Leeds Studies in English

Laȝamon or the lawman?
A question of names, a poet and an unacknowledged legislator

John Frankis

On the face of it there is no problem: the poet names himself at the beginning of his poem, as was not uncommon, an obvious parallel being in his source-text, Wace's *Roman de Brut*:

> An preost wes on leoden, Laȝamon wes ihoten;
> He wes Leouenaðes sone, liðe him beo Drihten;
> He wonede at Ernleȝe at æðelen are chirechen.[1]

It has long been accepted without question that *Laȝamon* was the poet's given name, and a personal name of this form is recorded in documents from the eleventh to the early thirteenth century, though it was fairly uncommon; moreover, whether or not it was a relevant factor at the time when the poem was written, it alliterates in the Anglo-Saxon tradition with the father's name.[2] As a given name Laȝamon was Scandinavian in origin and is recorded in parts of England and Scotland in which there were Scandinavian settlers. Since Tatlock's discussion of the name it has generally been assumed that the poet, like many people in England from the ninth century onwards, had a given name of Old Norse origin, and there is nothing remarkable in this.[3] Rosamund Allen has suggested however that *Laȝamon* (literally 'lawman') 'is not in fact a given name but a cognomen', referring to his involvement in some kinds of legal work.[4]

The title 'lawman' was current in the Danelaw before the conquest: D. M. Stenton refers to 'a class of hereditary lawmen' there, but concludes that 'changing times made the office obsolete long before the end of the twelfth century.[5] More obviously relevant to the Worcester poet is a class of lawmen established in the late Anglo-Saxon period to mediate in legal disputes between the Welsh and

English (six from each community) in the territory of the *Dunsæte* (between the lower Severn and Gwent, approximately the modern Forest of Dean).[6] The laws relating to these lawmen are preserved in English in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 383, pp. 93-5 (probably from London, s.xi-xii), including the sentence, *XII lahmen scylon riht tæcean Wealan ond Ænglan: VI Englisce ond VI Wylisce* ('twelve lawmen, six English and six Welsh, shall interpret the law for the Welsh and English'). A Latin version of the same laws, retaining the English word *lahmen*, is preserved in several sources, including London, British Library, MS Royal 11.B.ii (a Worcester manuscript, s.xii-xiii), fol. 160v: *'Duodecim lahmen (id est legis homines) debent rectum discernere Walis et Anglis: sex Walisci et sex Anglici'*.[7] It is noteworthy that these copies of the laws of the Dunsæte survive in post-conquest copies, with the Worcester manuscript showing that knowledge of the lawmen was still current there in the thirteenth century, and the poet's connection with Worcester has frequently been discussed.[8]

The existence of this group of lawmen in the southern Welsh marches adds some weight to Rosamund Allen's suggestion. There seems to be no evidence as to whether these lawmen held a hereditary office like their counterparts in the Danelaw, but by analogy with the latter, and in a society in which sons often tended to follow their fathers' occupation, it is likely that they did, and this might have encouraged the early adoption of the title as a hereditary surname. The transition from personal title to hereditary surname had begun by the thirteenth century in aristocratic circles, and for the holders of an important office what was originally a title acquired something of the quality of a patronymic, eventually becoming a family surname.[9] It is unlikely that the lawmen of the Welsh marches had this kind of status, and the poet's byname, if that is what it is, is more likely to refer to some kind of actual legal occupation, whether or not inherited as part of a family tradition. The title of lawman evidently continued to be applied as an occupational byname, and subsequently as an inherited surname, long after the decline of the particular circumstances that had given rise to it, as is indicated by the later prevalence of 'Lawman' as a surname.[10] La3amon is thus an example, rare in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and so perhaps a potential cause of confusion, of a name that could be either a given name or a byname; examples of the name collected by Tatlock show it standing by itself as a given name from 1042 to 1216, and appended as a byname to various given names from 1247 to the end of the thirteenth century, but he does not distinguish between these functions.[11]

In the Anglo-Saxon period a man (and here we are not concerned with the slightly different problem of women's names) had a single given name chosen from a restricted body of acceptable names, but there were no inherited family-names to assist the process of distinguishing among people with the same given name. During the late Anglo-Saxon period there are occasional examples of bynames added to a given name (like the writer Ælfric Bata and the Canterbury scribe Eadwig Basan),[12] but there was no general movement away from the single-name system. After the conquest there developed the practice of supplementing the given name with some kind of byname, usually of place or occupation, and the use of a patronymic, already common in the Anglo-Saxon period, was also extended, but the given name remained the essential identifying feature and the byname could not be used in isolation: it was indistinctive without the given name that it qualified.[13] This of course shows the difficulty involved in Allen's suggestion: although occupational bynames, including *Lawman* (in various spellings), had become well established by the late twelfth century, they were only added to a recognised given name and they were not used in isolation (as is proposed for this poem) until much later.[14]

The evolution of surnames as an appendage to a given name in the post-conquest period has been the subject of numerous studies, but the further change, the dropping in certain circumstances of the given name and the consequent use of the surname in isolation, seems to have been less well investigated. Stephen Wilson discusses the replacement of the given name by an initial letter in documents, which might be seen as a first step towards dropping the given name, and comments that 'initials designated only the commonest first names like John or William. The move towards recognizing the second name as *the* name was very slight.'[15] The subject deserves further study, but literary usage, as opposed to the kind of documentary evidence on which name-studies are generally based, suggests that this development did not occur in England until after the middle of the fourteenth century, probably about a century or more after Laȝamon's time.

In the first half of the fourteenth century bynames are still, as they had been for over two hundred years, strictly an attachment to a given name, and may indeed vary between different possibilities in the case of the same person, so that a man may be referred to by his given name followed by any one of several possible bynames, whether an inherited family-name or a patronymic or a place of origin or an occupational name or a nickname.[16] Two literary figures active in the first half of the fourteenth century illustrate aspects of this fluctuating usage.

First, the author of *Handling Sin* names himself as 'Roberd of Brunne', but in his *History of England*, while repeating this locative byname, he also gives his family surname, 'Robert Mannyng'; but the primary name by which he was known was 'Robert', and there is no suggestion that he could ever have been referred to simply as 'Mannyng', which was an optional alternative to other possible bynames.[17] This poet incidentally demonstrates the system in his reference to a famous thirteenth-century churchman:

> Y shall ȝow telle, as y haue herd,
> Of þe bysshope Seynt Roberd;
> Hys toname ys 'Grostest
> Of Lynkolne,' so seyþ þe gest.[18]

Leaving aside the ascription of sanctity, it is clear that the churchman's essential name was 'Robert', and that this could be supplemented with either a family-name (originally a nickname), 'Grosseteste', or a locative byname, 'of Lincoln', or a title, 'bishop', or all three of these.[19]

The second example, Richard Rolle, is less decisive as it is not certain that he names himself in any of his writings, but forms of his name appear in manuscript headings that could be either authorial or scribal additions of varying date; in these he is referred to (in Latin or English, with varying spellings) as 'Richard Hermit' (an occupational byname) or 'Richard Hermit of Hampole' or simply 'Richard Hampole' (a locative byname), and only rarely as 'Richard Rolle' (a family surname); some nineteenth-century writers refer to him as 'Hampole', as if it were a surname, but the custom of referring to him as 'Rolle' became firmly established only in the twentieth century.[20]

In both these cases the individual concerned had a family-surname that might be appended to his given name, but it did not have the dominant status that surnames later acquired and it was not used in isolation. This is a continuation of the usage established over the preceding two and a half centuries.[21]

At some time after the middle of the fourteenth century, however, it became customary in rather unclear circumstances, and perhaps in a restricted social or professional circle, to drop the given name and use the family surname by itself. One of the earliest examples of this usage is probably also one of the best known, appearing at the end of Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*:

> O moral Gower, this book I directe

To the, and to the, philosophical Strode (V, 1856-7).

