of the day; and allow us to imagine, with a better sense of our surroundings, the world of an author's thinking and writing. In some cases, we can trace the path of how that author's thoughts developed and changed.

Alongside the advances and discoveries about these manuscripts and Richard's works, a number of errors and ambiguities have accumulated and persisted. These have caused misunderstandings of what Richard wrote, and when he was writing. This article sets out to

Irarum Nutrix. Emotionen und Ehrverletzungen bei William of Newburgh, Richard of Devizes und Walter Map (Bochum, 2014); Marisa Libbon, "The Function of Twelfth-Century Form in the Chronicle of Richard of Devizes," *Viator* 52 (2021): 171–210.

⁵ As outlined in Appleby's "Introduction," *CRD*.

⁶ No complete edition exists. For selective printing of material 519 through 1065 inclusive from the Corpus manuscript, and printing of annals from 1066 inclusive from the later Cotton manuscript: "Annales monasterii de Wintonia (A.D. 519-1277)," in *Annales monastici*, ed. Henry Richards Luard, vol. 2, 5 vols. (London, 1865), 3–125 (hereafter cited as "AW"). Luard noted a partial edition of the Cotton manuscript was printed in Henry Wharton's *Anglia Sacra*. For selective printing of material for the years 1066 through 1138 inclusive (often fragments of annals, not full annals, which the printing does not make clear): J. Appleby, "Richard of Devizes and the Annals of Winchester," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 36 (1963): 75–77; for selective printing of material from the years 1066 to 1193: Thomas Jones, ed., *Brenhinedd y Saesson: Or, The King of the Saxons: BM Cotton MS Cleopatra B v, and The Black Book of Basingwerk, NLW MS. 7006* (Cardiff, 1971), xliii–xlv.

⁷ Detailed studies of aspects of Richard's annalistic works include Appleby, "Richard"; Jones, *Brenhinedd y Saesson*, xl–xlviii; John Gillingham, "Richard of Devizes and 'a Rising Tide of Nonsense': How Cerdic Met King Arthur," in *The Long Twelfth-Century View of the Anglo-Saxon Past*, ed. Martin Brett and David A. Woodman (Farnham, 2015), 141–56.

⁸ See now esp. Pauline Stafford, *After Alfred: Anglo-Saxon Chronicles and Chroniclers, 900-1150* (Oxford, 2020); for a reconstruction of a later, lost Winchester chronicle, *Wintonienses deperditi*, Felix Liebermann, ed., *Ungedruckte anglo-normannische Geschichtsquellen* (Strasburg, 1879), 173–202, discussed below, 000-000; on lost chronicles of southern England, see Ian Stone, "Connections and Collaborations between Centres of Historical Writing in Thirteenth-Century London and Southwark," *Mediaeval Studies* 79 (2017): 211–12.

explain the origins of misunderstandings and to clarify the discussion; to review the medieval evidence; and to set out revised theories about the questions of dating, composition, and authorship of Richard's known works. Through this rethinking and refinement of the evidence, it offers a guide for future work on: a) understanding the relationship among Richard's works, his sources, and annalistic and prose chronicling in southern England and beyond; b) narrowing down the date range in which he composed his works; and c) examining his ideas, works, and career across his known corpus.

The article begins by presenting a naming framework that distinguishes Richard's compositions from the manuscripts in which parts of them survive. Here it problematizes the term "Annals of Winchester." A naming system that disambiguates Richard's works from the "Annals of Winchester" is necessary to perceive and study them as distinct from the later annals, witness manuscripts, and editions that include them. This system permits a direct discussion of the annalistic works originally composed by Richard: lost, partly surviving, and indirectly witnessed. These names make it possible to consider more precisely the relationship among Richard's known works, and to refine future discussions about their transmission.

The article then addresses two related matters: what Richard wrote, and when he wrote it. The article distinguishes between "real" dates, or times of possible composition; and "textual" dates, or the dates of events covered in his written material:

- 1) the real date range in which Richard composed his works: when, or within what date range, was he writing them?
- 2) the textual date range of Richard's compositions: what events did he cover in writing? For which parts of annals in the later witness manuscript is there solid evidence of his authorship? What did he compose?

These two kinds of dates are more intimately connected to the question of *terminus ante quem* than to that of *terminus post quem*. An author could start writing annals in any real date, and begin them with any textual date in the past. But if an author was bringing annals up to the present day, and keeping them up to date, the last surviving textual date for which there is evidence of authorship is potentially an important piece of evidence about when that author was writing. The textual *terminus ante quem* of a work—the latest material for which there is evidence that Richard wrote—is therefore among our evidence for its real *terminus ante quem*—the latest real date in which we can demonstrate that he was writing it.

The word "date" permits refining the discussion further than the word "year," and so to resolve persistent ambiguities in the discussions about Richard's annalistic works and prose chronicle. The words "to" and "in," used in relation to a real year or an annalistic year, have contributed to ambiguity in referring to the textual date ranges of Richard's known historical works. This is because usage varies: it is neither obvious nor consistent whether "running to" or "ending in" 1066 (for example) mean annals running through the end of 1065 inclusive, material running to mid-1066, or annals running through the end of 1066 inclusive.⁹ We will often use the word "inclusive" for absolute clarity about whether breaks occur before, after, or in the middle of an annal.¹⁰

⁹ E.g. annals running through 1138 inclusive, and not beyond, are said to "end in 1139", Pamela Robinson, *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c.737-1600 in Cambridge Libraries*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1988), 56.

¹⁰ "Inclusive" will always include fully both ends of a date range unless otherwise specified.

The focus here is on Richard's known works, parts of which do not survive, or survive only in direct or indirect witnesses. When referring to Richard's authorship behind parts of the later witness, the Cotton manuscript, "compose" will be preferred to "write," in order to distinguish Richard's original material from the scribal writing activity of the material preserved in the later manuscript. The discussion of "original" works by Richard presumes neither an ideal "urtext" nor "the" single original. We know that Richard wrote in real time: planning his works, updating and changing them (with ^s and erasures), and deliberately leaving room to add new material. "Original" is meant in the senses of: 1) text or texts composed by him that exist or once existed in his hand; 2) compositions distinct from later witnesses that adapted and changed his presentation, wording, or both; and 3) compositions that were the product of his unique mind and imagination. With a firmer framework for the historical context and times in which Richard was writing, and a more solid foundation for identifying, describing, and understanding Richard's corpus of historical writing, we may better study him as a writer.

The Manuscripts

The first manuscript containing surviving works by Richard of Devizes is Corpus Christi College, Cambridge MS 339 (Parker Library).¹¹ It is a codex in two parts. The first part contains two works by Richard in his own handwriting:¹²

- 1) An annalistic chronicle (or the first part of one), beginning with Brutus's landing in Britain in Abrahamic year 1201, running through AD 1138 inclusive (fol. 1r–fol. 24v)¹³
- 2) A prose chronicle about events in England and abroad during the time of King Richard I (fol. 25r–fol. 43v)

The Parker catalogue tentatively ascribes this first part of the manuscript to St Swithun's Winchester and suggests it was produced "around 1200."

After the end of the known text of the prose chronicle, a partly cut-away section of a thirteenth-century manuscript with a canon law text (two uncut leaves on a single piece of parchment), turned counterclockwise ninety degrees relative to the book, was pasted over the mid- to lower part of fol. 43v. The canon law piece runs the full length of the binding; the cutting and pasting were therefore completed after this piece was bound into the book. It is possible that this was originally a flyleaf for another book, re-cut to serve a new purpose in the Corpus manuscript. M. R. James did not know whether the patch covered part of Richard's

¹¹ Hereafter "the Corpus manuscript." For the Parker Library's "Parker on the Web" Catalogue entry, see <<https://parker.stanford.edu/parker/catalog/gs070yh9296>>; the latter part of this manuscript, a fourteenth-century copy of Peter of Ickham's *Compilatio de gestis Britonum et Anglorum*, does not concern the present enquiry. Note that the present folio numbering of this manuscript as catalogued in the Parker Library adds two to Luard's numbering. Parker's fol. 9r is Luard's fol. 7r.

¹² For a brief summary of the attribution, see Appleby, "Richard," 70.

¹³ On these textual dates, see discussion below, 000-000.

autograph text or an otherwise blank page.¹⁴ The paste has since worn away, and the Parker Librarians have confirmed visually that the parchment beneath is indeed blank.

This canon law segment would have served as a bookend, inserted over a blank leaf after the end of a finished composition book, and meant to signal a break before the next volume in the book. There are three key considerations. First, the decision to angle the piece shows that the book's text was not meant to be read continuously: in physical practice, its effect is to force a break in continuous reading. Second, the law leaf was bound in full, then cut to reveal the text of the prose chronicle on the top of fol. 43v: this demonstrates a concern both to reveal Richard's composition and to frame its limit. Third, the law leaf's precise placement and the use of an adhesive prevented any further additions to, or continuations of, Richard's composition, beyond what one might add in the margin. The goals and methods are akin to those used to prevent fraud in the once-common practice of writing a check. Alphabetic text or horizontal lines, which could not possibly be confused with Arabic numerals, are used to fill in empty space to avoid any ambiguity or confusion and to stop further contiguous additions. In the Corpus manuscript, the horizontal alignment of the canon law leaves, their full coverage, their pasting, and their unrelated content, achieved the same ends. The complementary goals of checks and end leaves were to prove that "this" was the original, complete work, and to preserve it as such.

The second manuscript containing surviving works by Richard is British Library, Cotton MS Domitian A XIII (hereafter "the Cotton manuscript").¹⁵ The first 89 folios are dated to the first quarter of the thirteenth century. They include, in sequence:

- 1) An anonymous annalistic chronicle, AD 1–594 (fols. 3v–8v)
This chronicle bears no connection to Geoffrey of Monmouth or Richard.¹⁶ It was probably inserted to replace the lost, earlier part of the "Winchester" chronicle that continues on fol. 9r.
- 2) Winchester Chronicle, AD 519–1277 (fols. 9r–71v)
This "Winchester Chronicle" contains annals takes the form of annals in a single hand (hereafter "Scribe 1") from 519 inclusive to partway through 1190, where the annals appear interrupted mid-sentence at the end of a *verso* folio. The same hand picks up on a *recto* folio with what is at least a partial entry for 1196, and this hand continues through what is at least a partial entry for the year 1202. A second hand (hereafter "Scribe 2") begins a second, fresh entry for the year 1202 and continues through 1277 inclusive.

The text is almost identical to Richard's annalistic chronicle in the Corpus manuscript from 519 through 1065 inclusive, with occasional slight differences,

¹⁴ M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1912), 171.

¹⁵ Hereafter "the Cotton manuscript," unless disambiguation is required. For the British Library's online catalogue entry, see http://hviewer.bl.uk/lamsHViewer/Default.aspx?mdark=ark:/81055/vdc_100000000035.0x0000b4. Note that the present folio numbering of this manuscript as catalogued in the BL adds two to Luard's numbering. The BL catalogues the Winchester Chronicle as running fols. 9r–71v, Luard's former fols. 7r–69v.

¹⁶ Discussed by Luard, "AW," x; and by Gillingham, "Richard"; missing from Appleby's description of the Cotton manuscript: Appleby, "Richard," 70.

usually in individual words.¹⁷ The annals for 1066 to the interrupted 1190 entry inclusive could be indirectly related to Richard's annalistic works, judging by where they overlap in coverage of material from 1066 to 1138 inclusive. However, the Cotton manuscript annals never quote Richard, and are in a distinctly different voice. More terse and less idiosyncratic than Richard's, the Cotton manuscript annals have more material from William of Malmesbury, a less classical style, and different historical conclusions.¹⁸ It will be argued below that the material from the partial 1196 entry to at least partway through the entry for 1201 inclusive is largely a copy of lost annals originally by Richard, and that a small part of this section was copied from the unrelated lost Winchester chronicle *Wintonienses deperditi*. Neither entry for 1202 was originally Richard's composition.¹⁹

- 3) Catalogued by British Library as "Richard of Devizes, Chronicle" (fols. 72r–89r). This is a copy of the prose chronicle as it appears in Richard's autograph manuscript, the Corpus manuscript. It is in the same hand as the "Winchester Chronicle" through the first partial entry for 1202. It may be based on an intermediate copy, but the most current thinking is that the prose chronicle in the Cotton manuscript is a direct copy of the text in the Corpus manuscript.²⁰

M. R. James dated the Corpus manuscript to the late twelfth/early thirteenth century; John Appleby agreed on these dates for the Corpus manuscript and the Cotton manuscript, placing the Cotton manuscript after Richard's death.²¹

Problematizing the Term "Annals of Winchester"

Richard's annalistic works are commonly embraced by the umbrella terms "Annals of Winchester," "Winchester Annals," or "Winchester Chronicle(s)." These terms, signalling composition or scribal copying in Winchester, are ambiguous. They do not differentiate between the assemblage of annals preserved in Corpus and Cotton manuscripts;²² they do not distinguish between the two discrete sets of annals in different hands in the Cotton manuscript;²³ and they do not appreciate the distinction between composed chronicles and surviving parts of them.

No Winchester chronicle exists, or existed, as Henry Luard printed it. Studies of the "Winchester Annals" tend to treat Luard's composite edition of parts of the Corpus manuscript and the later Cotton manuscript as the definitive text, or even as the text of an original

¹⁷ The Corpus manuscript omits the date numerals 1064 and 1065; entries for these years do appear on fol. 21v.

¹⁸ See Appleby, "Richard," 74.

¹⁹ Below, 000-000.

²⁰ Libbon, "The Function," 187 n. 67.

²¹ Appleby, "Richard," 71–72.

²² E.g. for the term used in a general sense, Rebecca Browett, "The Cult of St Æthelwold and Its Context, c. 984-c. 1400" (Institute of Historical Research, University of London, 2016), 174–75.

²³ E.g. N. Denholm-Young, "The Winchester-Hyde Chronicle," *The English Historical Review* 49 (1934): 85–93.

Winchester chronicle.²⁴ With few exceptions, studies do not show awareness that a) the text of item 2 in the Cotton manuscript (preserved in fols. 9r–71v) probably started earlier, b) Richard’s own annalistic chronicle in the Corpus manuscript did start much earlier, and c) Richard’s annalistic writing was an original, distinct composition (or compositions) that pre-dated the Cotton manuscript.²⁵ References to “the Winchester Annals” usually mean the later, thirteenth-century versions of annals as preserved in the Cotton manuscript—specifically, as edited by Luard²⁶—and do not differentiate it from the distinct material in the Corpus manuscript: Brutus–518 inclusive and 1066–1138 inclusive.²⁷ Luard’s edition of the “Winchester Annals” printed the Corpus manuscript only for annals 519–1065 inclusive, then switched to printing the later Cotton manuscript annals from 1066 inclusive. The extant Cotton manuscript was the reference point by which he determined what to print from both manuscripts. He decided to print the Corpus manuscript annals beginning only with the year AD 519 inclusive, which he admitted was an arbitrary date: it was an artefact of the Cotton manuscript’s current state.²⁸ That textual date is irrelevant to the question of the annals’ composition: what original medieval works did either surviving manuscript witness?

As Scribe 1 originally wrote them, the “Winchester annals” preserved in the Cotton manuscript very likely began much earlier than AD 519. The annal for 519 begins at the top of a *recto* folio, and there is no signal that it was originally the beginning of a chronicle. An earlier and unrelated set of annals running from AD 1–594 was later added to the beginning of the Cotton manuscript. This was probably done to replace the lost leaves. If part of the Cotton manuscript was originally a complete, near-exact copy of Richard’s annalistic composition on early Britain—as Cotton’s surviving annals for AD 519 through 1065 inclusive were, and as the manuscript evidence suggests—then it, too, would have begun with Brutus’s landing in Britain.

Richard’s annals in the Corpus manuscript have been examined by Appleby, Thomas Jones, and John Gillingham.²⁹ Nevertheless, discussions of the “Winchester Annals” continue to neglect the Corpus manuscript (especially the first part of Richard’s chronicle preserved in the first nine folios), to assign arbitrary importance to the year 519, and to overlook the consistency of thought and subject in Richard’s original composition.

If we seek Richard’s annalistic works as he conceived them and conceived of them, and the history of chronicling at Winchester before the Cotton manuscript was produced, then recent studies and reference works about the annals are potentially misleading. For example, the *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle* article on the Winchester Annals does not mention the existence—either in the Middle Ages or in surviving manuscripts—of any Winchester annals for the years before AD 519. The article notes that the Corpus manuscript “contains annals to 1139”

²⁴ E.g. Liebermann, *Ungedruckte*; parts of the printed annals only are discussed in Edward A. Freeman, *The History of the Norman Conquest of England: Its Causes and Its Results*, 2nd ed., rev., vol. 3, 6 vols. (Oxford, 1869); Pauline Stafford, *Queen Emma and Queen Edith: Queenship and Women’s Power in Eleventh-Century England* (Oxford, 2001), 19–21.

²⁵ E.g. John Crook, “Early Historians of Winchester Cathedral,” *Hampshire Studies* 58 (2003): 226, was not aware of the material unprinted by Luard, and issued a clarion call for more work on the relationships among the manuscripts, 227.

²⁶ As e.g. Sharon Goetz, “Winchester Annals,” in *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle* (Leiden, 2016).

²⁷ Martin, “Devizes.”

²⁸ “AW,” x; on Luard’s omission, see Gillingham, “Richard,” 144–45.

²⁹ Appleby and Jones printed fragments of these annals (see fn. 000 above); all three discuss Luard’s selective printing.