It seems likely that this use of the surname in isolation arose within the lifetime of the persons named here. From about the same date or slightly later Chaucer has a similar use of a surname several times in the text of *Lenvoy de Chaucer a Scogan* (as well as in the title, which may or may not go back to the poet); the same usage appears in the title of *Lenvoy de Chaucer a Bukton*, though the opening phrase 'My maister Bukton' perhaps suggests that the use of the surname by itself may have originated in 'dropping the title' and that the use of the surname alone after a title was a stage in the process of omitting the given name, perhaps beginning among people who held the title (normally conferred by a university) of 'master'.[22]

By using surnames in this way Chaucer may conceivably have been following the usage, and perhaps thus asserting his membership, of a restricted social circle: the full social implications of this usage are uncertain, but relative rank and status were apparently involved. In *The House of Fame* the Eagle obviously lays claim to intellectual superiority, but he probably also asserts his social superiority when he addresses the poet condescendingly as 'Geffrey'. A similar usage appears in Gower's *Confessio Amantis* when the poet approaches Venus:

> Sche axeth me what is mi name.
> 'Ma dame,' I seide, 'John Gower.'
> 'Now John,' quod sche . . . (VIII, 2320-2)

When he takes his leave of the goddess her manner may have become more respectful:

> 'Lo,' thus sche seide, 'John Gower . . .' (VIII, 2908);

but there is perhaps a suggestion of something closer to social equality in her further remarks:

> 'And gret wel Chaucer whan ye mete,
> As mi disciple and mi poete.' (VIII, 2941-2, first recension)

In the latter lines Venus refers, as it were, to a professional associate, obviously of lower rank than the goddess, but still privileged over Gower by the omission of

113

the given name. The social background to such usage may also be glanced at in the *Canterbury Tales*, when a fictitious professional figure, the Man of Law, refers to poems by 'Chaucer', perhaps (whether admiringly or condescendingly) implying social equality by his omission of the given name.[23]

The restricted social range of this new usage of dropping the given name is suggested both by the naming habits of other characters in *The Canterbury Tales* and by the fact that in documentary sources Chaucer is regularly referred to (in Latin or French and with varying spellings) in the first instance as *Galfridus Chaucer* or *Geffrey Chaucer* and thereafter by such phrases as *eidem Galfrido, predicto Galfrido, le dit Geffrey* and so on, but he is never named in such documents simply as 'Chaucer'.[24]

After Chaucer and Gower references by surname alone become common in literature. Thomas Hoccleve, who was employed in the same administrative circles as Chaucer and Gower, demonstrates the new usage in his *Dialogue*:

> On knokkid / at my chambre dore sore
> And cryde alowde / 'How, Hoccleue, art thow heere?'

Having been admitted, however, the visitor uses what is presumably a more familiar mode of address and calls the poet 'Thomas'.[25] In official records the older usage, already noted in fourteenth-century documents referring to Chaucer, continued well into the fifteenth century: the later poet is named in records in the first instance (with varying spellings) as 'Thomas Hoccleve', and thereafter by some such phrase as 'the same Thomas' or 'the said Thomas' (*ipsius Thome, eidem Thome, prefatum Thomam, predicti Thome*), clearly showing that, at least for record-keepers, the decisive name is still the given name, to which the surname is added solely for an opening identification.[26]

The evidence presented here, which could easily be multiplied from late medieval sources, suggests that literary texts may reflect an aspect of spoken usage that is not clearly represented in the kind of documentary evidence on which name-studies traditionally rely. The whole question of the dropping of the given name is clearly a subject for further investigation by specialists in onomastics, but a tentative conclusion that it is a process that began about the middle of the fourteenth century seems justified, at least as regards England (perhaps a wider parallel system is suggested by the fact that Dante Alighieri is generally referred to in the middle ages, as still today, by his given name, while surnames are normally used for the slightly later writers Francesco Petrarca and

Giovanni Boccaccio). It therefore follows that a byname would not normally have been used without the given name that it supplemented at the time when La3amon and the scribes of the extant manuscripts of his poem were writing.

If La3amon is a byname, '(the) lawman', the poet must then have had a given name by which he would normally have been known and officially identified, and he might have been expected to mention this given name in the introductory lines of his poem, as so many poets of that time do. He might however have preferred not to identify himself so specifically, for the ways in which a medieval poet might name himself vary. Most writers were evidently content to remain anonymous, but occasionally, and probably with growing frequency, a poet might give his name in a straightforward and uncomplicated way. The most famous English example from the early Middle English period is of course Orm, who tells us that his poem takes its title from its author's name: *Þiss boc iss nemmnedd Orrmulum Forrþi þat Orrm itt wrohhte;*[27] Orm is incidentally another well attested given name of Old Norse origin that subsequently developed into an inherited surname. Other writers from this period in England who name themselves clearly (usually at the beginning or at the end of their works) include Thomas, the author of *The Romance of Horn*, and several writers of Anglo-Norman saints' lives, including *La Vie Seinte Audree* by Marie and *The Life of St Catherine* by Clemence, a nun of Barking.

On the other hand, a poet might name himself indirectly or in a riddling manner. Various methods of encrypting authorial names are attested back to Anglo-Saxon times, an early example being the eighth-century Anglo-Saxon nun *Hugeburc* (in normalised spelling 'Hygeburg') who wrote a *Vita Willibaldi*.[28] The best known example from Old English verse is Cynewulf, who both reveals and conceals his identity by inserting his name in runes at the end of certain poems, so that only readers with special knowledge could understand it. Closer to La3amon's lifetime, a canon of Hereford who wrote Anglo-Norman verse at the end of the twelfth century gives his name but conceals it in an acrostic placed at the head of a poem, where it appears as *Simund de Freine*.[29] Later medieval English poets who used a similar acrostic device include Chaucer's contemporary Thomas Usk, who encrypts a message, including his name, in the initial letter of each chapter of *The Testament of Love*; one notes incidentally that this author, from the same professional milieu as Chaucer and Gower, gives only his surname without his given name.[30] Closer in time to La3amon, a less certain example of encrypting an authorial name may appear in two Anglo-Norman poems preserved (like La3amon's poem) in London, British Library, MS Cotton Caligula A.ix, *La*

Vie de Seint Josaphaz and *Les Set Dormanz*, in which the poet names himself as *Chardri*. Discussing this poet's identity Brian S. Merrilees repeats a suggestion made privately by Professor E. G. Stanley that 'Chardri, a name not found elsewhere, may be an anagram for Richard'.[31] The suggestion is appealing because the encrypted name is in fact rather more than an anagram; it is a simple reversal of the two syllables of the presumed name, for which there is a famous model in the *Tristan* romances when the hero disguises his name by calling himself 'Tantris'. In the cases mentioned here the writer names himself only indirectly, giving varying kinds of clues that have to be interpreted in order to solve the puzzle of the writer's identity.

With these examples in mind, we may reconsider precisely how the author of the *Historia Brutonum* (to use the manuscript title and avoid confusion with the numerous other texts called *Brut*) names himself at the beginning of his poem, for there are two possibilities. The first and most obvious is the generally accepted view that Laȝamon was a given name and that the opening lines of the poem supplement this with information about his occupation (priest), place of residence (Areley) and parentage (Leovnað's son), since this information was commonly used in bynames as a way of clarifying identity. Many will no doubt feel that this remains the most reasonable interpretation. The second possibility, extending Rosamund Allen's suggestion, is that the poet had a given name that he concealed, while giving the information that would normally have been supplied in various possible bynames, so that some readers or hearers, perhaps members of a restricted circle, might be able to identify him. The consequent question would then be whether the opening lines of the poem could be interpreted as omitting the poet's given name and giving his occupational byname as a kind of pseudonym, so that an acceptable translation might be: 'There was a priest among the people, he was called "(the) Lawman", he was Leovnað's son', or, more freely in order to make the point more clearly, 'There was a priest among the people, he was Leovnað's son, known as "(the) Lawman".'

In recent years several scholars have cited a reference showing that in 1268 the rector of Areley was named William,[32] and this was taken by Elizabeth Salter as evidence that the poet was dead by that date. Indeed, we would hardly expect him to have been alive in 1268 if we believe that the poem was composed early in the thirteenth century, which still seems to be the most widely accepted view.[33] Long ago, however, E. G. Stanley pointed out that 'the only probable *terminus ad quem* [for the composition of the poem] is the palaeographical dating of the manuscripts',[34] and he subsequently argued that the use of deliberately

archaic language in the poem undermined the traditional ascription to the late twelfth century on linguistic grounds, so that the poem could have been written 'perhaps as late as the second third of the thirteenth century'.[35] With this in mind one cannot rule out the possibility that the poet was still alive in 1268, though much would depend on whether one thought of the poem as taking shape closer to 1235 than to 1265. One might then consider the possibility that Laȝamon was a byname, 'Lawman', and that the poet had the given name William; in that case he would have been known variously (I give modernised spellings for convenience) as 'William Priest', or 'William Areley', or 'William Leovnaðʼs son' (perhaps even, on the evidence of the Otho manuscript, 'William Lucas'), or, if his qualifications or ancestry justified it, as 'William Lawman'. Indeed, if it were ever established with reasonable certainty that William was the poet's given name, speculation would doubtless follow as to whether the closing line of the poem contains an oblique reference to this name: *i-wurðe þet i-wurðe, i-wurðe Godes wille* ('let happen what may, may God's will be done', with the implied secondary sense, 'may Will[iam] be God's').[36]

In the document relating to 1268 the bishop of Worcester gives his permission for William, rector of Areley, to be absent from his parish while 'undertaking the duties of Master Thomas de Cantilupe, who is going beyond the seas on his business for three years.'[37] Dr Cartlidge takes this to imply that the Cantelupe family 'exerted some sort of patronage over the living at Areley Kings',[38] which would be plausible if one could be sure that Thomas Cantelupe himself chose the rector of Areley for whatever work was involved and that he had the authority to implement this choice. This however is far from certain in the light of the known facts concerning Thomas Cantelupe.[39] In 1268 he was about fifty years of age, a cleric of noble birth apparently destined for high office and already a notable public figure; he was a leading expert in both canon law and civil law and a former chancellor of Oxford university, but after the end of the baronial wars in 1265 he was in a difficult, even dangerous, position.

Like other members of his family Thomas Cantelupe had been a supporter of the baronial faction under Simon de Montfort; he had played a prominent part in presenting the baronial case before the French king at Amiens in 1263 and had been appointed chancellor of England during the period of baronial rule following the capture of the king at the battle of Lewes in 1264.[40] There is some uncertainty as to whether he still held the chancellorship at the time of the collapse of the baronial cause,[41] but after the defeat of the baronial leaders at Evesham in 1265 and the restoration of the king to power, a new chancellor was

appointed and Thomas Cantelupe's whole future became very doubtful. His journey abroad to resume his earlier academic life has the appearance of a temporary exile: it is possible that 'his return to Paris probably indicates that his position in England was unsafe', or perhaps, more circumspectly, 'a period of residence abroad must have been deemed tactful'.[42] His uncle, Walter Cantelupe, who in earlier years had assisted his nephew's career in various ways, had been bishop of Worcester, a close friend of Simon de Montfort and a leading supporter of the baronial cause. Under bishop Walter the see of Worcester had become a stronghold of baronial support, but after Walter's death in 1266 the king was understandably anxious to remove baronial sympathisers and to install royalists in positions of influence wherever possible.

To this end Godfrey Giffard, member of a prominent royalist family and the king's own choice as chancellor in 1266, was appointed bishop of Worcester in 1268, and he immediately began strengthening the king's position in his see.[43] Among the first entries in his register in fact are dispensations to Thomas Cantelupe and his brother Hugh to go abroad to study, and it was in this connection that the bishop appointed William of Areley as a replacement for Thomas Cantelupe. This of course suggests a rather different interpretation from that proposed by Cartlidge: the bishop of Worcester may have been anxious to remove a powerful political opponent, or, in accordance with the compromises necessary in post-civil-war society, he may have wanted to help a respected colleague to take temporary refuge abroad. Either way, the rector of Areley may have been little more than an instrument in the bishop's political machinations and no connection between Areley and the Cantelupes can safely be inferred from this: the bishop simply needed a suitably qualified cleric from his diocese, or even from his household, to take on whatever work Thomas Cantelupe had been doing there.

It is however quite unclear what part Thomas Cantelupe played in Worcester affairs at this time: his main ecclesiastical living up to that point had been as archdeacon of Stafford and prebend of Lichfield in the diocese of Coventry and Lichfield, an office that he still held after the collapse of the baronial cause, so the bishop of Worcester was not his obvious ecclesiastical superior. Thomas's elder brother, Hugh Cantelupe, was archdeacon of Gloucester in the diocese of Worcester, so bishop Godfrey was clearly entitled to remove him on a temporary assignment to study in Paris, but Thomas was a more complex case.