(i.e. through 1138 inclusive). It does not specify that these annals in the Corpus manuscript begin not in 519, but with Brutus's arrival in Britain centuries earlier. The article continues to mislead about the Corpus manuscript, by taking Luard's edition of the Cotton manuscript as the reference point, and attributing to Appleby the suggestion that Richard wrote the Winchester segments 519–1066 and 1196–1202. Appleby suggested Richard wrote the Winchester segments from the arrival of Brutus to 1066 and 1196–1202. If one is interested in who composed the annals from and including 519 as preserved in the extant Cotton manuscript, the textual year of AD 519 is meaningful. However, neither Richard, nor his colleagues working in Winchester's scriptorium later in the Middle Ages, began a work with an entry for AD 519.

The problem with the term "Winchester Annals" in its common usage is that it seems to presume the existence of the latest "Annals of Winchester" in the Cotton manuscript, as printed by Luard, as an entity: an intended chronicle with coherence and integrity. This assumption is then used as the reference point for investigating earlier "versions" of the Annals of Winchester, whether by attempting to confirm the existence of this later entity in the earlier work, or by writing of annals in the earlier Corpus manuscript as though they anticipated the later collections of annals.³⁰ This is the wrong way around. It ignores what is a continuous and coherent annalistic chronicle from Brutus's arrival in Britain, and a lost annalistic chronicle of contemporary history, witnessed in the Cotton manuscript, that develops ideas from Richard's prose chronicle. In order to be examined and understood in their own right, Richard's annalistic writings must be distinguished by names distinct from manuscript witnesses to them, from the sets of annals preserved in the Cotton manuscript, and from Luard's edition of the Cotton manuscript.

Identifying the Works of Richard of Devizes: A New Naming Framework

These names for the works attributed to Richard of Devizes are given without italics because they are tools, not titles. These names allow us to do two things. First, they identify a coherent work (or works) by Richard that once existed but do not survive in full. Second, they disambiguate Richard's original compositions from a) the later witness (the Cotton manuscript), and b) the vague "Winchester" appellations given to sets of annalistic writing that include, but either ignore or fail to distinguish, Richard's contributions. These names for Richard's works are given in the chronological order of their content. Bold type indicates names introduced here for the first time.

1) **The World of Britain Chronicle (WBC)**

WBC is the name for Richard's coherent chronicle, annalistic in form and layout. Richard's autograph manuscript for at least part of this chronicle survives in the Corpus manuscript. It covers events in Britain's history in a sequence of annals, beginning with Brutus's arrival in Britain (Abrahamic year 1201) and continuing to partway through 1138 at least. On this basis, M. R. James catalogued the surviving part as: *Historia Angliae a Bruto ad primordia regni regis Stephani*.³¹ In the Parker Catalogue it is named "Annales Wintonienses, to 1138."³²

WBC's annals extended through at least 1138 inclusive, and may at one time have extended further into the twelfth century. Two points must be noted. First, in the autograph Corpus manuscript, the material for 1138 appears in the margins and main column at the

³⁰ E.g. a catalogue description of the Corpus manuscript incorrectly refers to Richard's original annals as a "copy of the Annals of Winchester:" Robinson, *Catalogue*, 1:56; Luard called the works in the Cotton manuscript "the real Annals of Winchester:" "AW," ix.

³¹ James, *Descriptive Catalogue*, 2:170–71.

³² Above, n. 000.

bottom of fol. 24v, after which there is a break. This raises the possibility that later folios, beginning with an entry for 1139 on the *recto* of the next folio, once existed and were lost or replaced. Second, the Cotton manuscript annals for the years 1066 to partway through 1190 inclusive may represent a response to Richard's annalistic works, either direct or indirect, for at least some of these years: there are overlaps in content visible where entries survive for the same years, but no overlaps in wording, style, or perspective.³³ The absence of Richard's voice in this section makes it impossible to venture a textual *terminus ante quem* (the latest entry Richard composed in the original WBC) on the basis of the Cotton manuscript. For now, our objects are to note the circumstantial evidence and its nature, and to admit the possibility that WBC once extended beyond the entry for 1138.

The name WBC is distinct from a name for the surviving annals, in that it refers to the original chronicle as written by Richard, part of which may not survive. This name thus acknowledges the possibility of lost annals. By contrast, James's term refers only to the autograph annals surviving in CCC 339; by contrast again, the term "Annals of Winchester" refers to a nebulous grouping of annals produced in Winchester, some of which were composed or inspired by Richard, and some of which were not.

The three elements of the distinguishing name "World of Britain Chronicle" require comment. Richard's work merits the term "Britain" because it is a Latin Brut chronicle.³⁴ It begins with an account of Brutus's landing in Britain and the naming of the island of Britain after him. This was Richard's intended beginning. The manuscript was designed and planned to accommodate the dedication (also in his hand, on fol. 1r), which has space marked and left for a capital initial. His preface to a different work, his prose chronicle (CRD, discussed below), reveals that Richard as an author thought it important to attend to a chronicle's beginning. It had to be a beginning of consequence. In the remarks he directed here to his friend Robert FitzHenry, former prior of St Swithun's, Richard referred three times, and in a self-conscious way, to planning his chronicle's beginning. He noted, first, their agreed starting point for his chronicling project (1191, when Robert left St Swithun's); second, that he moved this start point earlier; third, that he started the work instead with the coronation of King Richard, that it might have a "beginning of moment" (*momenti ... initium*).³⁵ Equal care is evident in the layout and planning of the first page of CRD.³⁶ In writing WBC, Richard read and engaged directly (often in spirited debate) with works from and about early medieval Britain, including the Anglo-Saxon Chronicles of Winchester, Geoffrey of Monmouth, Gaimar, William of Malmesbury, Henry of Huntingdon, Aelred of Rievaulx, and Wace's *Roman de Brut*.³⁷ The chronicle begins with Britain, and it develops the subsequent story from that idea of Britain.

³³ Appleby, "Richard," 74.

³⁴ Richard Howlett, noting this start point and the coherence of the chronicle, aptly called it a "Brut" chronicle in 1886: *Historia Rerum Anglicarum*, 3:lxviii.

³⁵ CRD, 2–3.

³⁶ On Richard's planning of content and form in beginning CRD, see Libbon, "The Function," 179–81.

³⁷ Richard's source for the death of Earl Siward was Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, ed. Diana E. Greenway (Oxford, 1996), 378–80 (vi.24); "Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 339" n.d., fol. 21r (hereafter cited as "CCCC MS 339"); cf. "AW," 26; for discussion of Richard's knowledge of material from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, William, Henry, and Aelred, "AW," xii–xv; on the relationship with Geoffrey, Wace, and Gaimar's lost work, see Gillingham, "Richard."

The term “Chronicle” applies because the work has integrity and consistency, with strong narrative prose elements that unite the history, beyond a sequence of laconic annals. The term “annals,” although accurate and certainly not precluding coherence, neither helps in refining Richard’s work from later annals, nor expresses strongly enough the originality with which Richard both used and played with the form.

“World”—and, specifically, “World of Britain”—derives from a phrase in Richard’s autograph manuscript, on fol. 5v. Here, Richard wrote in his short and striking encomium of the British king Kimbelinus: *totum mundum illi Britannia repr[ae]sentauit* (“Britain embodied the whole world to him”). The line is contained in the final entry for the pre-Christian era. Richard signals this moment by leaving space and changing to the Anno Domini dating system.³⁸ The encomium to which the line belongs offered readers a key lesson of leadership, inspired by Stoic philosophy and Christian teachings: a leader will have the sort of happiness normally reserved for saints, and will be truly prosperous, only when conceiving of the world as one’s own realm, and being content with that. A leader will not experience such happiness when desiring to have, obtain, or conquer other parts of the human world beyond what one already has. This is a recurring theme in the work, and this entry sets the tone.

Winchester features prominently, as we might expect; but the work has a much wider reach, including both insular and continental events. Richard portrayed Britain in relation to the world around it. For a long while the chronicle runs in two parallel columns: one for events most significant to Britain, the other for events significant to Rome; and the two in dialogue tell a story about the relation between these realms.³⁹ In Richard’s 585 entry, he included the tale of the dream of the Frankish king Guntram (d. 592), condensing and enlivening Paul the Deacon’s account in his favourite alliterative style.⁴⁰ “Winchester” is, at any rate, an unhelpful word to have in the name for this work, because our object is to distinguish and disambiguate Richard’s contributions from material known by vague Winchester appellations.

2) The Chronicle of Richard of Devizes (in the Time of Richard I) (CRD)

This was the name given to Richard’s chronicle of contemporary history in the editions by Joseph Stevenson and then by Appleby; the Parker catalogue lists it likewise as *Chronicon de tempore regis Ricardi*.⁴¹ Richard’s autograph manuscript (the Corpus manuscript) survives, as does a copy in the Cotton manuscript. It is not structured or presented annalistically. It includes discursive content both centrally and in the margins. CRD is given here for the first time as an abbreviation, as it is necessary to disambiguate it from the assorted “Chronicles” under discussion.

³⁸ On Richard’s dating systems, below, 000.

³⁹ E.g. “CCCC MS 339,” fols. 5r–6v.

⁴⁰ “vigilans vidit parvum animal de ore regis egressum, cui volenti et non valenti vicinum rivum transire”, “CCCC MS 339,” fols. 7r–7v; “AW,” 4; Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum* [*History of the Lombards*], ed. Ludwig Bethmann and Georg Waitz (Hanover, 1878) iii.34. A small creature enters the mouth of the sleeping king; while it is there, he dreams of crossing an iron bridge and discovering a treasure which, waking, he then finds. Manuscripts of *Historia Langobardorum* circulated in English Benedictine libraries, including Bury St Edmunds, Colchester, Evesham, and Rochester: see Richard Sharpe et al., *English Benedictine Libraries: The Shorter Catalogues* (London, 1996), 62, 108, 151, 487–88, and Canterbury, “Royal MS 13 A XXII” (British Library, n.d.).

⁴¹ Above, n. 000.

3) Later Angevin Chronicle (LAC)

LAC is the name for the coherent chronicle material, originally by Richard, that survives only in the Cotton manuscript. No autograph copy survives. As will be demonstrated below, part of LAC survives in annals running from 1196A to partway through 1201, inclusive, at least. Richard's original LAC may have covered events beginning with the end of CRD in autumn 1192. Importantly, LAC is not a name for the annals as they appear in the Cotton manuscript, but for a lost composition by Richard, for which the Cotton annals represent at least a partial copy.

The term "Chronicle" is employed because the material is stylistically and thematically coherent, and it develops a storyline. In these regards it is consistent with WBC and CRD. Richard may have originally conceived of LAC as: a) a new independent work; b) an annalistic continuation of WBC, or c) a non-annalistic prose sequel to his contemporary chronicle, CRD. Because the Cotton manuscript for these textual dates is a witness, and because no original survives, there is no way to tell whether the annalistic presentation of the material copied from LAC into the Cotton manuscript was a) an integral part of Richard's original autograph manuscript or b) an artefact first introduced by a later intermediate witness or by Scribe 1 to material originally in prose.

"Later Angevin" signals a) that LAC was written after CRD, which covered the first part of Richard's reign; b) that it develops directly ideas and content in CRD; c) that it covered assorted events of the reigns of at least two Angevin kings, Richard and John. Just as CRD is not "about" Richard alone, LAC is not exclusively "about" these Angevin kings; the idea is to signal sequence rather than content.

The Dating and Composition of the Chronicle of Richard of Devizes in the Time of Richard I (CRD)

The Composition of CRD: Textual Dates

We will first consider the timeline of historical material and events covered by CRD, and the significance of these for Richard's composition. It is not known whether Richard finished, abandoned, or hoped to return to CRD. It is possible to show, based on the manuscript evidence (discussed above) and a balance of probabilities, that Richard neither abandoned nor planned to continue CRD. A case is made here that Richard conceived of CRD, as he wrote it in the Corpus manuscript, as a complete work. That conception may have been formed during the writing process, at the time of completion, or even some time after: the point is that this decision about completion occurred.

Chronologically, CRD covers events beginning with the coronation of King Richard I on 3 September 1189. The last major political event it mentions marked the end of the Third Crusade: the peace treaty with Saladin, concluded on 2 September 1192, by which Christians were granted the right to visit Jerusalem (the Treaty of Jaffa).⁴² CRD then comments briefly on the pilgrimages Henry of Jerusalem, Hubert Walter, and other Christians made to Jerusalem under the auspices of the treaty; these took place in September.⁴³ In Richard's closing sentence,

⁴² Alan V. Murray, "Participants in the Third Crusade (*Act.* 1190–1192)," in *ODNB* (Oxford, 2009).

⁴³ Hubert Walter led the third of three groups, and he met with Saladin in Jerusalem in September 1192. C. R. Cheney, *Hubert Walter* (London, 1967), 37. Jerusalem, less than 80 miles from Acre and 40 miles (absolute distances) from the Christian territories on the coast, lay within several days' journey. One eyewitness commentator wrote that diplomatic messengers had

the duke and bishop advised the king to go, too; but on account of his righteous anger (*indignatio*), the king refused to make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. The chronicle ends in mid-September 1192, likely near the end of the month, by recounting something the king did not do.

Appleby claimed that CRD “ends with the king’s decision to leave the Holy Land in October 1192.”⁴⁴ This is not an accurate description of CRD. The king’s moment of decision occurs before the end of the chronicle, and the chronicle described no events that occurred after the end of September 1192. Appleby, rather than describing the extant text, was attempting to relate CRD to an accurate, retrospective, known timeline of the events of the Third Crusade, in order to assess CRD’s value as a source for the events of the crusade. His comment is misleading about CRD’s composition and content. To understand these, a closer look at the text is required.

On the penultimate leaf of the Corpus manuscript text, before his account of the treaty, Richard claimed that the king, “resolving to return home” (*repatriare deliberans*), stationed defenders in his lands and knocked down Ascalon’s fortifications, lest the pagans should shelter in them. The dismantling of fortifications at Ascalon, which the king and his forces had built, was one of the conditions Saladin stipulated in the 2 September treaty.⁴⁵ Appleby read this as a straight-forward case of mixed-up chronology, muddled events, and murky detail, not crediting Richard’s cleverness and compositional technique as a narrator in the way Appleby did elsewhere.⁴⁶ In writing CRD, Richard was avoiding a humiliating story of a king, forced to capitulate to Saladin, who agreed to destroy the very defences he himself had built. Richard rendered the demolition as the king’s initiative, a strategic play to get ahead of the enemy. Equally strategically, Richard literally got ahead by placing the demolition chronologically before the treaty.⁴⁷

In CRD, the statement of the king’s resolve to go home occurs several episodes before the end. It is not referred to again. At no point in CRD did Richard describe any of the king’s preparations for his voyage home, the journey, or his embarkation on 9 October 1192. Other chroniclers, crusaders themselves, did; and it may be that Appleby had these accounts in mind. Roger of Howden described the conclusion of the treaty, and in the next sentence wrote that the king “hurried to return” (*redire ... properavit*) to his kingdom.⁴⁸ Ambroise narrated the treaty and the pilgrimages in substantial detail. Upon the pilgrims’ return from Jerusalem to the Christian strongholds, Ambroise then reported that the king “made ready” (*fist ... atormer*) to return: ensuring his ship was stocked with food, weapons, and other supplies; freeing Muslim prisoners

trouble keeping up with the pilgrims and made haste to catch up: William Stubbs, ed., *Itinerarium peregrinorum et gesta regis Ricardi* (London, 1864) vi.31.

⁴⁴ CRD, ix.

⁴⁵ Saladin agreed to keep the peace ‘if [the king] would restore Ascalon to [Saladin] in the state in which [Saladin] had surrendered it’ (*si ille redegisset Scalonom in eum statum quo ipse eam dimiserat*), Roger of Howden, *Chronica magistri Rogeri de Houedene*, ed. William Stubbs, vol. 3 (London, 1868), 184; Christopher Tyerman, *God’s War: A New History of the Crusades* (London, 2006), 471.

⁴⁶ CRD, xvii; for a powerful revision of Appleby’s perception of CRD as a chaotic narrative, see Libbon, “The Function.”

⁴⁷ This is part of a larger pattern at the end of CRD, in which Richard rendered the king the decision-maker: for discussion and other examples, see John Gillingham, *Richard I* (New Haven, 1999), 219–20.

⁴⁸ Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, 1868, 3:184–85.

in exchange for the release of his trusted supporter William des Préaux; and paying debts.⁴⁹ The anonymous *Itinerarium peregrinorum et gesta regis Ricardi* described the pilgrimages in terms of preparations to return home: the French were preparing to leave, but wanted to finish their pilgrimage before they did. Three organized groups made pilgrimages, each upon the return of the first group. The author, who was in the second group, commented frequently on the haste involved in the pilgrimages: the first pilgrims were so eager they kept walking through the night; once in Jerusalem, Saladin met all of the parties promptly; the leaders endeavoured to conclude the visits quickly to limit time in enemy territory. In the author's group, those on horseback got there first, and he noted that those on foot, like himself, were unable to see as much.⁵⁰ This chronicler then turned to the pilgrims dying or heading westwards; and noted the king's ship was provisioned, the freeing of William, and the debt payments.⁵¹

It is significant that Richard chose not to close with a story of plans for homecoming, a decision in contrast to these eyewitness or near-eyewitness accounts that did.⁵² Richard left his crusaders in the Holy Land. There is strong evidence—in form and theme, and in the manuscript—that Richard meant his composition to end here. In writing of the troubled Angevin house, Richard had informed Robert in the preface that his aim was to write, not of victors, but of survivors (*superstitibus*).⁵³ Where Richard left his tale, the king was just that: a survivor, who stood by while others made pilgrimage.