An indication of Thomas Cantelupe's professional far-sightedness was that early in his career he had acquired a papal dispensation to hold a variety of livings in plurality, and beside his position in Lichfield he held canonries in York and London and livings in widely scattered parts of the country, including two in the diocese of Worcester (one of them at the Cantelupe family-seat at Aston Cantlow), so the bishop of Worcester presumably had some interest as regards Thomas.[44] It is possible that after the disaster of Evesham in 1265 Thomas took refuge and was given some employment in the household of his uncle, Walter Cantelupe, who was bishop of Worcester until his death in 1266; at any rate, whatever Thomas had been doing in the diocese of Worcester, it was evidently under the authority of the bishop and important enough to require the appointment of a replacement when he left the diocese and went to Paris. The register gives no indication of the duties to be undertaken by this replacement, but since Thomas had achieved national preeminence in law and administration, one might expect him to have been engaged in some administrative and legal duties in the diocese of Worcester, presumably in the bishop's household. In his absence abroad these duties would then have had to be allocated to a cleric who was qualified to undertake them, and it may thus be reasonable to deduce that William of Areley was experienced in some kinds of legal work in 1268, which would strengthen the case for identifying him as the 'lawman' who wrote the poem, though this would imply that the poem was probably written towards the end, rather than at the beginning, of the second third of the thirteenth century. Obviously a certain lapse of time is needed after the completion of the poem to allow for the making of intervening copies before the compilation of the Caligula manuscript, for which a commonly accepted date is about 1260-80, but the difficulty is not insuperable.[45]

This might also suggest new possibilities concerning the poet's social role and status: he has generally been seen as a parish priest living in a small rural community that may have included a manorial household, and the implications of this with regard to the poet's expected audience have been explored by Dr Barron, who considers two possible audiences for the poem: one in Worcester (which Barron eventually rejects), 'a huddle of like-minded antiquarians in some corner of the Worcester cloisters', the other in Areley (which Barron cautiously favours, suggesting ways of reconciling the role of parish-priest with duties as chaplain to the lord of the manor) in a manorial household 'mingling minor clerics and local gentry, the semi-educated and illiterates, sharing a common interest in the past of their country but varying in knowledge and intellectual capacity'.[46] Neither of

these alternatives need be ruled out, but we should also consider a third possibility: the poet may have been less firmly domiciled in his parish than the third line of the poem, *He wonede at Ernleȝe at œðelen are chirechen* (Caligula), is normally taken to claim. It no doubt implies that Areley was in some sense home for him and that he held the living there, but that might not have precluded his spending a good deal of time elsewhere on tasks allocated by his bishop; indeed, we might infer from the Otho reading, *He wonede at Ernleie wid þan gode cniþte*, that his residence at Areley was little more than a lodging in the household of a friend and benefactor.

It is easy today to think of a parish priest as being a fairly modest figure in the ecclesiastical hierarchy (and it is striking how frequently published accounts of Laȝamon include the word 'humble'), but in the middle ages there were large numbers of clerics in minor orders performing a wide range of tasks and functions, of whom only a small proportion would ever rise so far as to take orders as priests, while to be appointed to a parish living was a highly desirable goal. It was profitable enough for members of the higher ranking clergy (Thomas Cantelupe is a good example) to retain one or more parish livings alongside higher appointments to which they had been preferred. Rather than being a humble parish priest, leading a life like that of Chaucer's idealised 'povre persoun', or acting as chaplain to a manorial household, Laȝamon might have been a cleric engaged in diocesan administration in the bishop's household and being rewarded with the living at Areley Kings (perhaps even employing a vicar to undertake routine pastoral duties on his behalf):[47] in fact a functionary more like Walter Map, who evidently travelled widely and performed many different roles as he rose through the ecclesiastical hierarchy, but still speaks of his church at Westbury-on-Severn in terms not altogether different from Laȝamon's reference to Areley. The fact that the lord of Martley or the Prior of Newent officially appointed the incumbent to the living at Areley need not rule out this hypothesis: when it came to finding livings for members of his household, the bishop could, and often did, override such obstacles.[48] This might place a potential readership for the poem among the bishop's *familia*, a more rigorously selected and intellectually accomplished milieu than the manorial household envisaged by Barron, and incidentally an audience who could easily penetrate the pseudonymity (if that is what it is) of 'the lawman'. One objection to this, of course, is that a writer addressing such an audience in the thirteenth century might be expected to use French or Latin rather than English, but Laȝamon's poem is a transformation of a French original and its subject, a celebration of the

English nation as successor to the Arthurian past, would carry its own justification for the use of the English language, particularly in a form that deliberately evoked aspects of the Anglo-Saxon past and reflected some of the preoccupations of Worcester Cathedral priory in the first half of the thirteenth century.

The use of French in England was kept alive throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries by a number of factors, not least by the constant stream of immigrants from the continent whose first language (and, setting aside Latin, presumably only language) was French, primarily men of higher rank brought in to support royal power in church and state, but also their families and attendants. The Cantelupe family is a case in point: William, the first baron, was apparently born in Normandy and brought to England by King John, becoming steward of the royal household.[49] His grandson, Thomas Cantelupe, was born in England, but as bishop of Hereford (1275-82) he still preferred not to preach in English and he took with him on his travels a Franciscan friar to undertake English preaching for him.[50] If French was the preferred language of the third generation immigrant Thomas, it is unlikely that his uncle, Walter Cantelupe, who was born before the end of the twelfth century, perhaps before his father migrated to England, and who was bishop of Worcester from 1237 to 1266, was any more at ease with English. So if Laȝamon's poem, with its reliance on archaic language and poetic conventions, was written in the Worcester diocese during the second third of the thirteenth century, its expected audience can hardly have included the bishop. The thirteenth-century bishops of Worcester were in most cases rather transient figures and none of the more durable ones sounds like a person who was likely to take much interest in, or to have much understanding of, Laȝamon's poem.[51]

A career in clerical administration, however, was not necessarily closely involved with the person of the bishop, and it evidently gave some scope for literary activity, as far as one can judge from the admittedly rather unclear example of Walter Map. A better, if rather earlier, example of a comparable clerical writer is of course Geoffrey of Monmouth, and there would be an obvious appropriateness if Laȝamon came from the same professional class of secular clerics as Geoffrey and Wace.[52] In any case, the intended audience of the *Historia Brutonum* is rather elusive: Derek Brewer has pointed out that in Laȝamon's poem 'the marks of oral delivery...are missing', and that the poet 'appears to envisage a solitary reader', whom he consistently addresses in the second person singular.[53] This accords with the fact that although some aspects of

the linguistic archaism of the poem, particularly its vocabulary, would be audible in a public reading, others, especially the archaistic spelling, would appear only to a reader with the text in front of him.[54] On the other hand, Rosamund Allen, while taking account of the repeated addresses in the second person singular, sees this solitary reader as a fiction devised by the author, and not determining an actual audience.[55] These are clearly subjects on which one must remain uncertain, and the poet's social milieu remains unclear, but something rather more complex and sophisticated than whatever is likely to have been available in Areley Kings sounds intrinsically plausible.

I have considered elsewhere the literary context of the poem and argued that Laȝamon's choice of language and metre suggests that it was written at a time when there was a wider interest in Old English writing, perhaps even some kind of 'Anglo-Saxon revival' movement, and that Worcester in the first half of the thirteenth century provides the required context.[56] On balance this still seems to me a plausible view, but arguments for a later date of composition should not be ignored, particularly as it can be shown that aspects of Anglo-Saxon England continued to attract some interest throughout much of the thirteenth century. E. G. Stanley compared the language of the poem with that of Henry III's *Proclamation* of 1258, pointing out that both texts deliberately attempt to use archaic forms of language that evoke the Anglo-Saxon past.[57] In addition to the appeal to the past that appears in the *Proclamation* of 1258 it should be remembered that in 1239 Henry named his first son Edward, making him the first male Plantagenet (and in 1272 the first post-conquest king) to bear a name of English origin, and his second son, Edmund, was also given an English name.

Henry's naming of his sons was primarily, or at least ostensibly, in honour of the cults of two Anglo-Saxon royal saints, St Edward the Confessor and St Edmund the Martyr, but the wider implication that the Plantagenets were the legitimate heirs to the pre-conquest kings of England was obviously an important consideration. Matthew Paris's Anglo-Norman *Life of St Edward the Confessor* was addressed to Queen Eleanor, wife of Henry III, presumably to celebrate the birth and naming of her son Edward in 1239, and probably to explain to a queen from Provence the significance of the name given to her son. In this poem Matthew asserts that the three kings who followed Edward the Confessor (Harold Godwin's son, William the Conqueror and William Rufus) had no right by birth to the English throne, but legitimacy was restored when Henry I married a princess of the Anglo-Saxon royal line.[58] The Plantagenet claim to be the successors of the Anglo-Saxon royal dynasty was clearly important, and one

could say that an awareness of the Anglo-Saxon past was recurrent throughout the second third of the thirteenth century.

Henry's interest in Anglo-Saxon royal saints, no doubt motivated both by piety and by political considerations, is attested by Matthew Paris, who records in his *Chronica Majora* that on a visit to St Albans in 1257 the king dictated to Matthew a list of their names, *Nominavit insuper omnes Angliæ sanctos reges canonizatos*. The list of eleven alleged royal saints includes the familiar nationally recognised names (Oswald of Northumbria, Edmund of East Anglia, Edward the Martyr and Edward the Confessor), but the other names are less familiar and must be the result of a fairly diligent search for information: the cult of Oswine of Northumbria was mainly restricted to the north of England, but Tynemouth, where his shrine was located, was a cell of St Albans, so his name may conceivably appear as a result of prompting from Matthew Paris; on the other hand, Æthelbert of Hereford, Kenelm and Wistan all point to a West Midland source of information, however one may wish to explain it; while *Fromund* (an error for Fremund) and *Edwulf* (presumably for Eardwulf) were evidently unfamiliar enough for their names to be misrepresented; finally and most surprisingly, *Neithan* (Nectan) was neither royal nor English, being a Welsh hermit whose cult was confined to Devon, and his presence in a list of royal saints may be due to confusion with the Pictish king of the same name praised by Bede for his religious orthodoxy in *Historia Ecclesiastica* V.21.[59]

Clearly importance was attached to some aspects of the Anglo-Saxon past in the mid-thirteenth century, and there could have been a political motive for writing a poem on an Anglo-Saxon theme glorifying the English past; but Laȝamon's *Historia Brutonum* does not fit this requirement, for its theme is the glorification of a British national past, in which the English appear as both the supplanters and the inheritors of an earlier British glory. Indeed, in spite of Laȝamon's claim to have used Bede as a source, the theme of the poem gives little scope for displaying any knowledge of Anglo-Saxon history: the poet expands Wace's account of St Oswald and introduces mention of St Milburga,[60] but this hardly suggests a fascination with Anglo-Saxon saints commensurate with that ascribed to Henry III by Matthew Paris. Laȝamon's Anglo-Saxon interests are rather in matters of language and poetic technique that are not likely to have had much appeal at the royal court or among the aristocracy and higher clergy who still sought information on England's past through the medium of the French language, whether in Gaimar, Wace and the numerous Anglo-Norman prose chronicles or in Anglo-Norman lives of English saints.[61]

The poet's choice of language and metre is influenced by Anglo-Saxon models, and the *Proclamation* of 1258 suggests a nationalistic motive for linguistic archaism, but it is doubtful whether anyone in the mid-thirteenth century seeking a poem on national glory, appealing either to the royal party or to the baronial opposition, would have found Laȝamon's poem entirely to his satisfaction. Indeed, while one can readily deduce a general cultural context for the poem, it does not obviously lend itself to any specific political or factional interpretation. Rosamund Allen's comment that the events of the reign of King John (1199-1216) 'provide a political context for Laȝamon's verse chronicle' is certainly reasonable,[62] but it does not preclude the possibility that other periods might provide equally valid contexts: the political unrest in the reign of King John as summarised by Allen has in fact broad similarities to the unrest of the baronial wars in the reign of Henry III. The bleak resignation of the concluding line of the poem could certainly be interpreted as an expression of national apprehension on more than one occasion in John's reign and especially at the time of his death (and subsequent burial in Worcester), but it would be no less appropriate in the years of the baronial wars: it could for example express the apprehension of supporters of Simon de Montfort in the Worcester diocese after the baronial defeat at Evesham in 1265. As an encapsulation of a national mood it would have had a recurrent appropriateness throughout the whole period from 1190 to 1270, which still remains the period during which the poem might have been written; but the poem resists all attempts to relate it to any specific public or political occasion, and its destination is as likely to have been the private reader as the public audience.

Finally, there is an annoying circularity to the double problem of the poet's name and the date of the poem. The references cited by Tatlock, Thuresson and Fellows Jensen, and in Reaney (*Dictionary*, p.211), suggest that 'Laȝamon, Lawman' (in various spellings), though never very common, was in use as a given name until the early thirteenth century, but later occurrences show it used only as a byname added to a given name; hence, if the poem was composed in the early thirteenth century, it is possible that the poet should still be included among the few people of that period who had the given name 'Laȝamon', but conversely, if he was active later in the century the likelihood is that 'Lawman' was a byname and the poet conceals whatever given name he had. The whole range of possibilities deserves to be kept open for consideration.

NOTES

[1]   *Laȝamon: Brut*, ed. by G. L. Brook and R. F. Leslie, 2 vols, EETS o.s. 250 and 277 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963 and 1978), lines 1-3; all references are to this edition, but in quotations I insert my own punctuation; all translations are my own. 'There was a priest among the people who was named Laȝamon; he was Leovnað's son, may God be gracious to him; he lived at Areley at a noble church.' The poet repeats the name in lines 14, 24 and 29. *Wace's Roman de Brut, a History of the British*, ed. and trans. by Judith Weiss (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1999), lines 7-8, 3823, 1328-83 and 14866. Wace, like Geoffrey of Monmouth (*Historia Regum Britanniae* XI.1), and like other writers mentioned below who name themselves in their writings, refers to himself in the third person: in this respect Laȝamon's usage follows convention and to take it as evidence that the prologue is by a different writer shows an unawareness of normal practice: see *Layamon's Brut. A History of the Britons*, translated by Donald G. Bzdyl, (Binghampton, New York: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies LXV, 1989), cited with approval by Kelley Wickham Crowley, *Writing the Future: Laȝamon's Prophetic History* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2002), p. 15: I am indebted to Rosamund Allen for this reference.

[2]   J. S. P. Tatlock, *The Legendary History of Britain* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1950), pp. 512-14, discusses the name and cites numerous examples; see further Gillian Fellowes Jensen, *Scandinavian Personal Names in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire* (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1968), p. 183.