CRD covers the first three years of King Richard's reign.⁵⁴ It does so to within the same month. The time span encompassed by CRD's first major political event (the king's coronation) and its final major political event (the Treaty of Jaffa) is exactly three years. The two anecdotes that follow the treaty belong in its shadow, and they mirror each other in their Christian morals. One is about a pilgrimage to Jerusalem and the suffering of Christians witnessed there. The other is about a pilgrimage that never happened because of a king's indignant heart. Richard had promised his friend and dedicatee Robert to write a chronicle of the mutable world, reassuring Robert that the worth of that world was worth less than Robert's chosen path of Christian quiet.⁵⁵ With these two final tales, Richard offered an elegant coda that tied CRD neatly back to the purpose he had outlined in his dedicatory preface.

In Richard's autograph copy, the Corpus manuscript, CRD ends only about a third of the way down the folio.⁵⁶ The rest of the leaf was left blank intentionally. Had Richard wished at any point to add more anecdotes—about the king's departure, or the pilgrims', or the shipwrecks along the way—he could have. He did not. The copy of CRD in the Cotton manuscript is the same text, with the same start and end points, which suggests Scribe 1 also perceived it as a complete work.

Given Richard's keen interest in fitting beginnings, the tidy time period of coverage, the match between his stated purpose in the beginning and the message of his chosen ending, and the existence of two manuscripts with the same version of CRD (with these same start and end

⁴⁹ Ambroise, *The History of the Holy War: Ambroise's Estoire de La Guerre Sainte*, ed. Marianne Ailes and Malcolm Barber, vol. 1 (Woodbridge, 2003), l. 12,221-37 (pp. 197-8).

⁵⁰ *Itinerarium peregrinorum*, 431-8 (vi.30-4, esp at vi.33).

⁵¹ 439-41 (vi.35-7).

⁵² See Marcus Bull, *Eyewitness and Crusade Narrative: Perception and Narration in Accounts of the Second, Third and Fourth Crusades* (Woodbridge, 2018), chap. 3.

⁵³ CRD, 3.

⁵⁴ Libbon, "The Function," 172.

⁵⁵ CRD, 2; discussed above, p. 000.

⁵⁶ "CCCC MS 339," fol. 43v.

points), it is probable that Richard made a conscious authorial decision to cease work on CRD at this point, and to consider the work complete.

The Composition of CRD – Real Dates

It has long been firmly established that CRD was written in the 1190s.⁵⁷ Appleby's descriptions of the textual date range, and the parameters he set out for the real date range of composition within the 1190s, have been accepted without question.⁵⁸ As will be shown below, these parameters are problematic as they are founded on untenable assumptions, rather than on an understanding of the text and its composition. An alternative set of parameters is outlined.

Terminus post quem

It has been established on content that CRD was begun no earlier than 1191, when its dedicatee Robert moved from St Swithun's to the Carthusian house of Witham. Addressing Robert in his preface, Richard noted that he had agreed to write "a chronicle for you" (*tibi cronica*) to remind Robert of the inconstant world and of his friend.⁵⁹ A further point should be added: CRD must also have post-dated Richard's first visit to Robert at Witham, to which he also refers in the preface.⁶⁰

Appleby's introduction to his edition of CRD has established a long-unchallenged argument: namely, that CRD cannot have been written before news of the Lionheart's capture in Germany reached England.⁶¹ Appleby drew this conclusion based on his assertion that Richard "obviously knows" the king of England was imprisoned in Austria (by Duke Leopold) in December 1192, but did not give the evidence.⁶² (Elsewhere, however, Appleby appears to assume that Richard was writing in or after 1194.⁶³) This *terminus post quem* must be re-evaluated, because the text of CRD does not support Appleby's assertion.

The well-known enmity between the Lionheart and Duke Leopold of Austria had been simmering for a year and a half prior to the capture. Both German and English chroniclers, writing about the Lionheart's capture and the events that precipitated it, recognized that the duke already had a long-standing, potentially legitimate complaint against the king of England, and had been actively seeking redress well before the capture.⁶⁴ In July of 1191, after the crusaders' siege of Acre, it was widely acknowledged that king of England had refused to honour the duke's contribution to the city's capture. The king cut the duke out of a share of the spoils he intended to share with the French king alone. The Lionheart even permitted his soldiers to tear

⁵⁷ Stevenson (ed.), *Chronicon*, vi.

⁵⁸ Accepting Appleby: Robinson, *Catalogue*, 1:56; Freudenberg, *Irarum Nutrix*, 61–62.

⁵⁹ CRD, 2; see also Libbon, "The Function."

⁶⁰ CRD, 1.

⁶¹ The king's brother John learned of Richard's capture by mid-January 1193 at the latest. John Gillingham, "Richard I [Called Richard Coeur de Lion, Richard the Lionheart] (1157–1199), King of England, Duke of Normandy and of Aquitaine, and Count of Anjou," in *ODNB* (Oxford, 2009).

⁶² CRD, xviii; Staunton alone does not accept this at face value, noting instead that Richard "seems to know of the king's captivity," Staunton, *The Historians of Angevin England*, 130 n. 8.

⁶³ Appleby claims that Longchamp "chooses to ignore" the permission the king gave for John to return CRD, 64 n. 1. Richard, however, was recording an event that happened in 1192. The king did not grant John permission to return until 1194.

⁶⁴ John Gillingham, "The Kidnapped King: Richard I in Germany, 1192–1194," *German Historical Institute London Bulletin* 30 (2008): 10–14, esp. at 14.

down Duke Leopold's banner, a gross public humiliation. The insult was big news at the time, a scandal that made fodder for gossip across Europe.⁶⁵ Richard had told this very story in one of his later additions to his existing account of the events of 1191, made in a darker ink.⁶⁶ Richard knew the duke of Austria was out for revenge.

Appleby's argument appears to hinge on a passage near the end of CRD. Richard reported that the French king plied the German emperor with gifts to make him hate England's king. Richard continued the story: the emperor issued an imperial edict (*imperiali mandatur edicto*) across the empire stating that if (*si*) the English king should come to their realm, he should be presented to the emperor alive or dead; and if (*si*) anyone should show him forbearance (*ei parceret*), that person was to be punished as the empire's public enemy. A key line follows: "All yielded to the emperor's authority, and most of all that diligent duke of Austria, whom the king of England had dishonourably discharged at Acre." (*Paruerunt omnes imperatoris imperio, et mage sedulus ille dux Austrie, quem rex Anglie apud Accaronem exauctoraugerat.*)⁶⁷ In recounting the emperor's edict, Richard referred specifically to his earlier story about the the Lionheart's public dishonouring of Leopold. He also reported that Philippe de Dreux, bishop of Beauvais, had spread many negative rumours about the king of England upon Philippe's return to Europe in mid-1192, which Richard thought helped to precipitate the German emperor's edict and to fan latent hatred for the king.⁶⁸

As Richard framed it, the emperor's edict was formulated as a conditional mandate, requiring action should a possible future event occur; rather than a direct mandate, ordering immediate action. The edict's demand depended upon King Richard entering a particular part of the empire. One could adhere to the spirit of the edict, without King Richard's ever entering one's dominion, by acknowledging the emperor's authority, whether privately or publicly. It would be impossible to obey the emperor's order, in the sense of either attempting to carry it out (without success) or carrying it out successfully (accomplishing it), if the king of England did not enter the German Empire.

Appleby translated the clause *paruerunt omnes imperatoris imperio*, in what is potentially a valid translation, as "complied with the emperor's command." The word *imperium* does not necessarily mean "a command," nor was this the most common usage.⁶⁹ As used in medieval Latin, *imperium* often connoted the power and dignity of a people and realm, especially in the authority of its ruler (as in the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*, senses 1–9), and often in the exercise of that authority. Its meaning could be as narrow as "command" or "order" (sense 12);⁷⁰ it could also refer to the authority behind such a command, rather than to the

⁶⁵ On similar phenomena of newsletters and communications from the east, see e.g. Helen Birkett, "News in the Middle Ages: News, Communications, and the Launch of the Third Crusade in 1187–1188," *Viator* 49 (2018): 23–61; Sophia Menache, "The Crusades and Their Impact on the Development of Medieval Communication," in *Kommunikation zwischen Orient und Okzident: Alltag und Sachkultur*, ed. Helmut Hundsbichler (Vienna, 1994), 69–90.

⁶⁶ On the inks in CRD and their significance, see Libbon, "The Function," 175, 197–99.

⁶⁷ CRD, 81.

⁶⁸ 79–81; see also Stephen Bennett, "Philippe de Dreux, Bishop of Beauvais: 'A Man More Devoted to Battles than Books,'" *Medieval Warfare* 3 (2013): 28–29.

⁶⁹ See e.g. entry for *imperium*, *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* (Oxford, 2018).

⁷⁰ See e.g. William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, ed. R. A. B. Mynors, Rodney M. Thomson, and Michael Winterbottom, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1998), 180 (ii.159), hereafter cited as *GRA*.

command itself (sense 10).⁷¹ Is it possible to determine in what sense Richard meant *imperium* in this case?

If *imperium* does mean “command,” as Appleby would have it, then to have “complied” with that command must mean that a prince or city achieved capture of Richard in their own territory. We arrive immediately at a logical problem. How could “everyone” (to whom the edict was issued) have “complied” with the “command” if, as Appleby contended, Richard knew that only one person—the duke of Austria—had successfully captured Richard and therefore, alone fulfilling the conditions of the edict, alone complied with it?

We can determine that Richard used *imperium* to mean the imperial will or authority behind the edict, something that everyone could honour regardless of the king of England’s whereabouts. Appleby’s argument also depends on his reading of the word *paruerunt*, which he translated as “complied”—in the sense of achieved. However, it is not obvious that *parere* is a “success verb” in Richard’s usage. As used in medieval Latin, *parere* could mean to obey, to follow, or to comply with a command, guidance, or advice (usually in the dative). It could also mean to serve, or to be at the bidding, of something or someone (also usually in the dative).⁷² As used in classical Latin, in which Richard was very much at home, it was close to a synonym for words like *oboedire* (to obey; to listen to; to behave obediently towards), *obsequi* (to yield to; to be compliant to; to gratify), and *obtemperare* (to be submissive to; to obey; to submit to).⁷³ The dative objects can be a person, an order, someone’s will, or another entity. The verb *parere* and its close relatives cover a range of meanings, all of which are oriented towards the action’s intention; but not all of which are focussed on the action’s outcome.

In Richard’s usage, the subject of Richard’s verb *parere* is *omnes*: everyone. For it to be accurate that “all” were doing what the emperor wanted, Richard must have meant *parere* in the sense of will, at a minimum: “all” wished to honour the emperor’s edict should occasion arise. This is Abelard’s sense of the will: prior to, and the more telling aspect of, action. In Abelard’s view, for example, a person incurred sin by wanting to do a wrong action, whether or not the person subsequently attempted that action (and failed), or accomplished that action (successfully).⁷⁴ If Richard knew (as Appleby conjectured he doubtless did) that the duke of Austria had both captured Richard and delivered him to the emperor, then to use *parere* exclusively as a success verb would be to make a false statement. “All” might intend to keep the edict; but only one could—and did. The duke of Austria alone, not “all” the princes and cities invoked by the edict, captured the king of England.

Richard was the sort of writer who might have used *parere* as a zeugma, invoking multiple meanings simultaneously. If so, Richard’s open-ended field of reference could plausibly have been one of his significant winks alluding to a generally known fact: the king’s capture. Equally plausibly, by deliberately invoking the wide range of possible meanings of *parere*, Richard might aptly have signalled the true state of affairs immediately following the edict: open-ended and unresolved. The king of England was a wanted man, wanted more by some than by others. Whether he would be apprehended was, at the time, food for gossip and a question of great interest to kings and chroniclers.

⁷¹ E.g. Bede, *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, ed. Bertram Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1969), 154 (iii.13); Gerald of Wales, *Descriptio Kambriae*, ed. James F. Dimock, vol. 6 (London, 1868), 173 (i.5).

⁷² See e.g. entry for *parere*, *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* (Oxford, 2018).

⁷³ See entry for *pareo* in e.g. Charlton T. Lewis and Thomas Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1962).

⁷⁴ E.g. Abelard, *Ethics*, ed. D. E. Luscombe (Oxford, 1971), 6–36.

Richard knew of the German emperor's imperial edict to capture the king of England should he enter the imperial realms. He knew the duke of Austria wanted to be the one to make this happen. Richard may have meant only to imply, in that subtle way of his, that the duke of Austria was actively trying to find King Richard in his own dominions. The duke, already aggrieved and spoiling for revenge, as Richard knew and had already related twice,⁷⁵ might readily have read between the lines of the edict, and chosen to hear what it did not say explicitly ("Go get him!"). This was very likely the story Richard wanted to tell. Whether Richard knew that the duke succeeded in capturing Richard near Vienna around Christmas 1192 cannot be derived from CRD.

Terminus ante quem

The absolute outside real date of CRD's completion, which has long been established on content, is spring 1198: Walter, prior of Bath, died then and was buried on 31 May; Richard referred to him as alive.⁷⁶ The other widely accepted *terminus ante quem* is Appleby's: that Richard must have stopped writing CRD by early 1194. He concluded this on the grounds that Richard would "hardly" have left out the Lionheart's ransoming (he was released in Mainz on 4 February 1194) and return, and suggested that Richard worked on CRD no later than 16 April 1194 on like grounds: that Richard would "certainly" have mentioned the king's visit to Winchester on that date. Appleby's argument needs revision, as the textual and manuscript evidence cannot support it.

Appleby had made an *a priori* assumption about CRD: that Richard was writing a continuous and open-ended chronicle, like an annalistic chronicle, which he would always bring up to the present. It would never have an ending. This assumption determined how Appleby formulated his parameters for estimating the real dates of composition. He believed the political drama of an event would always take priority in Richard's mind. This thinking neglects the coherence and interest of Richard's composition.

The two events Appleby named are unrelated to, and beyond the scope of, the surviving end of CRD which, as we have demonstrated, Richard chose to leave complete regardless of whether or not he knew of what came after. He was not writing a comprehensive annalistic chronicle, but a little book for his friend Robert with a central theme and message. Richard included events from Winchester, but the city in which he worked was not the focus of his chronicle. As Marisa Libbon has shown, Richard probably filled in most of his anecdotes about Winchester while he was waiting for material he knew he wanted: news from the east of the king on crusade. There are no grounds for presuming that the simple fact of a royal event happening in Winchester would drive Richard to go back and change his finished work. We cannot admit historical events that took place after the events with which Richard concluded CRD as evidence for when Richard must have finished composing it.

Most pertinent to the case about when Richard finished writing CRD is the surviving evidence and its nature. Richard did not mention any event after September 1192. As we have seen, he chose not to, leaving the rest of the manuscript leaf blank. I would suggest the latest real date at which Richard was composing the text was earlier, very likely not beyond the end of 1192 or early 1193. He was working on the chronicle continuously, keeping it up to date as news arrived from crusading endeavours abroad.⁷⁷ Had he wanted to continue the chronicle, he would

⁷⁵ CRD, 46–47.

⁷⁶ Staunton, *The Historians of Angevin England*, 130, and n.8.

⁷⁷ Libbon, "The Function."

likely have done so on a shorter time frame, consistent with how he planned and produced the earlier material for CRD.

The Composition of CRD – Reconstruction

Richard began writing CRD in 1191, after Robert moved to Witham and after his own first visit to Robert there. After receiving news from the east about the end of the third full year of the king's reign in September 1192, Richard filled in and completed CRD, probably in autumn 1192, as he was consistently endeavouring to stay up to date in composing CRD. At some point, he decided to consider CRD a complete work. Either he knew in advance that three years would complete his task, or realized afterwards that the material for these three years made an elegant book that allowed him to consider his task complete.

Richard probably wrote most of CRD in 1191 and 1192, in a single or similar inks, bringing the "crusade" narrative up to two full years of the king's reign (September 1189–1191), and his "home" narrative through Longchamp's second departure from England in mid-1192. At a later date, in a darker ink, he went back over these leaves, added comments, and added historical material to both narratives. To the crusade narrative he added material from mid-1191, starting with the marriage of the king to Berengaria (12 May 1191), including the encounter between the king and Leopold at Acre, and ending with the king of France sailing homewards from Acre (1 August; he then sailed from Tyre on 3 August 1191). To the home narrative he added material from and including the formation of the commune of London (8 October 1191) through to the end of calendar year 1191, where he added a comment to his already existing deathbed scene of Reginald (26 December 1191, a date Richard supplied).

This suggests that, in mid-1192, Richard updated his account of the completed calendar year 1191 with news received meanwhile. Libbon has demonstrated that there was a gap in Richard's information from abroad. On the basis of intervening material, Libbon has identified a long subsequent waiting period for news from the east, before Richard began again with crusade events that occurred in August 1192. This gap in reporting events from the east has been noted by Appleby and Libbon.⁷⁸

Since his object was to write about the Angevin royals, I suggest he waited until a further full year of the king's reign had elapsed before continuing in dark ink on fol. 41r, in or after autumn 1192. We know Richard was thinking of CRD in terms of units of years of the king's reign, for he began this fresh folio with a sentence asserting that "by now, King Richard of the English filled a period of two years in conquering the region around Jerusalem" (*Rex Anglorum Ricardus in conquiendo regionem circa Ierosolimam iam compleuit biennium*).⁷⁹ Having waited to continue writing until he had news of the third year of the king's reign, Richard may have decided that the finale of that year—the last crisis of the Third Crusade: the Treaty of Jaffa and its aftermath—was more relevant to the Christian moral purpose he stated in his dedicatory preface than were any preceding events in the east in the year before August 1192. In bringing the crusaders to a bittersweet, unfulfilled pilgrimage in Jerusalem, Richard could remind Robert that such worldly journeys were not for Robert, who had what he needed of Christian consolation at home in Witham Priory. When Richard did learn of the king's capture, or his ransom, or his visit to Winchester, what would these have added to his "little book" (*libellum*)? These matters belonged in another story. With CRD as it was, Richard was satisfied. After all, Richard never promised Robert to be comprehensive. He did what he promised Robert he

⁷⁸ CRD, 73 n. 2; Libbon, "The Function," 198–99.

⁷⁹ CRD, 73.

would: he completed, with his indomitable flair, an elegant and original “chronicle for you” (*tibi cronica*).

Then it was time for him to turn to another project. For events kept on occurring, and Richard certainly savoured writing about them. This time, though, it would be a different project, an ongoing annalistic work, keeping up with current events: the Later Angevin Chronicle. We turn now from Richard’s well-known prose chronicle to his annalistic works, which, if more obscure, are no less compelling.

The Dating and Composition of Richard’s Annalistic Works: The World of Britain Chronicle (WBC) and the Later Angevin Chronicle (LAC)

Because at least the first part of WBC survives in Richard’s autograph manuscript, its textual date range is a known, if open-ended, set: its planned and executed beginning was Brutus’s arrival in Britain, and Richard continued it through at least the entry for 1138 inclusive. Its relationship to LAC is discussed below

The Composition of WBC – Real Dates

Richard was composing WBC—updating, changing, and amending it—in multiple sittings, or at least with different pens. In hand-writing WBC, Richard used multiple inks, at least three of which are obvious.⁸⁰ On fol. 2v the marginal dates (written by Richard) and the numerals adjacent to the annals (written by an annotator: a different scribe) were added subsequently in an ink darker than the annal text; two of the annotator’s numerals were also amended in a dark ink. The styling of the letter “x” indicates the presence of an annotator. Richard’s *rex* in the entry on Riuallo is the same as his four Roman numerals “x” in the margin on that same line; this handwriting is distinct from the still-later hand that added the Roman numeral “xxxvii” in dark ink in line adjacent to the text.

Different inks are apparent in WBC’s text, as well as in some of its dates; for example, in the interlinear date *annis xv* added above *Cerditius rex Westsaxonum* on fol. 9v, and among the marginal content on fol. 10r (see e.g. *Augustinus uenit in Angliam*). On fol. 12r the text running from and including the first “g” of *Egbirtus rex Anglie fuit filius Edmundi. Qui* appears to be in a different ink: this very pale, greyish ink lacks the pooling, blotting effect the brown ink exhibits especially around curves. Curved letters are formed more slowly, and with different degrees of force at changing angles, offering more opportunities for absorption depending on the viscosity and composition of the ink. On fol. 23v, the interlinear addition (beginning in the margin with *Randulfus* and running across into the main text with *Et ordo Cisterciensis habuit ...*) is in a different ink from the segments before and after. There is also evidence that Richard erased part of his text and rewrote it.⁸¹ WBC, like CRD, was a work that Richard did not write in strict serial sequence, and probably worked on over a period of time. We now endeavour to investigate and re-set the boundary parameters for the real date range of that ongoing annalistic composition.

Terminus post quem – WBC

We begin by establishing the earliest possible real date at which Richard could have begun writing WBC.

Luard and Appleby made different suggestions about the real dates of composition of WBC. Both based their suggestions on the same reference Richard made to recent times in the

⁸⁰ Libbon, “The Function,” 197, identifies the main ink only.

⁸¹ See the story of Cnut and Eadric, “CCCC MS 339,” fol. 16r.

entry for 837.⁸² The 837 entry contains a reference to Æthelwulf, king of Wessex (d. 858), and his sons “in whom he rejoiced no less than a certain king in our times whom we saw rejoice in his own sons” (*de quibus non minus gavisus est quam quendam nostri temporis regem uidimus fuisse gausum de filiis suis*).⁸³ Luard argued this must signal a real date of writing before 1173, because Henry II would only have taken joy in his sons before they rebelled against him in that year.⁸⁴ Appleby suggested that the line probably referred to Henry’s Easter court in 1176, where the Young King, Richard, and Geoffrey gathered.⁸⁵ The implication is that only then, at a time of public reconciliation, could they have been joyful.

However, it is not self-evident that Richard’s is a candid remark about the king’s joy. The line does not make an absolute statement that the king was joyful. It makes a comparative statement about the degree of the king’s joy. This remark in the 837 entry is special for another reason: it is the only explicit comparison Richard made in WBC between an historic king and a modern (i.e. late twelfth-century) one. What, exactly, did Richard think Æthelwulf and Henry II shared, to a degree that invited the comparison? For this we need to take a closer look at Æthelwulf (d. 858)—and, most important, what Richard knew about him.

Æthelwulf’s son Alfred became a successful king of Wessex who fought off the Danes, although Anglo-Norman chroniclers tended to praise his learning foremost, and to speak of his struggles more than his successes in battle.⁸⁶ Æthelwulf, however, never had the opportunity to rejoice in his youngest son’s victories and wise, learned kingship. Alfred did not accede to the kingship of Wessex until 871, more than ten years after Æthelwulf’s death—and, in 858, it was not likely that he would, not least because he had three older brothers.

Richard knew William of Malmesbury’s *Gesta Regum Anglorum* and, like John of Worcester and William himself, may have known the work of Alfred’s chronicler Asser first-hand too. Asser reported that Æthelwulf went on a year-long pilgrimage to Rome in 855, bringing his best-loved son Alfred with him, and returning with his new bride Judith. While he was away, “a certain notorious event, against the custom of all Christians’ (*quaedam infamia contra morem omnium Christianorum*) occurred. King Æthelbald, Æthelwulf’s eldest son, schemed with a few leading men to drive the king from his own kingdom. The consequence was civil war, more cruel still for being fought between father and son, an intranecine dispute that galvanized all to revolt and endangered the kingdom.”⁸⁷ Only Æthelwulf’s wisdom in suffering a gross injustice prevailed: he agreed to give up half the kingdom to his son, and for a time saved the West Saxons by ruling a divided kingdom. The scandal drove Asser to compare the present to the past—like Richard in this regard, and as uncharacteristically—and he deemed the event “unheard of in all prior ages” (*inauditum omnibus seculis ante*). When William of Malmesbury took up Æthelwulf’s story in the first part of the twelfth century, he applied to his summary of Asser a shortened version Lucan’s apt phrase: this was a war *plusquam civile*, “worse still than civil.”⁸⁸

⁸² “AW,” xiii; Appleby, “Richard,” 74.

⁸³ “CCCC MS 339,” fol. 12r; “AW,” 8.

⁸⁴ “AW,” xiii.

⁸⁵ Appleby, “Richard,” 74.

⁸⁶ Emily A. Winkler, “King Alfred and the Danish Wars in Anglo-Norman Histories,” in *Textualität von Macht und Herrschaft: Literarische Verfahren im Horizont transkultureller Forschungen*, ed. M. Albert et al. (Bonn, 2020), 201–25.

⁸⁷ Asser, *Asser’s Life of King Alfred: Together with the Annals of Saint Neots Erroneously Ascribed to Asser*, ed. W. H. Stevenson and Dorothy Whitelock (Oxford, 1959), 9–10 (chap. 12).

⁸⁸ *GRA* ii.113, p. 170; see also Lucan, *De bellum civile* i.1.

Was Æthelwulf a king, in Richard's estimation, who had cause to delight in his eldest sons? On the contrary. Æthelwulf of Wessex had left his kingdom in trust to his eldest son, and found himself betrayed when his son would not give it back. Henry II had his eldest son crowned king of England, a son indignant at being king only in name, and found his sons in revolt.⁸⁹ These parallel situations reveal the classic dangers of royal parity: if a king's power is given to a son in the king's own lifetime, the son expects to realize it, and it is difficult for the father to take back. The true cost is in the lives and fortunes of the kingdom's people.

Both Luard's and Appleby's arguments for the real dates of composition—Luard's *terminus ante quem* and Appleby's *terminus post quem*—depend on the assumption that Richard was recording great joy of kings in their sons. Richard wrote that Æthelwulf experienced no less joy than Henry II, but cleverly made no comment about the absolute magnitude of that joy. This is a classic example of ironic understatement. As Richard proceeded to demonstrate with specific examples, stylistic choices, and fraternal groupings, the amount of joy he means us to understand is: hardly any at all.

The key clue in Richard's comparison of kings in the 837 entry is that Richard was, deliberately, not writing about Alfred—the only son in whom, according to Richard, Æthelwulf could really have rejoiced.⁹⁰ The main clause of the sentence reads: “Hic habuit tres filios, Ethelbaldum, Ethelbirhtum, et Ethelred” (*he had three sons, Aethelbald, Aethelberht, and Aethelred*). To these three only does Richard's *de quibus* relative clause refer. In the next sentence, Richard tells us that Æthelwulf had a fourth son by name of Alfred (*Quartum habuit filium Eluredum nomine*), and that his father sent him to be anointed by the pope in the city of Rome (*in urbe Roma*). Alfred, he wrote, was of so much patience and gentleness, because even though he had been anointed king during his father's lifetime, after his father's death he allowed his three brothers, one after the other, to wear the crown before him (*Qui tantae fuit patientiae et mansuetudinis, quod cum esset rex inunctus, vivente patre, post patris obitum tres fratres suos quemque post alterum ante se permisit portare coronam*).⁹¹

In Richard's rendering, the three eldest sons are usurpers of the father's will and the pope's anointing. Richard was always very precise in discussing coronation, making much of coronation rituals in Winchester. He distinguished crowned kings (*coronatus*) from those who seized, or wore, crowns. Coronation was a legitimating activity, indicating assent and approval, even if the character of kings (like Modred and Cerditius) was wanting.⁹² Vortigern, by contrast, “with his own hands” (*propriis manibus*) put the crown on his head (*diadema imposuit*).⁹³ Similarly, these three dastardly sons of Æthelwulf “wore the crown” (*portare coronam*), but were not “crowned,” prose choices Richard made to show they were not legitimately crowned in a public ceremony by a man of the church. Lacking coronation, they were not proper kings.

To write that Æthelwulf had three sons and one son, instead of writing that he had four, was bald and pointed. Richard effectively highlighted Alfred's merit by contrast, as though Alfred rightly belonged to a different brood. This contrast is as stark as the one he made between Edwy

⁸⁹ For discussion of the problem of Henry the Young King, “a king without a kingdom”, see Matthew Strickland, *Henry the Young King, 1155-1183* (New Haven, 2016).

⁹⁰ On Richard's highlighting of Alfred's importance, see Gillingham, “Richard,” 152–53.

⁹¹ “CCCC MS 339,” fol. 12r; “AW,” 8–9.

⁹² “CCCC MS 339:” the four kings appointed by Brutus, fol. 2v; Elidurus, fol. 3v; Constans, fol. 7v; Modred and Cerditius, who betrayed Arthur but still managed to arrange to be crowned, fol. 9v.

⁹³ “CCCC MS 339,” fol. 7v.

(Eadwig) and his brother Edgar (the Peaceable): the former is a rotten apple who has evacuated the kingdom's bowels; the latter is a sweet and nourishing rose.⁹⁴

The coy remarks “no less joy” of “a certain king in our day” reveal Richard's dry wit at its most potent. Richard is well known for being oblique about the Angevin rulers' family relations, and pointed in imputing impropriety. His rhetorical gestures were significant looks to show that all was not well in Henry II's family after the rebellion of 1173–1174. In the preface to his CRD, he wrote that he would not dwell upon “the troubled House of Oedipus” (*Edipode confusa domus*), by which he meant Henry II's royal family.⁹⁵ Later in CRD, he wrote that letters that “were sent or went” (*mittuntur uel ibant*) against Richard speak to John's ineffective treachery against his brother the king.⁹⁶ This, like the reference to Æthelwulf, is ironic understatement. Letters do not go on their own: John had them sent. Many contemporary chronicles written after 1173 made conspicuous, knowing, allusive remarks about the civil war.⁹⁷ Richard's remark reflects this style. The king's youngest son, John, was not implicated at the time; and indeed Henry II rewarded him for his loyalty by making him Lord of Ireland at the Council of Oxford, 1177.⁹⁸ John, like Alfred was to Æthelwulf, was the youngest of the king's four surviving sons.

Richard was adopting the perspective of one in the present, looking back on the recent and distant past. The sentence in the annal steps outside the limits of 837, as though the discussion of Æthelwulf's sons has triggered reminders, both of recent times and of the events that would follow in 855. This is a feature of retrospective chronicling, especially for negative or despairing events. The chronicler who wrote the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle annals for Æthelred II's reign, for instance, wrote that Eadric always interfered with defending against the Danes, “as it still ever was” (*swa hit gyt æfre wæs*).⁹⁹

Richard, as a monk of Winchester, could well have witnessed the Easter gathering in Winchester 1176. It is highly unlikely that he had this event in mind. To support his point that Richard was referring to genuine rejoicing, Appleby quoted the words of a different contemporary observer, who wrote that the royal sons were received there “with great joy” by their lord king and father (*cum magno gaudio a domino rege patre eorum recepti sunt*).¹⁰⁰ However, it was Roger of Howden, not Richard, who ascribed “great” joy to the king on this occasion, in this detailed description of a formal event. When Richard chose to commemorate an honourable and meaningful reconciliation, he did so lavishly, naming the council, its leader, and what transpired there—as he did for the Winchester coronation and naming edict of Ecgbert, and to a lesser degree for the coronation of Matilda of Flanders in 1068 (which he erroneously placed at

⁹⁴ “CCCC MS 339,” fol. 13v; “AW,” 11.

⁹⁵ CRD, 3, quoting Statius, *Thebaid* i.17.

⁹⁶ 30.

⁹⁷ Jordan Fantosme, *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, ed. R. C. Johnston (Oxford, 1981); Staunton, *The Historians of Angevin England*, chap. 11; Matthew Strickland, “Arms and the Men: War, Loyalty and Lordship in Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle,” in *Medieval Knighthood IV*, ed. Christopher Harper-Bill and Ruth Harvey (Woodbridge, 1992), 187–220.

⁹⁸ Roger of Howden, *Chronica magistri Rogeri de Houedene*, ed. William Stubbs, vol. 2 (London, 1868), 133.

⁹⁹ David Dumville and Simon Keynes, eds., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition* (Cambridge, 1983–) CDE 1009.

¹⁰⁰ Roger of Howden, *Chronica magistri Rogeri de Houedene*, ed. William Stubbs, vol. 1 (London, 1868), 115.

Winchester).¹⁰¹ In the 837 entry he did not honour Henry II or his sons with their names, and named neither council nor particular moment. His words are arch, gossipy (“a certain king,” like Asser’s “a certain notorious event”), and general. They invite one to think of a universally known, probably scandalous, state of affairs. Richard’s self-conscious ambiguity—a wink at the reader—is one of his signature techniques.

Luard’s and Appleby’s suggestions for the real date of composition of WBC were based on the premise that Richard meant that Henry II was happy with his sons. However, Richard’s remark was considered out of context in the 837 annal, a comparative reference about the quantity of joy was mistaken for an affirmation that joy was present, and interpretations were made without accounting for what Richard knew of Æthelwulf from William of Malmesbury (and, very likely, Asser) and asking why he made the comparison. Richard, with his familiar style and wit, chose to highlight the contemporary resonance of a king’s elder son, appointed to the role of king during his father’s lifetime, who then rebelled against his reigning father, and whose next-eldest two brothers joined that filial treachery. The meaning of the remark in its context demonstrates that the proposed dating is untenable. There is no reason to suppose 1176 a significant year either way, so we may discount it as a factor. I propose a revised *terminus post quem* based on content: Richard wrote WBC no earlier than the first rebellion of Henry’s sons in 1173.

The manuscript evidence may allow refinement of this starting point;¹⁰² beyond this, the most we can do here is conjecture. Although not written in a single ink, a good portion of WBC closely resembles the first ink of CRD in the Corpus manuscript. This is circumstantial evidence: Richard could have used similar inks at different times, or different pens at the same time. It is possible Richard was working on two projects, WBC and CRD, concurrently. Perhaps that he embarked upon the annalistic project in 1192, while he was waiting for news about the king of England in the east. Alternatively, perhaps it was Richard’s experience writing the annalistic WBC, before Robert left for Witham, that inspired Robert to ask Richard to write an account of present-day events for him.

The *terminus ante quem* for WBC we must discuss jointly with that of LAC, as we seek the latest date at which we can demonstrate Richard was writing annalistic works. Joint discussion is necessary because the same dating errors have been applied to both texts, and because it is an open question as to whether WBC and LAC were originally separate works or one continuous annalistic composition.