[3]   John Frankis, 'Lawman and the Scandinavian connection', *Leeds Studies in English* (2000), 81-113 (pp. 81-82), follows the accepted views of the author's name and the date of the poem: the present article questions these views without necessarily invalidating the arguments of the previous study.

[4]   Rosamund Allen, *Lawman, Brut* (London: Dent, 1992), pp. xxiii-iv; amplified in R. S. Allen, '"Where are you, my brave knights?" Authority and Allegiance in Laȝamon's Brut', in *Lexis and Texts in Early English. Studies presented to Jane Roberts*, ed. by Christian J. Kay and Louise M. Sylvester (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2001), pp. 1-12 (p. 3). Specialists in name-studies tend to prefer the term 'byname' for any name added to supplement the given name; the poet uses (line 6443, concerning Aurelius Ambrosius) the term *to-nome*, translating Wace (6450), *surnuns*.

[5]   Doris Mary Stenton, *English Society in the Early Middle Ages* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1951), p. 172; for recent views on the Danelaw see Katherine Holman, 'Defining the Danelaw', in *Vikings and the Danelaw*, ed. by James Graham-Campbell, Richard Hall, Judith Jesch and David N. Parsons (Oxford: Oxbow, 2001), pp. 1-11, particularly pp. 3-4.

[6] Doris M. Stenton, *English Justice between the Norman Conquest and the Great Charter 1066-1215* (London: Unwin, 1965), pp. 6-7; on the localisation of the *Dunsæte* see Margaret Gelling, *The West Midlands in the Early Middle Ages* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1992), pp. 113-18, which also refers to studies on the whole standing of the document concerned.

[7] Text quoted from F. Liebermann, *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, 3 vols (Halle: Niemeyer, 1903-16), I 376-77, discussed in III 214-19; the manuscript dates and provenance are from N. R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), p. 110, and N. R. Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain* (Second edition, London: Royal Historical Society, 1964), p. 208, respectively. Liebermann, *Gesetze* II 565-6 (*Sachglossar* s.v. Lagamen) cites numerous references both to the term 'lawman' and to the personal name.

[8] References cited in John Frankis, 'Towards a regional context for Lawman's *Brut*: literary activity in the dioceses of Worcester and Hereford in the twelfth century', in *Laȝamon: Contexts, Language, and Interpretation*, ed. by Rosamund Allen, Lucy Perry, and Jane Roberts (London: King's College London, Centre for Late Antique and Medieval Studies, 2002), pp. 53-78 (pp. 53-61).

[9] David Crouch, *William Marshal: court, career and chivalry in the Angevin Empire, 1147-1219* (London: Longman, 1990), p. 205, illustrates this development with regard to the Marshal and Despenser families. J. C. Holt, *What's in a name? Family nomenclature and the Norman Conquest* (Reading: University of Reading, 1982), shows that the Norman aristocracy had earlier pioneered the development of locative surnames in connection with land-inheritance.

[10] See P. H. Reaney, *The Origin of English Surnames* (London: Routledge, 1967), pp. 159 and 193; *A Dictionary of British Surnames*, Second edition revised by R. M. Wilson (London: Routledge, 1977), p. 211; further examples in Liebermann as cited and *MED* s.v. laue-man; see also Patricia Hanks and Flavia Hodges, *Dictionary of Surnames* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), under 'Lamont'.

[11] Christopher Cannon, 'Laȝamon and the Laws of Men', *English Literary History*, 67 (2000), 337-63, makes important points about medieval law and legal references in the poem, but he is reluctant to discuss (or even to accept) actual thirteenth-century use of 'Laȝamon' as either a given name or a byname, and seems to interpret it as a pseudonym chosen to indicate authorial interests: this may not be unreasonable, but the author's naming usage needs explaining. The use of a pseudonym by a French poet is discussed by D. D. R. Owen, 'Two more romances by Chrétien de Troyes?', *Romania*, 92 (1971), 246-60, who also refers to third-person naming (pp. 250-1).

[12] See references cited in *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. by Michael Lapidge *et al.* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), pp. 7-8, s.v. Ælfric Bata, and Richard W. Pfaff, 'Eadui Basan: Scriptorum Princeps?', in *England in the Eleventh Century. Proceedings of the 1990 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. by Carola Hicks, Harlaxton Medieval Studies, 2 (Stamford: Watkins, 1992), pp. 219-38; on the whole subject see Gösta Tengvik, *Old English Bynames*, Nomina Germanica 4 (Uppsala: Almqvist, 1938).

[13] See Reaney, *Surnames*, and R. A. McKinley, *A History of British Surnames* (London: Longman, 1990); for further references see Cecily Clark, 'English personal names ca. 650-1300: some prosopographical bearings', *Medieval Prosopography*, 8 (1987), 31-60, and 'Socio-economic status and individual identity: essential factors in the analysis of Middle English personal naming', in *Naming, Society and Regional Identity*, ed. by David Postles (Oxford: Leopard's Head Press, 2002), pp. 99-121. For Anglo-Saxon patronymics see, for example, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, MS E, s.a. 798, *Alric Heardberhtes sunu*, and MS E, s.a. 1010, *Wulfric Leofwines sunu*, and further examples in Tengvik, *Bynames*. I prefer the term 'given name' to the perhaps more common 'Christian name', but 'forename' and 'baptismal name' are also used by name specialists to refer to the same feature.

[14] For occupational names the classic study is Gustav Fransson, *Middle English Surnames of Occupation, 1100-1350*, Lund Studies in English 3 (Lund: Gleerup, 1935): see p. 20; for a survey of later work see Gillian Fellows Jensen, 'On the Study of Middle English By-names', *Namn och Bygd*, 68 (1980), 102-15. Bertil Thuresson, *Middle English Occupational Terms*, Lund Studies in English 19 (Lund: Gleerup, 1950), p. 143, gives examples of *Laweman* as both a given name and a byname but does not explain the distinction between the two functions.

[15] Stephen Wilson, *The Means of Naming: A Social History of Personal Naming in Western Europe* (London: UCL Press, 1998), p. 159; he cites English evidence for the use of initials only from the late thirteenth century, but the practice was already common in twelfth-century England: numerous examples are cited, for example, in Z.N. Brooke and C.N.L. Brooke, 'Hereford Cathedral dignitaries in the twelfth century', *The Cambridge Historical Journal*, 8 (1944), 1-21 (pp. 3-4, 8, 11, 13).

[16] For the use of different bynames for the same individual see Reaney, *Surnames*, pp. 94 and 302-6; and Reaney, *Dictionary*, pp. xii-xiii; Clark, 'Socio-economic status', p. 101, refers to 'some continuing lack of fixity' of bynames in the fourteenth century.

[17] Full references and discussion in Ruth Crosby, 'Robert Mannyng, a new biography', *PMLA*, 57 (1942), 15-28.

[18] *Robert of Brunne's 'Handlyng Synne'*, ed. by Frederick J. Furnivall, EETS o.s. 119 and 123 (reprinted as one volume, Millwood, N.Y.: Kraus Reprint, 1991), p. 158.