Terminus ante quem – WBC and LAC

In this section, we move to discuss 1) the latest annalistic material (textual dates) demonstrably written by Richard, and 2) the latest real date at which Richard was writing it. As part of this discussion I will reinforce the argument that Richard’s own composition (LAC) is indeed behind a section of annals that survive uniquely in the Cotton manuscript. This has been suggested, but never demonstrated, and so has remained open to easy attack. I will also refine the argument for which specific part of the surviving annals in the Cotton manuscript represent Richard’s LAC composition.

¹⁰¹ “CCCC MS 339,” fols. 11v–12r, 22r; the Ecgbert entry, but not the Matilda entry, is printed in “AW,” 8.

¹⁰² The writing has been dated to the end of the twelfth or beginning of the thirteenth century based on palaeographic evidence: James, *Descriptive Catalogue*, 2:170–71; Appleby, “Richard,” 71.

In order to approach the question of a *terminus ante quem* of composition—the latest real date at which Richard was evidently writing WBC and LAC—our first task is to determine, as far as possible, the latest annalistic material (textual date) he composed. We must begin by pointing out two spurious arguments about these real and textual dates. Both arguments were based on simple misreadings of numbers. They require discussion here, because both have continued to cause confusion about the evidence and arguments for the extent of Richard’s authorship.

The first error represents a misreading of the Corpus manuscript’s layout and numbers and a confusion of dating systems. Richard Howlett was mistaken in asserting that the date “1201” (by which he meant AD 1201) appears opposite the dedication of Richard’s autograph manuscript, the Corpus manuscript. This assertion implies that these two items appear on the same line.¹⁰³ The numeral “m.cc.i.” written into the left-hand margin is not opposite to the dedicatory inscription. It is well below it, on the other side of the page. More important, this number bears no relation to the dedication. It relates directly to the historical content of the annalistic text next to which it does sit. It is the first date of Richard’s WBC annals given in the dating system and chronology of the Eusebius-Jerome chronicle, which date events to the birth of Abraham.¹⁰⁴ Richard gave this as the date for Brutus’s founding of Britain. The dates continue in chronological sequence: the entries on fol. 1r progress with 1224, 1225, and those on fol. 1v continue with 1234, 1242, and so on, the only difference being that after fol. 1r, “i” rather than “m” is used for 1000. Howlett confused an Abrahamic year for an incarnation year. Richard did not begin to date his entries in incarnation years until the birth of Christ, and he signalled the switch explicitly: *Anno ab incarnatione Domini* in year 14 (i.e. the fifteenth year, per Eusebius and Jerome) of Tiberius’s reign.¹⁰⁵ The appearance of the numeral “m.cc.i.” on the first folio—the Abrahamic date of Brutus’s arrival in Britain—resembles an AD year only by coincidence. This numeral in the manuscript must be discarded as evidence for the *Anno Domini* date of authorship. Howlett also tacitly assumed WBC and LAC were originally the same work: this possibility will be discussed below, but cannot be proven.

Second, another error has been perpetuated, arising from a misreading of Appleby’s *terminus ante quem*. In his 1963 article, Appleby observed that the Cotton manuscript annals by Scribe 1, after several missing leaves, pick up “with the year 1196,” continuing in that same hand “to the middle of 1202.”¹⁰⁶ As will be discussed below, what Appleby meant by “1196” and “1202” here needs refining, as precision is necessary for the case of the textual and real dates of Richard’s composition. For now it is sufficient to establish what Appleby’s argument was. Appleby argued that the annals running from 1196 to mid-1202, as preserved in the Cotton manuscript, are a copy of Richard’s original work. He gave two reasons. First, they are in a single hand (Scribe 1). Second, they contain several anecdotes (Appleby listed five: one in 1197, two in 1198, one in 1199, and one in 1201) that reflect Richard’s distinctive, lively style. In any case, his argument was explicit: Richard originally wrote the series of entries later copied into the Cotton manuscript, from 1196 to mid-1202.

¹⁰³ *Historia Rerum Anglicarum*, 3:lxxi n. 2.

¹⁰⁴ Anne Lawrence-Mathers, “Computus and Chronology in Anglo-Norman England,” in *Writing History in the Anglo-Norman World: Manuscripts, Makers and Readers, c. 1066-1250*, ed. Laura Cleaver and Andrea Worm (Woodbridge, 2018), 54.

¹⁰⁵ “CCCC MS 339,” fol. 5v; see above, 000.

¹⁰⁶ Appleby, “Richard,” 74–75.

Antonia Gransden, however, incorrectly credited Appleby with suggesting that Richard wrote the annals 1196 to 1210.¹⁰⁷ Appleby never mentioned the year 1210 in either of his two discussions of Richard's authorship and dating.¹⁰⁸ Gransden's typo has not been noticed, which has caused ongoing confusion about the arguments for end-dating Richard's contributions. Both Gransden and, following her, G. H. Martin (in his *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* entry on Richard) affirmed: "It has been suggested that" Richard wrote the annals between 1196 and 1210.¹⁰⁹ No one ever made this suggestion.

Perhaps in part because he could (understandably) find no evidence for Richard's authorship to 1210, Martin discounted Richard's authorship of any Winchester annals from 1196 inclusive onwards altogether. He concluded "on balance" that Richard had probably died before the Lionheart's reign had ended, but offered no evidence in favour of Richard's early demise, and did not explain on what the "balance" hinged. Luard's early contention that Richard's CRD could not have been written after 1173—whereas this article has just demonstrated that it must have been written after 1173—may have attracted guesses towards an early death date. At any rate, Martin thought only Richard's authorship of CRD was secure, and not his authorship of the Winchester annals we have named LAC. Thus, he reasoned, because CRD ended in 1192 and showed no knowledge of the king's release from captivity, Richard must have stopped writing and died. This reasoning hinges on the same fallacy as Appleby's: the assumption that CRD was an ongoing work, one Richard would never consider complete, rather than the "little book" (*libellum*) Richard asserted it was. The end of Richard's CRD is admitted here as evidence for when he stopped writing that particular work, but not as evidence for his death.

Appleby noted that several stories in the Cotton manuscript within this section (by Scribe 1) beginning "with 1196" and running to "the middle of 1202" share a lively, mocking style markedly different from the pithy annals for 1139–1190 preceding. This similarity in style, he wrote, was such that "one feels certain that no one but Richard of Devizes could have written this section."¹¹⁰ I agree, to a point, but the convincing nature of this stylistic similarity has not yet been demonstrated (as Appleby did amply for the Corpus manuscript).¹¹¹ Furthermore, the point must be qualified based on the evidence for Scribe 1's other sources, unknown to Appleby. As noted above, Appleby listed five anecdotes which he claimed were similar to Richard's style. Because Appleby stopped short of actually making his case about the Cotton manuscript's 1196–1202 material, preferring to make a more vague remark about a feeling of certainty, his position was left open to easy attack by Gransden and Martin (who, equally, were free to make their critiques of Appleby's vague claim without needing to give evidence or reasons). Conversely, those who have accepted Richard's authorship of this whole section of annals in the Cotton manuscript have almost universally cited Appleby's feeling on the matter.¹¹²

Gransden and Martin both doubted Richard's authorship of any material in these Cotton manuscript annals for 1196–1202 inclusive; Martin went so far as to reject it altogether. That

¹⁰⁷ Gransden, *Historical Writing*, 1:252, and n.47.

¹⁰⁸ Appleby, "Richard"; CRD, xxiv–xxvi.

¹⁰⁹ Gransden, cited above; Martin, "Devizes." Martin does not mention WBC.

¹¹⁰ Appleby, "Richard," 74–75; cf. CRD, xxiv–xxvi, at xxvi: "one cannot resist the conviction that."

¹¹¹ Appleby, "Richard," 72–74.

¹¹² E.g. Staunton, *The Historians of Angevin England*, 131; John Crook, *English Medieval Shrines* (Woodbridge, 2011); Crook, "Early Historians of Winchester Cathedral"; Browett, "The Cult of St Æthelwold and Its Context, c. 984–c. 1400."

doubt and rejection are still acknowledged as though they are in play¹¹³—and they are, because no one has refuted them, nor pointed out that they stem from assumptions based on their misreading of Appleby's argument. To my mind there is no question that Richard, unabridged, wrote at least most of this section: and this must be demonstrated. The lively style and mocking tone, remarked by Appleby, are not the only compelling factors in this case, nor indeed are the classical references remarked by Luard, Howlett, and Appleby.¹¹⁴ What compels is the consistency in philosophy and opinion, observable across Richard's oeuvre, of a single author writing about people whom he knew well, and who developed his ideas as he observed these people over time.

Now that we have eliminated two spurious dates (an Abrahamic year 1201 in a manuscript mistaken for an *Anno Domini* year, and AD 1202 in an article mistaken for AD 1210), it is time to return to Appleby's original contention. We must establish what, if any, of the annalistic material preserved in the Cotton manuscript represent Richard's authorship.

1196 and 1202: Years or Annals?

What of the disputed section of the Cotton manuscript annals did Richard compose? In order to establish what material in the Cotton manuscript material is a copy of Richard's LAC, we must also establish, as far as the evidence allows, what material Richard did not compose. Appleby did not ask this question. Appleby evidently assumed that the annals in the Cotton manuscript in a single hand, 1196 through mid-1202 inclusive, are an exact copy of Richard's original chronicle, which would have run from Brutus partway through 1202 at least. The "single hand" argument must have been the decisive factor in his making this assumption, since he did not claim to discern Richard's voice in the annals for 1196, 1200, or 1202.

Previous discussions of the plausibility of Richard's authorship have mostly paid attention to what dates he covered, rounding up to the nearest full year, rather than considering how much of a given annal he may have composed. We need to be more specific about where breaks—interruptions, splicing, or repetition of content—occur in individual annals in the manuscript. Failing to account for these has contributed to the confusion and vagueness around discussions of Richard's authorship, which in turn have continued to permit suggestions that there is no substantial basis for attributing Richard's authorship to any parts of these later annals. Lack of precision about what, specifically, in the Cotton manuscript is Richard's work has left the case open to critique on the basis of what he manifestly did not write. As we will show, the content, manuscript, and transmission evidence enables us to refine the case for Richard's authorship and composition significantly.

Let us start by zeroing in on the annals for the first and final years of Appleby's date range: 1196 and 1202. As observed above, Appleby contended that Richard wrote the single-hand section of the Cotton manuscript beginning "with the year 1196" and continuing "to the middle of 1202." Appleby's argument was then restated with less precision, with one claim that Richard wrote the segment "from 1196 to 1202,"¹¹⁵ and another that "the annals for the period from 1066 to 1202" are in the same hand.¹¹⁶ Howlett affirmed (on the basis of Scribe 1's hand in

¹¹³ See e.g. Staunton, *The Historians of Angevin England*, 130–31, esp. 131 n. 11; Gillingham, "Richard," 144, mentions the annals written by the Cotton scribe, but does not mention Richard's probable authorship of any Cotton annals 1196–1202 inclusive.

¹¹⁴ "AW," xi–xii; *Historia Rerum Anglicarum*, 3:lxv, lxxii; Appleby, "Richard."

¹¹⁵ Goetz, "Winchester Annals"; also ambiguous about 1202 is Denholm-Young, "The Winchester-Hyde Chronicle," 87.

¹¹⁶ Gillingham, "Richard," 144.

Cotton, which he mistakenly thought was Richard's) that Richard "lived as late as the year 1202;" Appleby and his followers agreed.¹¹⁷ These assertions are ambiguous, and for that reason potentially misleading. This is because they fail to capture the essential difference between years and annals. In order to describe the Cotton manuscript as it survives, this difference is important to establish, as it is directly relevant to the case for exactly what Richard wrote.

We will call the surviving latter part of the 1196 entry "1196A," to signal we are referring to the annal as it survives in the Cotton manuscript, and not to the events or year of 1196. The first event noted in 1196A is Joan of England's marriage to Raymond VI of Toulouse. The marriage occurred in October. It contains no information on any events in 1196 from January through September. Based on the length and detail of coverage of this single event, and of the extended length of the successive annals in the same hand, a good deal of this entry is probably missing. The probability that 1196A is only part of an annal is also supported by the absence of several manuscript pages before 1196A. The interruption begins, as Appleby noted, in the entry for 1190: this annal breaks off in the middle of a name at the end of a *verso* page. Although Appleby noticed the break in the 1190 annal, he did not for the 1196 annal: he simply thought "the annals resume" in the same hand with 1196.

Appleby suggested a potential reason for the break in sequence here: the intervening section may have been removed by a compiler, he claimed, because the events of these years were given much fuller treatment in the appended CRD by Richard.¹¹⁸ If true, it would suggest the compiler was interested in: 1) trying to include Richard's version of events as far as possible, and/or 2) preferring more coverage to less coverage in a given entry. Again, though, Appleby's claim needs refining. The events of Richard's CRD run from September 1189 through September 1192. CRD would not suffice to replace a full sequence for the years 1190–1196 inclusive. It would be odd (and highly irregular) for a compiler to remove annalistic material covering the period from late 1192 through early 1196 (inclusive), especially since the compiler had no issue with the fact that Richard's CRD and LAC duplicated material for the year 1189 and 1190. Could Richard have composed annals for the intervening years? We need to confront the possibility that the intervening leaves were simply lost or misplaced.

The Cotton manuscript contains two different entries for 1202, which overlap in content. The first is likely incomplete. The latter is a complete annal that derives directly from a later chronicle. The rupture in 1202 is thus more marked than Appleby's observation implies. It is not, as Appleby implies, one entry for the year 1202 written in two hands, begun by one scribe and then completed by another. As Luard and N. Denholm-Young both noted, not only does a new hand begin, but it also repeats information only a few lines before about the capture of Arthur, nephew of John, at Mirabeau.¹¹⁹ We will call the two distinct entries for 1202 respectively, for convenience, 1202A and 1202B. To be explicit and precise, then, about the one-hand material in question: 1196A through 1202A, inclusive, are in a single hand (Scribe 1).

1202A runs at some length through a series of events from the beginning of the year through the Battle of Mirebeau, which occurred on 1 August. 1202B picks up in a different hand, and includes two events, though not in the same or similar wording or style, also in 1202A. 1202B reports the Battle of Mirebeau (1 August) and then (out of order) the death of Geoffrey III of Perche (5 April) as he prepared to go on Crusade. The manuscript is not damaged between the two entries; the hands simply change. This smooth transition indicates that 1202A

¹¹⁷ Howlett, *Historia Rerum Anglicarum*, 3: lxx–lxxii; Crook, *English Medieval Shrines*, 126; Freudenberger, *Irarum Nutrix*, 61.

¹¹⁸ Appleby, "Richard," 74.

¹¹⁹ "AW," x, 79 n. 2; Denholm-Young, "The Winchester-Hyde Chronicle," 87.

was left unfinished, or perceived as incomplete by the continuator, and not that the manuscript was damaged or reorganized by a compiler. Rather than picking up with an entry for 1203, the continuator saw that 1202A was incomplete, and decided to make a fresh start by copying an existing 1202 annal that was, if less comprehensive, at least known to be complete.

For 1202B is a complete entry. We know this because it and the entries that follow (all in Scribe 2's hand) through 1277 are identical to, and "directly derived" from, those of MS Bodley 91.¹²⁰ Folios 103–132 of MS Bodley 91 were written at Hyde Abbey in the second half of the thirteenth century. They appear in one hand from Year 1 to 1264, and continue in a different hand to 1280. Because the annals in the Cotton manuscript derive directly from MS Bodley 91, 1202B cannot have been copied from a chronicle written by Richard.

The Authorship of Cotton Manuscript Annals 1196A and 1202A

1202B, therefore, is ruled out: it was not composed by Richard. There is nothing in content, thought, or style, that marks 1196A or 1202A as distinctively Richard's. However, it should be noted that both of these are incomplete annals: the first part of 1196A probably existed at one time but is missing; and it appears that 1202A was never finished (whether it was Scribe 1's original annal, an unfinished copy of another complete annal, or an exact copy of another incomplete annal). 1196A, in particular, might be the last part of a long entry written with his vim and vigour—or it might not. Neither entry allows us to judge Richard's authorship by inclusive year. At the same time, the interruption of the first and potential incompleteness of the second means that Richard's authorship cannot be ruled out.

Can we rule 1196A or 1202A out on any other grounds, and establish a working theory for what of this section Richard wrote? 1196A should be left in the running, because there is no compelling reason to rule it out. Two factors indicate the value of keeping 1196A in play. First, it offers potentially only a very small sample of the original annal in the Cotton manuscript. We need to allow for the possibility that it was longer, and originally composed at least in part by Richard. Second, the unusual use of the letter "k" to sound out a hard "c" sound—a distinction potentially made by a French speaker—is found in both 1196A and the 1198 annal.¹²¹ This latter stylistic connection is no smoking gun; but is unique enough, and consistent enough with our learned linguist who liked sounds and puns, that it merits mention. At least there is no compelling reason to rule out 1196A.

1202A is a different story. The first event of 1202A is an agreement between the archbishop of Canterbury (Hubert Walter) and the Canterbury monks. That agreement resolved a long dispute between regular clergy (monks) and the archbishop, in favour of the monks. In the 1180s, much to the dismay of the monks, Baldwin, archbishop of Canterbury, had twice attempted to found a college of secular canons, once at Haddington and then at Lambeth. On the first occasion, the monks of Christ Church Canterbury successfully opposed him; on the second, he died before completing it. Hubert Walter took up the project when he took office, and completed the Lambeth chapel for secular canons. The Canterbury monks petitioned the pope against the foundation, who ruled in their favour and ordered the chapel demolished. An

¹²⁰ Denholm-Young, "The Winchester-Hyde Chronicle," 85–87; E. F. Jacob, *Studies in the Period of Baronial Reform and Rebellion, 1258-1267* (Oxford, 1925), 76; for discussion, see also Stone, "Connections and Collaborations."

¹²¹ "AW," 64, 68.

appeal resulted in a compromise. The archbishop was permitted to create a foundation at Lambeth—not of secular canons, as he had planned, but regular ones (Praemonstratensians).¹²²

This was a major concession, made by a pro-secular-clergy archbishop to a community of monks with a strong sense of their own identity and right. An interest in such a story, and its result, is perfectly consistent with Richard's passionate defence of monks; his CRD throughout reveals his keen interest in relations between monks and bishops (discussed below). However, there are three elements—content, style, and form—that, individually, fail to confirm Richard's authorship of 1202A. Taken together, they offer evidence against his authorship of this entry.

First, content: an agreement like this would be of equal interest to other monastic writers, especially those conscious of their own community's position and influence relative to the local bishop, such as the monks of New Minster/Hyde Abbey. This is not enough to rule out Richard's authorship; on the other hand, it offers no basis for arguing that he composed it. Second, style: 1202A's discussion of the matter has none of Richard's typical explicit, or implicit, commentary. It is devoid of any of the sly adverbial emotion and opinion Richard expressed in CRD's account of the dispute between Hugh Nonant, bishop of Coventry (Lichfield and Chester/Coventry), and the Coventry monks. The Coventry-Nonant dispute, another case of a monastic community facing off against an bishop, was in Richard's view a dramatic victory against an evil bishop: and such things mattered, because Richard thought the very future of the monastic way of life was at stake.¹²³ The 1198 entry of the Cotton manuscript takes just such a Richard-like tone, remarking on not only the presence of disagreement, but also the “utter dissension” (*maxima discordia*) that occurred between the archbishop of Canterbury Hubert Walter and the monks of Canterbury.¹²⁴ The 1202A account of the Lambeth dispute contains content of passionate interest to Richard, which he would have judged another great victory for monks. It is told in a style neutral, distanced, and dispassionate. The presence of these two elements together in one anecdote—a monastic victory over a bishop and a bland tone—makes the hypothesis that Richard was the author highly suspicious.

The third and most compelling factor is form. 1202A contains a transcription of the agreement between the Canterbury monks and the archbishop. The decision to include the text of a document was common among other contemporary recorders of recent history in Latin, most notably Roger of Howden.¹²⁵ It was not for Richard. He did not choose to include or transcribe a document in any of his extant known compositions. He preferred to use his own words, even going out of his way to be independent of William of Malmesbury in showing his unique classical cleverness.¹²⁶ 1202A is the first instance in the Cotton manuscript of an entry containing an interpolated document.¹²⁷

Here we have revisited the evidence for the beginning and end points of Richard's composition of material in the Cotton manuscript. Thus far we have established these theories:

¹²² H. E. Malden, ed., “Colleges: College of Lambeth,” in *A History of the County of Surrey*, vol. 2 (London, 1967), 127. The permission was never acted on.

¹²³ CRD, 69–73; below, 000; on the ecclesiastical context of this episode in CRD, see also Peter Coss, “Bishops, Chronicles, and Historians: The Case of Twelfth-Century Coventry,” in *Episcopal Power and Local Society in Medieval Europe, 1000–1400*, ed. Peter Coss et al. (Turnhout, 2017), 25–29.

¹²⁴ “AW,” 68; see discussion of 1198 entry below.

¹²⁵ Henry Bainton, *History and the Written Word: Documents, Literacy, and Language in the Age of the Angevins* (Philadelphia, 2020).

¹²⁶ “CCCC MS 339,” fol. 16r.

¹²⁷ The next is a letter from papal messengers in Scribe 2's 1273 entry. “AW,” li.

1) that Richard may well have composed 1196A, but not enough of the annal survives to confirm or to rule out his authorship, and 2) that there is good reason to think Richard did not compose 1202A or 1202B. It now remains to consider the evidence of the entries for 1197–1201 inclusive.

The Authorship of Cotton Manuscript Annals 1197–1201 Inclusive

The key annals are 1197–1201, which are longer and more discursive than a typical annal. Each has material consistent with Richard's style and thinking in WBC and CRD. These annals formed a sequel CRD's story of the early 1190s, building on the personalities of key contemporary figures that Richard had established in CRD. The annals showed how these figures' behaviour, actions, and circumstances developed in later years, in relation to their distinct characters in CRD.

1) Content – Personalities, Monks, Character Judgments

The best examples of this thematic consistency, and unity in development of ideas about character and personality, are the two texts' attitudes towards William Longchamp and Hugh Nonant.¹²⁸ Partner accepted that Richard gave his "final thoughts" on William Longchamp in this 1197 entry and quoted these in Latin, with a partial translation in English and without further comment.¹²⁹ Given the ongoing doubt and confusion about Richard's authorship, we must go further, and demonstrate that there is good reason to think they are his thoughts.¹³⁰ Two factors are critical here. First, the quality of admiration for William Longchamp as the king's advocate is consistent across the annals and CRD. Second, that admiration was tempered in the later, annalistic work because Longchamp's behaviour elicited a new grievance: the plight of monks, Richard's central grievance in CRD. In a retrospective look at Longchamp's life after his death, the annalist criticized Longchamp's aid to an arch-enemy of monks, Hugh Nonant—the central figure of the same grievance in Richard's CRD.

Let us begin with CRD's Longchamp, the flawed but loyal follower of the king. CRD portrayed Longchamp as a diplomat trusted by King Richard I, yet possessing a streak of arrogance. In CRD, Richard implicated the king's brother John in sedition against the king: John allowed himself to be called heir to the throne, and set himself against Longchamp.¹³¹ Longchamp perceived John's secret dealings, but at first ignored them, not deigning to accept that "anyone, in any way" would presume to dare "anything against him" (*aliquis in eum aliquo modo aliquid*).¹³² Richard used this elegant little trio (*aliquis, aliquo, aliquid*) to make fun of the hypocrisy a man who has refused to entertain the possibility of something he has already perceived to be true.

On behalf of his king, however, Richard's Longchamp displayed the admirable qualities of efficiency, intuition, and courage. When the chancellor received an official report of one noble (Gerard of Camville)'s treason against the king, he fulfilled the duties of his office immediately

¹²⁸ Franklin, "Nonant, Hugh de (d. 1198), Administrator and Bishop of Coventry," in *ODNB* (Oxford, 2004); Ralph V. Turner, "Longchamp, William de (d. 1197), Administrator and Bishop of Ely," in *ODNB* (Oxford, 2004).

¹²⁹ Partner, *Serious Entertainments*, 171; on Richard's portrayal of Longchamp, 169–72.

¹³⁰ For a different approach, cf. Freudenberg, *Irarum Nutrix*, 118–19, arguing for Richard's authorship on an exclusively textual basis: both portraits of Longchamp are consistent in their complexity of praise and blame.

¹³¹ *CRD*, 29–34.

¹³² 30.

and went rapidly with an army to punish the sedition. Too late, he besieged the conspirators. But in an exchange of letters with John, he read between the lines, perceived John's desire to take over the kingdom, and acted with strategy and dispatch to prevent this larger disaster.¹³³ As papal legate he appeared as an ardent negotiator. Even though he was forced to enter exile due to his unpopular policies, he got the last word in Richard's anecdote.¹³⁴

The 1197 Cotton manuscript entry offered a later perspective on Longchamp, written not during his exile, but after his death abroad. The entry noted the death of Longchamp, bishop of Ely and king's chancellor (*Eliensis episcopus et regis cancellarius*). The deathbed elegy's mostly favourable portrait of Longchamp¹³⁵ accords with the picture in CRD, of a man whose virtues in service of his secular duties were evident: that man was loyal, but his personal faults led him astray. The annalist observed that Longchamp was well regarded for his worldly good sense (*prudencia saeculi*) and his charming address (*gratia labiorum*). These points of praise relate specifically to his worldly role (as chancellor) and not his spiritual one (as bishop): no point of praise refers to his Christian or personal qualities.

The way in which the annalist qualified this deathbed elegy for Longchamp is important here because it amplified two themes also present in CRD: Longchamp's own ambiguous character, and the author's distress at the ill treatment of monks. The annalist remarked, rather elliptically, that Longchamp, "dying, went the way which he had deserved [in] living" (*viam ingressus est moriens quam vivens promeruerat*). In classical the verb *promerere* meant "to merit"—in a good sense or in a bad sense. Context was essential to indicate which sense was meant. Longchamp, apparently, got his just deserts. The chronicler pointedly refrained from opining on whether those deserts were good or bad.

The author placed an explicit condition on Longchamp's faithfulness, noting that "no one ever proved more faithful in the integrity of allegiance, once [that allegiance was] formed" (*nemo unquam in integritate semel conceptae dilectionis fidelior extitit*).¹³⁶ This remark, in one sense, extolled the strength of the attachments Longchamp formed—for example, to his king, the Lionheart. In another sense, it allowed the annalist to set a limit on the value of that faithfulness by drawing attention to the circumstances in which it was formed. Longchamp's faithfulness was conditional on his forming an allegiance. He did not form allegiance to all. In particular, the annalist judged that, by his deeds, Longchamp had never formed any allegiance to England's monks.

The annalist called Longchamp worthy of the name "father of monks" (*pater monachorum*), were it not for the role he played supporting his former enemy, Hugh Nonant, in ejecting the monks from Coventry. As the annalist wrote, he would merit that name,

qui et merito pater monachorum poterat appellari, nisi cum olim utrumque teneret gladium apostolica auctoritate et regia, consiliis consensisset religioni adversantium ut in magno concilio suo apud Lundonias eiectionem monachorum de Coventre quantum in ipso fuerat confirmasset.

had he not formerly—when he was holding the sword [of authority], and with both apostolic and royal power—consented to the counsel of those [who were] against

¹³³ 29–34.

¹³⁴ 59–64.

¹³⁵ "AW," 64; see also xvii.

¹³⁶ 64.

religion, since in his great council at London, he had approved, *as much as he could*, the ejection of the monks from Coventry. [emphasis added]

The problem, as the annalist expressed it here, was not that Longchamp proved himself an antagonist of the monks, but that he had done so while acting in his formal capacity to defend religious interests.¹³⁷ In this regard, he had betrayed them. The annalist spared no pointed reference to that despicable enmity. The phrase *quantum in ipso fuerat* appeared in legal proceedings and the dispute between Innocent III and Philip Augustus of France in the late 1190s, but the reference here is most likely to its use by Valerius Maximus. Valerius used it to refer to Hannibal, who had “ruined the Roman Empire” (*Romanum sepelierat imperium*) in this manner: as much as he could.¹³⁸ The annalist was using this classical quotation to compare the noble monks with the noble Roman Empire—and to liken Longchamp to that Empire’s deadliest enemy.

The key connection between this annalist’s remark in the 1197 entry and Richard’s CRD is the great dispute involving the monks of Coventry that broke out in 1189.¹³⁹ One of the most dramatic set-pieces of CRD is Richard’s invective against an evil Hugh Nonant, who, he alleged, spilled the blood of the Coventry monks. In this section Richard wrote of his fear that, with men like Hugh at work, all monks were was likely to be chewed up and engulfed, and so would vanish entirely.¹⁴⁰ The Canterbury monks, too, compared aggression from secular orders to physical assaults on the body—instead of teeth, they thought of lances and nails.¹⁴¹ Monastic influence had diminished by this point in the twelfth century, and regular clergy faced pressure from secular clergy to accept reform or to give up their resources.¹⁴² In light of this Nonant story from CRD, to be “father of the monks” would be among the highest possible praise, if coming from Richard.¹⁴³ To have taken direct action against the Coventry monks, and in aid of the reviled Hugh Nonant, would be among the most major criticisms.

The annalist was not graciously praising Longchamp simply because he had passed. This writer could be scathing about a particular type of secular cleric: one thought to be an arch-enemy of monks. The 1198 entry affirmed that Hugh Nonant, brought into the church by the very monks of Coventry (*monachis de Covintru*) he had once ejected, “after a long illness and intolerable suffering, terminated his miserable life with a duly deserved death” (*post diutinum*

¹³⁷ N.b. the phrase *nisi ... regia* appears in Partner’s footnote, but not in her (different) translation: Partner, *Serious Entertainments*, 171, 262 n. 86.

¹³⁸ Valerius Maximus, *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*, ed. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, vol. 1 (Cambridge, MA, 2000) i.6; Othmar Hageneder et al., eds., *Die Register Innocenz’ III*, vol. 1 (Graz, 1964), 10 (i.4).

¹³⁹ On this episode, see Jill Mann, “Does an Author Understand His Own Text? Nigel of Longchamp and the ‘Speculum Stultorum,’” *The Journal of Medieval Latin* 17 (2007): 26–27; Franklin, “Nonant, Hugh de (d. 1198), Administrator and Bishop of Coventry”; Donald E. Desborough, “Politics and Prelacy in the Late Twelfth Century: The Career of Hugh de Nonant, Bishop of Coventry, 1188–98,” *Historical Research* 64/153 (1991): 1–14.

¹⁴⁰ CRD, 69–73.

¹⁴¹ Stubbs, ed., *Epistolæ Cantuarienses*, 413; Hugh M. Thomas, *The Secular Clergy in England, 1066–1216* (Oxford, 2014), 350–53.

¹⁴² David Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England: A History of Its Development from the Times of St. Dunstan to the Fourth Lateran Council, 940–1216*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 1963); Thomas, *The Secular Clergy*, chap. 15.

¹⁴³ See discussion of 1201A, above, 000.

languorem et poenam intolerabilem miseram vitam merita morte terminavit).¹⁴⁴ This was not the death notice (*obiit*) of an annalistic recorder or Easter-table annotator. This invective condemned; and the condemnation was absolute.

The thinking was consistent between the two chronicles; more significantly, it developed over time, as the author better learned the sum of Longchamp's character. With the exception of his portrayal of Hugh Nonant, Richard seldom painted black-and-white cartoon characters. As his thoughts on Longchamp show, he could criticize some of a person's actions without vilifying that person's character. Likewise, he admired his noble crusading king, the Lionheart, who was nevertheless too proud to make a pilgrimage.¹⁴⁵

The two texts share a vested, passionate interest in the fates of monks in conflict with bishops; and they also share a distinctive and particular focus on relationships between monastic communities. This annalist, and Richard in CRD, were well informed about, and interested in recounting, tales of ecclesiastics moving back and forth between communities—specifically, between the Benedictine communities of Winchester (Hyde and St Swithun's) and the Carthusian priory of Witham. The 1200 entry of the annals recorded the death of St Hugh, bishop of Lincoln “of pious and sacred memory” (*piae et sanctae recordationis*), and made a point of noting that he had formerly been prior of the Carthusians (*fuerat prior Cartusiae*)—that is, at Witham priory.¹⁴⁶ The relationship between Witham and Winchester was the theme of the preface to Richard's CRD, addressed directly to his friend Robert. The preface described a visit to Witham he made with other Winchester monks; later in CRD, Richard relates a story about Robert's career change.¹⁴⁷ Both Richard's CRD and the annals (1198) include thematically consistent anecdotes about Walter, prior of Bath, who left Hyde to make his career at Witham, and later returned to Hyde.¹⁴⁸ In both works, the anecdotes about the Witham-Winchester relationship focussed on the personal motivations of monks considering career changes between different monastic communities.

2) Style – Alliteration, Rhythm, and Contrast

Richard is known for his literary style, and especially his particular preference for alliteration.¹⁴⁹ What must be added is that Richard especially liked alliteration and rhythmic similarity when the two together added piquancy to a contrast in meaning drawn through comparison. Examples from CRD include seditious letters sent “gladly but secretly” (*libenter sed latenter*), and an upcoming peace conference “accepted but suspected” (*susceptum sed suspectum*).¹⁵⁰ This kind of contrastive comparison, through alliteration, also occurs in the 1199 entry, when the annalist recorded the Lionheart's death, and remarked on the surprisingly small size of the king's heart. The lithe little alliterative triplicate, *paulo maius pomo pini* (“only a little bigger than a pine cone”), matches the playful style of Richard, and the contrast between expected and actual size.¹⁵¹ The alliteration and rhythm also resemble the first line of WBC's damaged dedication, *Meo malo mirum mu ...* which, although partly lost, appears to set up a

¹⁴⁴ “AW,” 67.

¹⁴⁵ See discussion of CRD, above, 000.

¹⁴⁶ “AW,” 74.

¹⁴⁷ CRD, 26. On Robert and the preface, see above, 000.

¹⁴⁸ 27, 56–57; “AW,” 68.

¹⁴⁹ On Richard's style, and particular preference for alliteration, see Appleby, “Richard,” 72–73; Introduction, CRD, xxiv; Partner, *Serious Entertainments*, 144–45, 151–52, and chapter 8.

¹⁵⁰ CRD, 30, 33.