[19] The system is sometimes misunderstood: the famous archbishop of that period is sometimes erroneously referred to as 'Edmund Rich', but his father's nickname 'Dives' was never used by any of the children; Edmund was always named as 'of Abingdon' (his birthplace) or 'of Canterbury' (his archbishopric) or, posthumously, 'of Pontigny' (his shrine): see *The Life of St Edmund by Matthew Paris*, translated and edited with a biography by C. H. Lawrence (Oxford: Sutton and St Edmund Hall, 1996), p.1.

[20] Examples quoted from Hope Emily Allen, *English Writings of Richard Rolle* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931), pp. 54, 57, 72, 81, 85; many more occur throughout Hope Emily Allen, *Writings ascribed to Richard Rolle* (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1927). Richard Morris and Walter W. Skeat, *Specimens of Early English*, Part II, *From Robert of Gloucester to Gower* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1873), p. 107: 'Richard Rolle de Hampole, commonly called Hampole' (cf.p.x, 'Hampole's "Pricke of Conscience"').

[21] I know of two apparent twelfth-century exceptions to this rule: first, the author of *L'Estoire des Engleis* refers to himself six times as 'Gaimar' and once as 'Geffrai Gaimar': 'Gaimar' looks more like a given name of Continental Germanic origin than a surname, and the double name is puzzling; secondly, though the writer of *De Nugis Curialium* gives his name as 'Gualterus Map', he several times refers to himself simply as 'Map', which may have originated as a nickname: this too is problematic. On Map see references cited in Frankis, 'Regional context', pp. 66-7.

[22] References are to *The Riverside Chaucer*, ed. by Larry D. Benson (Oxford University Press, 1987), pp. 85 and 655-56.

[23] *The Complete Works of John Gower*, ed. by G. C. Macaulay, 4 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901), III 449, 465-66; *Riverside Chaucer*, pp. 87 and 357.

[24] Numerous examples throughout *Chaucer Life-Records*, ed. by Martin M. Crow and Clair C. Olson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966), for example, pp. 34-35, 57-59, 259, 265, 271, 415.

[25] *Thomas Hoccleve's Complaint and Dialogue*, ed. by J.A. Burrow, EETS o.s. 313 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 33 and 35, lines 2-3 and 25.

[26] Relevant documents are printed in *Hoccleve's Works: the Minor Poems*, ed. by Frederick J. Furnivall and I. Gollancz, revised by Jerome Mitchell and A. I. Doyle, EETS e.s. 61 and 73 (reprinted as one volume, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970), pp. li-lxx.

[27] Quoted from *Early Middle English Verse and Prose*, ed. by J. A. W. Bennett and G. V. Smithers (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), p. 174; for examples of authorial naming from the late Middle Ages see Thorlac Turville-Petre, 'The author of *The Destruction of Troy*', *Medium Ævum*, 57 (1988), 264-69; for the wider implications of authorial naming see Anne Middleton, 'William Langland's "kynde name": authorial signature and social identity in late fourteenth-century England', in *Literary Practice and Social Change in Britain 1380-1530*, ed. by Lee

Patterson (Berkeley: California University Press, 1989), pp. 15-82, reprinted (not quite complete) in *Chaucer to Spenser, a Critical Reader*, ed. by Derek Pearsall (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), pp. 206-45.

[28] Wilhelm Levison, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946), Appendix VIII, 'St Boniface and Cryptography', pp. 290-94 (p. 294), and Pauline Head, 'Who is the Nun from Heidenheim?', *Medium Ævum*, 71 (2002), 29-46.

[29] References cited in Frankis, 'Regional context', pp. 63-64.

[30] *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. by Walter W. Skeat, Vol. VII, *Chaucerian and Other Pieces* (Oxford University Press, 1897), pp. xix-xx; the full acrostic is 'Margarete of virtw, have merci on thin Vsk'.

[31] *Le Petit Plet*, ed. by Brian S. Merrilees, Anglo-Norman Text Society 20 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1970), p. xxxi, n. 1.

[32] First referred to by Elizabeth Salter, *English and International: Studies in the Literature, Art and Patronage of Medieval England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), p. 67 and n. 119; subsequently noted by Neil Cartlidge, 'The composition and social context of Oxford, Jesus College, MS 29 (II) and London, British Library MS Cotton Caligula A.ix', *Medium Ævum*, 66 (1997), 250-69 (p.251); Carole Weinberg, 'Marginal Illustration: a clue to the provenance of the Cotton Caligula manuscript of Laȝamon's *Brut*?', and W. R. J. Barron, 'The Idiom and the Audience of Laȝamon's *Brut*', in Allen, *Laȝamon Contexts*, pp. 39-52 (p. 48) and pp. 157-84 (p. 184) respectively.

[33] For discussion of the dating of the poem see Françoise Le Saux, *Laȝamon's Brut: the Poem and its Sources* (Cambridge: Brewer, 1989), pp. 2-13, and Allen, *Lawman*, pp. xvi-xviii. Among recent writers, for example, Cannon, 'Laws of men', p. 337, ascribes the poem to '*circa* 1200'.

[34] E. G. Stanley, 'The date of Laȝamon's *Brut*', *Notes and Queries*, 213 (1968), 85-88.

[35] E. G. Stanley, 'Laȝamon's antiquarian sentiments', *Medium Ævum*, 38 (1969), 23-37 (p. 34): this hugely influential study is the basis of nearly all subsequent work on this poet and commands obvious respect.

[36] Reaney, *Dictionary*, pp. 384-85, cites examples of the abbreviated form 'Will' from the early thirteenth century, and of 'Wilkin' (with a diminutive suffix) from the twelfth century. I am indebted to Rosamund Allen for drawing my attention to the somewhat surprising nature of the closing line of the poem.

[37] *Episcopal Registers, Diocese of Worcester. Register of Bishop Godfrey Giffard*, ed. by J. W. Willis Bund, 2 vols (Oxford: Worcestershire Historical Society, 1902), I 3; this is not an edition, or even apparently a translation, but an English summary of the full contents, so details of the exact original wording are not given; the editor does not identify the manuscript or give its present location: see however David M. Smith, *Guide to Bishops' Registers of England and*

Wales, a Survey from the Middle Ages to the Abolition of the Episcopacy in 1646 (London: Royal Historical Society, 1981), pp. 215-16.

[38]   Cartlidge, 'Composition', p. 251, an interpretation supported by Barron, 'Idiom and Audience', p. 184.

[39]   For details of Thomas Cantelupe's life see *Dictionary of National Biography* III 900-4; A. B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D.1500*, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957-59), I 347-49; and *St Thomas Cantilupe Bishop of Hereford: Essays in his Honour*, ed. by Meryl Jancey (Hereford: Friends of Hereford Cathedral, 1982). 'Cantelupe' seems to be the usual spelling today, but some writers prefer 'Cantilupe': I use the former except when quoting writers who use the latter. The family took its name from Canteloup in Normandy.

[40]   On the general historical background see Sir Maurice Powicke, *The Thirteenth Century, 1190-1290*, Oxford History of England IV (Oxford: Clarendon Press, second edition, 1962), chapter V, pp. 170-226, and M. T. Clanchy, *England and its Rulers 1066-1272* (second edition, Oxford: Blackwell, 1998), pp. 190-205.