¹⁵¹ “AW,” 71.

contrast between a humble tone and an ill-advised project, on the one hand, and its ambition and worth of being offered as a gift on the other (... *placeant sapientibus*; “may it please the wise”). *Malo*, at any rate, would have offered Richard an irresistible punning opportunity: a direct ironic antithesis between desires and misfortunes, and a jocular link with fruit trees.¹⁵²

One anecdote illustrates the writer’s alliterative style and content particularly well. The 1201 entry records a conflict at Hyde. On the night of the Seven Sleepers, “a certain grievous dispute occurred of excessive immensity” (*enormis quaedam et nimis luctuosa evenit dissonantia*) between two junior brothers of Hyde.¹⁵³ This hyperbolic vocabulary is consistent with classical prose used to heighten emotional drama.¹⁵⁴ The internal rhyme and rhythm (*enormis*; *nimis*) and word order are the work of a classically educated writer attuned to sound, syllable, and alliteration. In each case the word and its modifiers are separated by a verb and/or by overlap with another set of modifiers, a practice often seen in classical poetry (e.g. Ovid’s “wrapping”). Horace—one of Richard’s favourite writers to emulate—is well known for wide separation in his poetry.¹⁵⁵ The winking style of indirect reference to “a certain” (but probably very well known) event is consistent with Richard’s writing (as in the 837 annal, discussed above). It has the quality of local gossip.

The choice to end an anecdote with poetic drama, a string of five alliterative words, and additional alliterative syllables in order to convey a message of gross injustice, is evident in both the Corpus manuscript annals and CRD. The account of the 1201 Hyde dispute ends with an alliterative moralizing judgment (five words begin with “p,” two of which have a further “p” syllable): many who did not deserve punishment suffered serious losses (*perplures plurimam quam non meruerant poenam perpassi sunt et grave dispendium*).¹⁵⁶ In CRD, as noted, one of Richard’s core set-pieces was his anecdote excoriating Hugh Nonant as the arch-enemy of all monks, based on his attack on the monks of Coventry, and especially his move to evict them all entirely from their homes and livelihoods as monks. In the final sentence of the story, Richard concluded with the percussive, rhythmic force of five alliterative words (u/v), as well as two repeated “sc” syllables, that Hugh was: “determined to glory in his victory, as if devouring victuals from the vitals of the monks whom he had vanquished by vice” (*gloriaturo de uictoria, ac si de monachorum quos uitio uicerat uisceribus uesceretur*).¹⁵⁷ Both stories concerned a dispute in a religious community that attracted the notice of communities beyond. Both disputes involved an unexpected outbreak of serious physical violence and, to its author’s mind, three other qualities: an obvious instigator, many innocent victims, and in the end a clear absence of justice.

3) Style – Inspiration and Content

Richard was extremely well versed in satire. The annalist also borrowed from classical and medieval satirists. For example, in the 1198 entry, the annalist included two direct quotations from the *Alexandreis* of the twelfth-century French poet and satirist, Walter of Chatillôn (d. 1180). In writing of the prior of Bath (also called Walter) and his rejection of the world, the annalist rewrote Walter of Chatillôn’s lines:

¹⁵² “CCCC MS 339,” fol. 1r.

¹⁵³ “AW,” 77.

¹⁵⁴ E.g. for *luctuosus* used to characterize a dispute or insult: Ammianus Marcellinus, *Historia* 26.1.1–3; Horace, *Odes* 3.6.8.

¹⁵⁵ T. E. V. Pearce, “A Pattern of Word Order in Latin Poetry,” *The Classical Quarterly* 18 (1968): 334–54.

¹⁵⁶ “AW,” 77.

¹⁵⁷ CRD, 70; above, 000.

... quam friuola gloria rerum,
Quam mundi fugitiuus honor, quam nomen inane!

How trifling the glory of human affairs,
How fleeting the honour of the world, how hollow fame

with a slight change of wording by flipping two words:

quam friuola gloria mundi,
Quam rerum fugitiuus honor, quam nomen inane!¹⁵⁸

This change is consistent with Richard's interest in monastic life as a rejection of the earthly world's glory. In recounting the death of Richard FitzNeal, bishop of London, the annalist borrowed from Walter of Chatillôn an image of the physical shock when an overheated Alexander the Great jumped into cold water: Walter wrote, "and the breath ... left the body empty" (*spiritus ... corpusque reliquit inane*, l. 168). Although Alexander recovered in Walter's story, the annalist wrote that Richard FitzNeal left the medium of this life, and the breath left the body empty (*exiit e medio corpusque reliquit inane*).¹⁵⁹

The 1201 entry's impostor story, with its jokes about food and roosters, is consistent with Richard's interest in animal stories and gustatory tales. He relished food stories and food metaphors in his CRD.¹⁶⁰ It is, likewise, consistent with Richard's enjoyment in taking inspiration from Horace and Juvenal's satires to draw morals or philosophies from such events. The annalist wrote that the impostors worked by "naming themselves with the names of saints, and having themselves be so named" (*sanctorum nominibus se nominantes et nominari facientes*). This whimsical triple alliteration on variations of *nomen* is distinctively Richard-like. In describing the impostors' wiles, the annalist uses puns and alliteration in conjunction. According to the annalist, the impostors had spies who infiltrated and learned the ways of simple men (i.e. monks), "so that through their accomplices, they [the impostors]—with more caution, rather than less—swindled the purse of the guards [i.e. cheated the guards out of their money]" (*ut per complices suos cautius crumenas minus cautorum emungerent*). In the classical Latin of Plautus and Horace, *emungere* meant "to cheat [someone] out of their money."¹⁶¹ The annalist again repeats variations on words with shared roots, here punning here *cauti* (guards) with *cautius* (with more caution). Note that the word *minus* ("rather than less") is used here as a pleonastic comparison, in the sense that its meaning is redundant to "more" caution. These stylistic choices involving repetition and emphasis add to the comic extreme of the impostors' disguises. As multiple examples from this witty anecdote show, this annalist—like a Latin writer and satirist of the Silver Age, and like Richard in CRD—will not use one word when three will do.

¹⁵⁸ Walter of Châtillon, *Alexandreis*, ed. R. Pritchard Telfryn (Toronto, 1986), l. 8.332-3; rendered as a quotation by Luard but not identified, "AW," 68.

¹⁵⁹ Walter of Châtillon, *Alexandreis*, l. 2.160-71; rendered as a quotation by Luard but not identified, "AW," 70; see also Sylvia A. Parsons, "Poet, Protagonist, and the Epic Alexander in Walter of Châtillon's *Alexandreis*," in *Alexander the Great in the Middle Ages*, ed. Markus Stock (2018), 177-99.

¹⁶⁰ E.g. CRD, 32, 38, 40-42, 69-72.

¹⁶¹ See e.g. Horace, *Ars Poetica*, l. 238: "Pythias won a sum of money by swindling Simo" (*Pythias emuncto lucrata Simone talentum*).

The authors of both texts were keen to recount anecdotes about key individuals that explored the tension between sacred or noble callings or causes, and others more vain, empty or cowardly. This includes the Winchester-Witham anecdotes, and the texts' consistent and developing evaluation of men like Hugh Nonant and William Longchamp. It includes references to the emptiness of glory, especially when the pursuit of some kind of glory is contrasted with a Benedictine monastic calling: from the first reference to *Alexandreis*, to the tale of Jocelin de Pomeroy who joined a monastic community only to escape punishment and death (1199 entry),¹⁶² to CRD's Hugh Nonant revelling in the glory of his short-lived victory over the Coventry monks.¹⁶³ Both writers were deeply interested in monastic matters, using language in similar ways to state opinions that sided with monks, as in the cases of Hubert Walter versus the monks of Canterbury, and Hugh Nonant versus the monks of Coventry. Both took an interest in the activities of the Jews of Winchester. Both employed an anecdotal style, and switched registers abruptly when moving to the next anecdote, from archbishops' deeds, to storms, to curses, to fires, to local gossip.¹⁶⁴ These authors, this analysis has demonstrated, were the same person. Richard, author of CRD, was also the author of LAC, which does not survive but is at least partly witnessed by the Cotton manuscript.

In this section we have established more solid and specific grounds that support the theory that the written work of Richard (part of his LAC) was copied into all entries 1197–1201 inclusive in the Cotton manuscript. The anecdote about the Hyde dispute in 1201 is the final story in the Cotton manuscript that is demonstrably in Richard's style. The final anecdote in the 1201 entry, on the bishops of France and the papal interdict, do not allow us to rule out Richard's authorship, but his signature style or content are absent. Nothing after the Hyde dispute reporting bears his distinctive style, stamp, or opinion.

Putting it Together: The Authorship of Cotton Manuscript Annals 1196A–1202A Inclusive Appleby himself noted that the stylistic evidence of Richard's authorship cannot be traced beyond partway through the 1201 entry. He nevertheless nevertheless concluded that Richard wrote 1202A. He did so on the basis that this part of the Cotton manuscript is in a single hand. There are two problems here. First, he gave no consideration to negative evidence: he did not ask whether the Cotton manuscript's Scribe 1 used any other sources, or whether these annals contain any material that offers evidence against Richard's authorship. Second, he did not account for the the presence of a new scribe (Scribe 1) potentially embarking on a new project. Since Richard's original LAC does not survive, and because the Cotton manuscript's Scribe 1 may have drawn on a later version of LAC, other sources, and/or his own ideas and information in writing this section, we must be alert to two possibilities: first, that Richard wrote no material describing events beyond the end of 1201; second, that he stopped writing LAC in or after 1201.

It is not possible to rule out the possibility that Richard's LAC originally included later entries. This means that we cannot assign Richard's composition firmly to this year. We will remember that the appearance of the Roman numeral for "1201" on the first folio of the autograph manuscript is the Abrahamic year for Brutus's in Britain, not 1201 AD. It is a coincidence that the numeral is the same as the last AD textual date for which there is evidence that Richard was writing LAC.

¹⁶² "AW," 71–72.

¹⁶³ CRD, 70.

¹⁶⁴ "AW," 68–69, e.g. 1198 entry; CRD, 3–4, 64–69.

We have arrived at three key findings. First, there is no evidence that Richard continued LAC beyond a textual date of mid-1201. Second, Richard did not write 1202A. Third, Richard was writing LAC until at least the middle of the real year 1201. The implication is significant: even though the Cotton manuscript's 1196A–1202A inclusive is in a single hand (Scribe 1), this section of annals does not represent an exact copy of Richard's LAC. Therefore, before a working reconstruction of Richard's composition, it remains to ask whether the original LAC can be further distinguished from the annals in the Cotton manuscript. To do so, it is first necessary to distinguish the annalistic works preserved in the Corpus manuscript and the Cotton manuscript from a lost Winchester Chronicle, because of ambiguity and confusion in the literature about the nature, extent, and stemma of these different Winchester works.

Disambiguating Richard's Annalistic Works from Lost and Surviving Winchester Annals

In 1879, Felix Liebermann posited the existence of a lost Winchester chronicle from which parts of the Winchester Annals, Waverley Annals, and annals in Cotton MS Vespasian E IV (British Library) were derived. He coined the term *Wintonienses deperditi* for this lost chronicle, and printed his reconstruction.¹⁶⁵ Liebermann's ideas about its relationship to the Winchester Annals preserved in the Cotton manuscript (Domitian A XIII) and the Corpus manuscript must be addressed here. Liebermann observed the Winchester annals preserved in the Cotton manuscript did not depend on *WDep* for any material through the end of 1065 inclusive. He knew that the piece of the "Winchester Annals" through 1065 inclusive (i.e. part of WBC) was a separate, special work ("ein besonderes Werk"), and claimed it was not relevant to his present discussion.¹⁶⁶ In his stemma modelling the relationships among the monastic chronicles, including the lost chronicle's influence on later annals, he noted of the Winchester annals (which he knew only in Luard's edition of the Cotton manuscript): "Anfang–1066 nicht hierher gehörig."¹⁶⁷

Denholm-Young successfully expanded Liebermann's stemma to include the Hyde Chronicle (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 91).¹⁶⁸ However, Denholm-Young did not quite represent Liebermann's claim about the relationship among the lost annals and extant chronicles of Winchester accurately. In reproducing Liebermann's stemma, he omitted Liebermann's key remark that the section of Winchester annals through the end of 1065 did not fit the scheme. Denholm-Young stated that what Liebermann achieved was: "to show convincingly that the Winchester and Waverley Annals, as well as those in Cotton MS. Vesp. E. iv, were all dependent upon the same source:" *WDep*, a lost Winchester chronicle through which

¹⁶⁵ Hereafter *WDep*. Liebermann, *Ungedruckte*, 182–202.

¹⁶⁶ Liebermann, 179.

¹⁶⁷ Liebermann, 180.

¹⁶⁸ See also M. Tyson, "The Annals of Southwark and Merton," *Surrey Archaeological Collections* 36 (1925): 24–57; Liebermann's argument has since been refined even further: Martin Brett demonstrated that an earlier set of lost annals (which he named 'the London annals'), and not Southwark annals, was the source of *Wintoniensis deperditi*. Martin Brett, "The Annals of Bermondsey, Southwark and Merton," in *Church and City, 1000-1500: Essays in Honour of Christopher Brooke*, ed. David Abulafia, M. J. Franklin, and Miri Rubin (Cambridge, 1992), 279–310; the lost London annals (named by Stone a "now-lost source") are also discussed in Ian Stone, "Southwark Annals," *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle* (Leiden, 2016); and for a further refinement of Brett's case, see Stone, "Connections and Collaborations," 211–15.

they knew the Annals of Southwark.¹⁶⁹ Liebermann had twice noted that not “all” of these annals depended on *WDep*.

Denholm-Young’s error was picked up and repeated by Thomas Jones, who identified the “intermediate version” of Richard’s Corpus manuscript annals (WBC) used by *Brenhinedd y Saesson*’s author as *WDep*. Jones, however, incorrectly claimed that *WDep* was Denholm-Young’s own coinage, even though Denholm-Young accurately attributed the term to Felix Liebermann. Without knowing Liebermann, Jones had no way of knowing that his own identification had already been discounted. Jones evidently took Denholm-Young’s “all” at face value, for it was on this basis that Jones erroneously concluded that “the extant *Annales Wintonienses*”—including Richard’s WBC—derived from *WDep*.

Once we eliminate the confusion of the *WDep* tradition, Jones’s discovery appears even more striking. Jones demonstrated that Richard’s WBC, as distinct from other annalistic traditions of Winchester including the Cotton manuscript, was known and/or in circulation beyond Winchester and even the borders of England. The anonymous author of the Welsh “History of the Saxon [English] Kings,” *Brenhinedd y Saesson*, used a version of annals from Winchester identical or close to Richard’s original (the Corpus manuscript), and not the later version contained in Cotton manuscript.¹⁷⁰ In addition to the clear textual resonances between WBC and *Brenhinedd*, a compelling factor is that *Brenhinedd*’s author used and adapted Richard’s text (or a text very like it) for events through at least the year 1095: in other words, well beyond the end of 1065, where the Cotton manuscript diverges from the Corpus manuscript.¹⁷¹

It is possible that an additional copy of Richard’s WBC once existed, but not necessary to posit the existence of an additional version of Richard’s annals (WBC) if *Brenhinedd*’s author saw the original at Winchester. The “minor differences” Jones noted are not compelling enough on their own to say definitively that another exact or intermediate copy existed. *Brenhinedd*’s author, making his own authorial decisions, and translating and adapting into Welsh, could well have worked from the original. If *Brenhinedd*’s author did not travel to Winchester, then another copy must have existed, very likely ending up in Wales. Either way—whether through the travels of writers, or of texts—Richard’s WBC, which Liebermann realized was something rather special, begins to emerge clearly as a work with its own tradition of transmission, no longer lost in the confusion of lost and surviving Winchester annals.

Chronicling at Winchester and in Southern England: The Relationships among Richard’s LAC, the Cotton Manuscript, and other families of Winchester Annals

It is possible to refine the case for the relationships among the Winchester annalistic texts by Richard and others, attested in the Corpus manuscript and the Cotton manuscript, and reconstructed from lost chronicles. Appleby speculated about a relationship between the Corpus manuscript and the Cotton manuscript, but apparently did not know the work of Liebermann or Denholm-Young.¹⁷² Theories about Richard’s compositions and their relation to other lost and extant chronicles, therefore, need to be revisited.

¹⁶⁹ Denholm-Young, “The Winchester-Hyde Chronicle,” 85.

¹⁷⁰ Jones, *Brenhinedd y Saesson*; J. Beverley Smith, “Historical Writing in Medieval Wales: The Composition of *Brenhinedd y Saesson*,” *Studia Celtica* 42 (2008): 55–86.

¹⁷¹ Jones, *Brenhinedd y Saesson*, 86. The last point at which it is possible to demonstrate that the author was using a Winchester text is for Anselm’s consecration as archbishop of Canterbury in 1095 (which the author incorrectly renders as 1093).

¹⁷² Appleby, “Richard,” 74.

Liebermann was explicit that WBC belonged to a tradition separate from *WDep*; but he did not address the origins of the Winchester annals preserved in the Cotton manuscript from the beginning of the 1066 entry through 1202A inclusive. He observed the handwriting and stylistic break between 1202A and 1202B, noted that the annals leading up to and including 1202A are much more verbose than those that follow, and commented that this break marks the end of “die ältere Chronik.” He claimed he was concerned not with this “older chronicle” (through 1202A), but only with the continuation (“Hier kommt nur die Fortsetzung in Betracht”)—that is, with the annals starting with 1202B inclusive in a new hand. He was interested thus interested in the section of this “continuation” by Scribe 2, shared with Cotton MS Vespasian E IV, and deriving independently from *WDep* (via Bodley MS 91, as Denholm-Young showed is true of Scribe 2’s annals).¹⁷³ Here again, though, the handwriting break in the Cotton manuscript (Domitian A XIII) may be misleading. There is evidence that Scribe 1 of the Cotton manuscript, as well as Scribe 2, also knew *WDep*.

There is no evidence that Scribe 1 of the Cotton manuscript drew on or quoted from *WDep* for the 1066–1190 entries inclusive. Even where there is occasional overlap in content, which Liebermann signalled in the margins of his reconstruction of *WDep*, the wording is always distinctly different in style.¹⁷⁴ The same is true with the single exception discussed below, for the section that included substantial copying of Richard’s LAC: Scribe 1’s annals 1196A–1202A inclusive. Here the overlap in content is limited to certain named individuals; the historical and narrative content about those people—events, details, and comments—are distinctly different stories. Both mention bishop Geoffrey in the 1198 entry, but give different information about him: the Cotton manuscript (in the margin) refers to him as the son of Peter and as the king’s justiciar; *WDep* mentions him in conjunction with an abbot Anselm. The 1199 entries mention the wounding of King Richard the Lionheart, but with different verb forms and different details. Both sources mention briefly Hugo, abbot of Reading, being made abbot of Cluny in 1199; and as Liebermann notes specifically, the two entries are not related.¹⁷⁵

The only entry in which there is a tantalizing connection is the annal for 1201. Both *WDep* and Scribe 1 mention an earthquake in Montacute in 1201. Both use the word *terr[a]motus* and *tremere*, apt for any annal about an earthquake. The presence of other like words, points of phrasing, and the remark’s message together suggest a direct connection. The relationship merits a closer look: exact shared text is underlined; related text is dotted-underlined. *WDep* has:

*Terremotus factus est apud Montem Acutum ita quod chorus monachorum tremere visus est.*¹⁷⁶

¹⁷³ Liebermann, *Ungedruckte*, 178.

¹⁷⁴ Liebermann noted comparisons for the annals for 1105, 1134, 1136, 1172, 1178, Liebermann, 182–83; “AW,” 42–61.

¹⁷⁵ “AW,” 68–74; Liebermann, *Ungedruckte*, 183 and n. 10.

¹⁷⁶ Identical in e.g. “MS Bodley 91” (Bodleian Library, Oxford, n.d.), fol. 111r; Reading Annals “Cotton MS Vespasian E IV” (British Library, n.d.); Worcester Annals, “Cotton Caligula MS A X” (British Library, n.d.), where the sentence appears twice in two different hands; published in Henry Richards Luard, ed., “Annales Prioratus de Wigornia (A.D. 1-1377),” in *Annales monastici*, vol. 5 (London, 1869), 390 and n. 3; see also Sharon Goetz, “Reading Annals,” *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle* (Leiden, 2016); Sharon Goetz, “Worcester Annals,” in *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle* (Leiden, 2016).

An earthquake happened at Montacute, to the extent that the choir of the monks was seen to tremble.

The Cotton manuscript (Scribe 1) has:

Eodem anno fuit terraemotus magnus apud occidentalem partem Angliae in villa quae Muntagu dicitur, et per septem miliaria in circuitu, durans per duas fere horas; ita quod stalli in choro monachorum visi sunt tremere, ipsi etiam monachi trementes stupefacti. Et fuit terraemotus iste die Martis in septimana Pentecostes, id est, idus Maii.

In the same year, there was a great earthquake in the western part of England in a village which is called Montague, and for seven miles around, lasting for nearly two hours; to the extent that the choir stalls of the monks were seen to tremble, the stunned monks themselves trembling likewise. And that earthquake was on the day of Mars in the seventh week of Pentecost, that is to say, the Ides of May.

The Cotton manuscript account diverges from *WDep* in naming the location differently (*Montem Acutum* in *WDep*; *Muntagu* in the Cotton manuscript). Scribe 1 also expanded on the *WDep* account: the Cotton manuscript's narrative situates Montacute more precisely in England; it added detailed information about the earthquake's reach, duration, and date; and it added the monks' reaction (*stupefacti*).

Most striking, Scribe 1's account responded directly to, and clarified, a significant ambiguity in the *WDep* account: the meaning of the word *chorus*. In medieval Latin, the word *chorus* could signify a) a place in a building, or b) a group of people: more precisely, a) the chancel or choir, the part of the church where monks gathered to sing, or b) the group of clergy doing the singing. I have used the English word "choir" in my translation to capture this very ambiguity in *WDep*'s account. What, exactly, is doing the trembling? Were the seats, fittings, and screens of the chancel seen to rattle? Or were the singing monks seen to shake? *WDep* offers no answer.

The Cotton manuscript does. Its account, consistent with a desire for precision in expanding the anecdote, resolved this ambiguity utterly by stating, in clear and unambiguous terms, that both the room and the group of people trembled. The "choir stalls" (unable to be confused with people) trembled, and the "stunned monks" (unable to be confused with objects) trembled. The clever awareness of ambiguity and puns, the new focus on the monks' experience, the repetition of a verb (*tremere*) in different forms, and the transformation of a sentence into an informative anecdote, could permit us to hazard the conjecture that this was Richard at work (and on the single annal for which there was overlap). This is an attractive conjecture, but it is only one of two possibilities that the evidence renders most plausible:

- 1) Richard himself had the brief 1201 annal of *WDep* before him. In writing his own account of the year 1201 in his original LAC, he expanded on it. The Cotton manuscript's Scribe 1 then copied Richard's LAC at a later date.
- 2) The Cotton manuscript's Scribe 1 had both Richard's LAC and *WDep*, or a set of annals in the same family of annals as *WDep*, which included—perhaps even began with—the brief 1201 earthquake annal. This scribe wrote an entry for the year 1201 that combined Richard's LAC, the earthquake story from the *WDep* tradition, and, perhaps from personal knowledge, his own expansion on that earthquake story.

Liebermann demonstrated that *WDep* was prior to at least the later section of the Cotton manuscript (Domitian A XIII), written by Scribe 2 from 1202B inclusive, but did not consider the relationship between *WDep* and the Cotton manuscript's Scribe 1. As the comparison above shows, there is good reason to think that the account of the 1201 earthquake in the Cotton manuscript is based on the sentence from *WDep*. Furthermore, to trace a connection in reverse is less likely. For a scribe to condense the longer account and to write *chorus* alone, garbling the careful precision of the longer sentence, would introduce an odd ambiguity, meaning the annalist was selecting either the monks or the buildings as the trembling thing, but not specifying which. If the original short annal originated in London prior to *WDep*'s copying it, another, later writer in Winchester—closer by half to Montacute—might well have added the detail to *WDep* from first- or second-hand knowledge.

Conclusions

The Dates and Composition of Richard's Works – A Reconstruction

The evidence of the autograph Corpus manuscript's narrative content demonstrates that Richard did not begin composing WBC before the rebellion of Henry II's sons in 1173: at a minimum, he could not have written the annals from 837 AD inclusive before this date. He continued WBC through at least the surviving entry for 1138 inclusive. He may well have continued writing annals for subsequent years, which are now mostly lost. Perhaps, like some of his fellow twelfth- and thirteenth-century annalists, he was working towards a complete annalistic account of history from Brutus's landing in Britain to his present day. That present day was between mid-1173 and, probably, mid-1192; based on similarities between WBC and CRD in the Corpus manuscript, and the palaeographic and codicological evidence already detailed by M. R. James, the latter end of that range is most likely.

We know from the autograph manuscript that Richard wrote many annals which are not stylistically distinctive, like the series of brief references to ancient kings of the Britons in his digest-style account of Geoffrey of Monmouth's kings. Either he copied these pithy entries from another annalistic chronicle, or composed them himself, choosing to reserve maxims, morals, and anecdotes for what he deemed particularly juicy stories, like the one about Kimbelinus. Either way, the presence of these entries shows that Richard made an authorial decision to compose annals even where there was little of note, in this project of writing a sequential year-by-year chronicle.

Richard's LAC was likely either 1) part of WBC, if Richard conceived of WBC as a continuous chronicle to the present and executed it as such, or 2) a separate, new project of annals or prose, perhaps meant to pick up with the events of late 1192, where the completed CRD left off. Because the autograph manuscript of LAC does not survive, we do not know when it began, what it continued, or where it stopped. The evidence of content, style, and continuity of annalistic material in the witness to LAC (the Cotton manuscript) demonstrates that Richard continued LAC through at least partway into coverage of the year 1201 AD.

This article has shown, based on the Cotton manuscript, that there are solid grounds for concluding that 1) Richard was the author of the bulk of the material preserved in the Cotton manuscript annals 1196A through partway through the 1201 entry; 2) the Cotton manuscript's 1201 entry drew on *WDep* or a related text, either through LAC or in addition to LAC; 3) Richard was not the author of the material preserved in 1202A. These findings show, in tracing both the presence of Richard's compositions and the presence of different, distinct strands of Winchester chronicling, that the significance of the break between Scribe 1 and Scribe 2 in the Cotton manuscript, for the question of Richard's authorship, has been overstated. That break is

potentially misleading in 1) identifying what compositions by Richard lie behind the Cotton manuscript annals 1196A–1202A inclusive; and 2) determining for what parts of the Cotton manuscript annals the *WDep* family is a source, and in what way it was used.

We do not know how Richard conceived of the relationship between these distinct surviving sections of his annalistic works, here named WBC and LAC. We do not even know whether LAC, as Richard composed it, was originally an annalistic work, because the autograph manuscript does not survive. Numerals for years appear in the Cotton manuscript, thereby framing 1196A–1201 as “annals” in form, even though they contain full and developed prose narratives. We do not know whether Richard labelled his LAC with years. If Richard wrote LAC as a work of prose like CRD, then the Cotton manuscript’s Scribe 1 or a lost intermediate text could have framed that prose material with annalistic years in copying parts of LAC and compiling the Cotton manuscript. We do not know whether the more pithy remarks in 1196A through part of 1201 inclusive are Richard’s, the interpolations of an intermediate scribe, or interpolations of Scribe 1. What we do know from WBC and CRD, in the autograph Corpus manuscript, is that it was at least consistent with Richard’s authorial character to include pithy remarks alongside anecdotes with fuller coverage. We also know that either Richard or the Cotton manuscript’s Scribe 1 used *WDep* material in the 1201 entry.

Richard could have composed a continuous, annalistic chronicle from Brutus’s arrival to partway through 1201 at least, parts of which survive as WBC and in a partial copy of LAC. If LAC was originally a work of prose, Richard could well have envisioned it as a sequel to his completed CRD, with material for 1192–1196 inclusive that no longer survives. LAC, witnessed by the Cotton manuscript, was originally written by Richard after CRD, either continuously or at one time in or after the real year 1201.

A Reconstruction of the Cotton Manuscript’s Relationship to Richard’s Annalistic Works

The Cotton manuscript’s Scribe 1 copied Richard’s WBC almost verbatim, probably from its beginning (although the part through 518 inclusive, as noted, was later lost or replaced), up through the end of 1065. That same scribe then wrote a set of unique annals from his own perspective, quoting from William of Malmesbury, from 1066 inclusive through at least the middle of the entry for 1190 (where the manuscript breaks off). For this section, Scribe 1 may have referred to annals by Richard, annals from the *WDep* family, or different annals altogether; it is unlikely that he quoted directly from the two former. Then, option 1 or option 2 probably occurred:

- 1) Option 1: Scribe 1 copied Richard’s LAC, which itself drew on *WDep* for the 1201 earthquake episode, almost verbatim through partway through the 1201 entry.
- 2) Option 2: Scribe 1 began to compose annals using Richard’s LAC and *WDep*, using both to compile the 1201 entry.

Scribe 1 then turned—for perhaps the latter part of the 1201 entry, and certainly for 1202A—to a documentary source, and to his own information or to another source. Finally, Scribe 2, beginning with 1202B, copied from *WDep* extensively, often verbatim.

Both the break in handwriting and the two entries for the year 1202 (1202A and 1202B) in the Cotton manuscript are unrelated to Richard’s composition. The Cotton manuscript here has more in common with other annalistic ruptures preserved for that particular year. Interestingly, a number of chronicles in circulation in southern England, sharing content with the Cotton manuscript, break off in or around entries for 1201 and 1202. The Southwark Annals preserved in Bodleian Library’s MS Rawlinson B 177, for example, contain no entries at

all for 1201 or 1202, although there is a blank space left between the entries for 1200 and 1203, as though someone intended to fill them in.¹⁷⁷ The Worcester Annals, we saw, contain duplicate earthquake sentences in different hands in the 1201 entry.¹⁷⁸ The Reading and Hyde Annals diverge markedly after the end of their respective 1201 entries (the relationship is visible again from the 1219 entry inclusive).¹⁷⁹

Other thirteenth-century annals and chronicles from southern England show similar peculiarities. The Annals of Waverley, in MS Vespasian A XVI (British Library), feature a change in hand in the middle of the 1201 entry.¹⁸⁰ There are multiple changes of hand in the earliest manuscript of Ralph of Coggeshall's *Chronicon Anglicanum* (British Library, MS Cotton Vespasian D X); a significant one occurs between the annals for 1201 and 1202. A later thirteenth-century copy of the *Chronicon*, the St Victor manuscript (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale MS lat. 15076), contains a break in the text at 1201. Roger of Wendover, in his *Flores Historiarum*, deviated from following Ralph's *Chronicon* with the beginning of the account for 1202; Maurice Powicke suggested that Ralph's text circulated, like news, in segments, one of which may have ended with or in 1201.¹⁸¹ Two early thirteenth-century copies of Ralph of Diss's *Ymagines Historiarum* (not contemporary copies, but ones made after the author died in 1199 or 1200) contain continuations by another author or authors: one ends with May 1201 (Trinity College, Dublin, MS E 4 24), the other with March 1202 (British Library, Cotton MS Otho D VII).¹⁸²

Are these coincidences? Could the storm and earthquake of 1201, the great fire in 1202 at Worcester, or simply the traffic of chronicle transmission have been involved? To understand the broader phenomena involved in chronicling the years 1201 and 1202 in southern England, we would need to look well beyond the works Richard, which is beyond the remit of this article. Speculation aside, these numerous examples of continuity breaks in or around 1201 and 1202 in surviving thirteenth-century chronicles caution us further against concluding, on the basis of such breaks, when Richard last lay down his pen.

The article has endeavoured to establish, with greater precision and accuracy, what surviving material was originally written by Richard of Devizes, and how this material relates to lost works by Richard and to other annalistic traditions of Winchester. The article has corrected some mistaken assumptions about numerals in both manuscripts, identified erroneous conclusions about the dating arising from typos, and refined existing arguments about the Annals of Winchester that were not precise about dates and years. It has shown that it is always worth thinking about an author's life and works, including lost works, together.

¹⁷⁷ "MS Rawlinson B 177" (Bodleian Library, Oxford, n.d.), fol. 215r.

¹⁷⁸ Above, n. 000.

¹⁷⁹ Goetz, "Reading Annals"; Goetz, "Worcester Annals"; Liebermann, *Ungedruckte*, 183 n. 12.

¹⁸⁰ Henry Richards Luard, ed., "Annales monasterii de Waverleia (A.D. 1-1291)," in *Annales monastici*, vol. 2 (London, 1865), 253.

¹⁸¹ Ralph of Coggeshall, *Chronicon Anglicanum*, ed. Joseph Stevenson (London, 1875), 135 and n. 1; for another comparative discussion of chroniclers' annals for 1201 and 1202, F. M. Powicke, "Roger of Wendover and the Coggeshall Chronicle," *The English Historical Review* 21 (1906): 286 (n. 2), 292–95; see also Staunton, *The Historians of Angevin England*, 117–20.

¹⁸² Diana E. Greenway, "The Succession to Ralph de Diceto, Dean of St. Paul's," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 39 (1966): 86–95; see also Staunton, *The Historians of Angevin England*, 69.

Richard and his works have long posed historical and textual problems. The theories and solutions presented here have involved returning to the original sources, remembering what might be missing, and understanding an author's writing as a corpus rather than as a set of unrelated texts. Richard's shrewd expressions of his ideas, the current events of his lifetime, and the distinct annalistic and prose works of history from southern England and Wales, are all a part of the story of the composition of his known corpus. Considering his known works together makes it possible to read his words, to enter his imagination, and to get closer to the questions of who, what, and when—so that we may, in a way, watch the writer at work.

All of Richard's known works use the same style, show the same peculiarities of interest, and balance similarly full and discursive anecdotes with pithy remarks. Perhaps the most striking thing, aside from the question of how he conceived of his different writing projects, is the historical continuity across the story of history he told in his surviving compositions. LAC, about the late 1190s and early 1200s at least, directly developed the stories and characters introduced in CRD with an accumulating historical perspective. In recounting the 800s, WBC alluded obliquely but unambiguously to the same troubled house of Oedipus—the Angevins—Richard alluded to in the same way in the opening gambit of CRD. Throughout, his work is grounded in ancient wisdom, dry humour, and sharp censure of false glory, especially if asserted at the expense of pilgrims or monks.

Richard wrote comfortably in genres of annals and of little books, able to chronicle the small and the great with alliterative prose and choice verse. His works inspired copyists of chronicles and adapters of annals in Winchester. His rendering of ancient history directly inspired the author of *Brenhinedd y Saesson*, who used Richard's WBC—not the more well-studied family of annals out of Winchester—in composing his well-known chronicle that defined a Welsh view of British and English history.

Richard of Devizes was a writer who saw himself in the middle of events east and west, and in the middle of a long story of history dominated by the troubled Angevin family. He looked backwards to Brutus in an age still measured by Abraham. He looked forwards to what the next year would bring worthy of writing down. Perhaps, like Janus, he was always looking both ways at the same time. All the while, in his present, he looked for news, for surviving events from history, and for history's survivors.