[41]   David Carpenter, 'St Thomas Cantilupe: his political career', in Jancey, *Cantilupe*, pp. 57-72 (pp. 69-70).

[42]   The first quotation is from *DNB*, the second from Jeremy Catto, 'The academic career of Thomas Cantilupe', in Jancey, *Cantilupe*, pp. 45-56 (p. 52).

[43]   The Giffard family were prominent in their support of Henry's reacquisition of power: Thomas Cantilupe was followed as chancellor by Walter Giffard in 1265, and when Walter became Archbishop of York in 1266 he was replaced by his younger brother, Godfrey, who held the office of chancellor from 1267 until he became bishop of Worcester in 1268. The introduction to *The Register of Godfrey Giffard* constructs a detailed narrative of Godfrey's actions to restore royal power in the see of Worcester on the basis of entries in the Register; see further R. H. Hilton, *A Medieval Society: the West Midlands at the End of the Thirteenth Century* (reissue: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), p. 46.

[44]   Jancey, *Cantilupe*, pp. 17 and 62; Emden, *BRUO* I 348, does not list Aston Cantlow among Thomas's livings, but he is named as the rector in a document of 1253: see *English Episcopal Acta 13, Worcester 1218-1268*, ed. by Philippa M. Hoskin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, for the British Academy, 1997), pp.118-19 (no. 150).

[45]   For detailed discussion of the date of the Caligula manuscript, with the possibility of a later *terminus ad quem*, see Jane Roberts, 'A preliminary note on British Library, Cotton MS Caligula A.ix', in *The Text and Tradition of Laȝamon's Brut*, ed. by Françoise Le Saux (Cambridge: Brewer, 1994), pp.1-14 (pp.6-8), and Elizabeth J. Bryan, *Collaborative Meaning in Medieval Scribal Culture* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999), pp.183-7.

[46]   Barron, 'Idiom and Audience', pp. 169-72.

[47] For an account of the households of thirteenth-century bishops of Worcester see Hoskin, *Acta*, pp.xxxiv-xli; at any one time the bishop's household included a number of clerics, each of whom held a parish-living in the diocese and was skilled in some branch of law. Hoskin's introduction also includes an excellent account (pp.xxvii-xxxiii) of the career of Walter Cantelupe. On rectors, whether resident or non-resident, and the employment of vicars see John R. H. Moorman, *Church Life in England in the Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940), pp.24-51.

[48] On Map see Frankis, 'Regional context', pp. 66-8; on the Areley living see Salter, *English and International*, p. 67; Allen, *Lawman*, p. xviii; Carole Weinberg, '"By a noble church on the bank of the Severn": a regional view of La3amon's *Brut*', *Leeds Studies in English*, New Series, 26 (1995), 49-62 (p. 52); and Barron, 'Idiom and Audience', p. 170. On the bishop's power to overrule the patrons of churches see Philippa Hoskin, 'Diocesan politics in the see of Worcester', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 54 (2003), 422-40.

[49] Carpenter, in Jancey, *Cantilupe*, p. 57; the early history of the Cantelupe family is somewhat unclear (and is left unexplored in *The Complete Peerage*): the early members of the family named in *DNB* suggest the possibility that King John brought more than one member of the family to England.

[50] David M. Smith, 'Thomas Cantilupe's Register', in Jancey, *Cantilupe*, pp. 83-101 (p. 90).

[51] Between 1190 and 1268 (the maximum time-span for the composition of La3amon's poem) there were nine bishops of Worcester (excluding one whose election was rapidly quashed), of whom six occupied the see for two years or less each: the other three were Mauger (1200-12: an immigrant from France), William de Blois (1218-36) and Walter Cantelupe (1237-66): see *Handbook of British Chronology*, ed. by E. B. Fryde (London: Royal Historical Society, third edition, 1986), pp. 278-9.

[52] See also the comments on clerical writers of history by Monica Otter, *Inventiones. Fiction and Referentiality in Twelfth-Century English Historical Writing* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 125.

[53] Derek Brewer, 'The paradox of the archaic and the modern in La3amon's *Brut*', in *From Anglo-Saxon to Early Middle English*, ed. by Malcolm Godden, Douglas Gray, and Terry Hoad (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), pp. 188-205 (pp.199 and 204-5). Brewer refers to the list of features of a text for oral delivery compiled by G. V. Smithers in 'The style of *Hauelok*', *Medium Ævum*, 57 (1988), 190-218: the presence or absence of these features in La3amon's verse deserves further discussion.

[54] Distinguishing between authorial and scribal spellings in this text is problematic: see the discussion (with further references) by Richard Dance, 'Interpreting La3amon: linguistic diversity and some cruces in Cotton Caligula A.ix, with particular regard to Norse-derived words', in *Contexts, Language and Interpretation*, pp. 187-202 (pp. 189-92); it is clear that the

poet intended to use quasi-Old English spellings, but the Caligula scribes may not have reproduced these authorial spellings with complete accuracy or with much understanding of their significance.

[55]   Rosamund Allen, 'The implied audience of Laȝamon's *Brut*', in *The Text and Tradition of Laȝamon's* Brut, ed. by Françoise Le Saux (Cambridge: Brewer, 1994), pp. 121-39.

[56]   Frankis, 'Regional context'.

[57]   Stanley, ' Laȝamon's antiquarian sentiments', p. 27.

[58]   *La Estoire de Seint Aedward le Rei*, ed. by Kathryn Young Wallace, ANTS 41 (London, 1983), lines 3829-41; Wallace dates the work between 1236 and 1245 (p. xxiii) but does not relate it to the birth of Prince Edward.

[59]   *Matthaei Parisiensis Chronica Majora*, ed. by H. R. Luard, 7 vols, RS 57 (London: Longman, 1872-1884), V, 617, where the printed list is 'Albertus, Edwardus martir, Kenelmus, Oswaldus, Oswinus, Neithan, Wistan, Fromund, Edwulf, Edmund, Edward': the implication of the Latinised form of some names but not others is unclear. On *Albertus* (Æthelbert), Edward the Martyr, Kenelm, Wigstan and Eardwulf see D. W. Rollason, 'The cults of murdered royal saints in Anglo-Saxon England', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 11 (1983), 1-22; on all the others see David Hugh Farmer, *The Oxford Dictionary of Saints* (Second edition, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987); the restricted nature of the cult of Fremund is suggested by the fact that his verse-life in the *South English Legendary* is preserved in one manuscript only: see Manfred Görlach, *The Textual Tradition of the South English Legendary*, Leeds Texts and Monographs, New Series 6 (Leeds: University of Leeds School of English, 1974), p. 167; his shrine was at Dunstable, close to St Albans, so here too the king may have received some help from Matthew Paris.

[60]   Discussed by Le Saux, *Laȝamon's Brut*, pp. 164-70, and Weinberg, 'Regional view', p. 51.

[61]   Examples are listed in Ruth J. Deane, *Anglo-Norman Literature, a Guide to Texts and Manuscripts* (London: Anglo-Norman Text Society, 1999), pp. 5-36 (esp. nos. 13, 36, 46) and nos. 519, 520, 522, 523, 566, 580, 581.

[62]   Allen, 'Authority and Allegiance', pp. 2-3.