National Identity, Propaganda, and the Ethics of War in English Historical Literature, 1327–77

Trevor Russell Smith

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Leeds
Institute for Medieval Studies

September 2017

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is his own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

The right of Trevor Russell Smith to be identified as Author of this work has been asserted by him in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

© 2017 The University of Leeds and Trevor Russell Smith

Acknowledgments

The list of people to whom I owe thanks is long and distinguished. Many librarians kindly allowed me to personally examine manuscripts in their collections, including those at Aberystwyth (National Library of Wales), Cambridge (Christ's College, Corpus Christi College, Gonville and Caius College, Jesus College, St John's College, Trinity College, Trinity Hall, and University Library), Chester (Cheshire Archives and Local Studies Centre), Detroit (Public Library), Dublin (Trinity College), Durham (University Library), Leeds (University of Leeds Library), Lisboa (Biblioteca nacional de Portugal), London (British Library, College of Arms, Gray's Inn, Inner Temple, Lambeth Palace Library, Lincoln's Inn), Manchester (John Rylands Library), Oxford (Balliol College, Bodleian Library, Christ Church, Corpus Christi College, Magdalen College, Merton College, New College, Queen's College), Taunton (Somerset County Heritage Centre), and Warminster (Longleat House). My trips to these libraries would not have been possible without the generous funding of the Anglo-Norman Dictionary, an LRHI Postdoctoral Fellowship, Medium Ævum, and the University of Leeds. Two of my non-medievalist friends, Holly Hunt-Watts and Will Dan Seymour, kindly put me up during my visits to libraries at the tail end of corrections.

Many librarians have been exceptionally helpful, examined manuscripts for me, and provided me with reproductions without charge, including Claire Arrand (Lincoln, Cathedral Library), Don C. Skemer (Princeton, University Library), Hilary Ely (Reigate, Parish Church of St Mary Cranston Library), Julian Harrison (London, British Library), Laura Keizer (Edinburgh, University of Edinburgh Library), Marianne Hansen (Bryn Mawr, College Library), Robert MacLean (Glasgow, University of Glasgow Library), Claire Arrand (Lincoln, Cathedral Library), Sara Powell (New Haven, Yale University Library), Ulrike Hogg (Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland), Vanessa Wilkie (San Marino, Huntington Library), and William Stoneman (Cambridge [Mass.], Harvard University Houghton Library), as well as Christina Durry (London, British Library) for performing multispectral imaging on MS Cotton Nero D X for me, Elizabeth Dumas (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College) for granting me access to Parker on the Web without charge, Kate Harris (Warminster, Longleat House) for allow me to examine manuscripts without the usual fee, Martin Kauffmann (Oxford, Bodleian Library) for tracking down the missing Lawn manuscript so I could examine it, and Paolo Vian (Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca apostolica) for arranging for MS Vat. lat. 1959 to jump the digitisation queue. I have

also been fortunate enough to have had several manuscripts and microfilms partially reproduced for me by friends and colleagues, including Amanda Bohne, Clarck Drieshen, Kivil Yavuz, Kyle Conrau-Lewis, Marina Viallon, Meg Smith, Meghanne Phillips, Michelle Hufschmid, Mike Livingston, Quentin Verreycken, Richard Thomason, and Rose Sawyer. Other manuscripts were examined for me by Aleksandr Lobanov, Carmel Ferragud Domingo, and Godfried Croenen. The many people and institutions listed above allowed me to more fully engage with the many problems considered in this thesis. It would have been impossible for me to complete my Appendix, with its analysis of the many unedited texts and variant manuscripts in my corpus, without their help.

Many people offered invaluable inspiration and guidance early in my academic career. While I was growing up my mother, Patricia Smith, encouraged me to never be too easily satisfied, but to always ask questions. During my undergraduate studies at the University of California, Santa Cruz, Thomas Walsh (now at the University of California, Berkeley) first instilled in me an interest in literary texts and the pre-modern past. Through his rigorous teaching he showed me the sorts of deep and varied investigations that were possible through a careful and contextualised approach to texts. He encouraged me to continue studying classical texts and prophesied that it would provide an invaluable background for a career in medieval studies. I was fortunate to be able to spend an exchange year at the University of York in 2007–08, during which I had the pleasure of studying with Craig Taylor, who also acted as my supervisor during my master's degree at York in 2009–10. It was Craig who first encouraged me to study the later Middle Ages and showed me the many fascinating thematic strands that I might approach. Although they surely did not know it at the time, I have benefited greatly from the generous and patient guidance of Tom and Craig. This thesis would have been very different, for the worse, if I had not been exposed to their teaching and sage advice in my formative years. It should also be noted that L. J. Andrew Villalon sent me an email at the end of the first year of my PhD that offered unsolicited advice on methodology and rigour. I owe him thanks for the empathy and kindness he showed to a fledgling doctoral candidate, and for encouraging me to 'do better' and 'continue the discussion'.

I have also had the pleasure and benefit of being able to draw upon many friends and colleagues for advice and assistance in a number of matters. At Leeds the so-called 'Le Pat Inhabitants' have been helpful for their academic debates, camaraderie, and taking part in the collective meritorious suffering that is the PhD, chief amongst them Charley Roe (for the

lengthy discussions of Anglo-Norman and hack scholars), Clarck Drieshen (for help with palaeography in my early years), Iason-Eleftherios Tzouriadis (for the countless collaborations, misadventures, drams, and for being the root cause of the infamous Christmas Party 2013 incident), Jack Litchfield (for the many discussions, especially on sausages and westerns), Kivil Yavuz (for guidance on manuscript investigation and the Appendix), Matthew Beckman (for outlandish conversations and help with Latin and liturgical matters), Richard Thomason (for sage advice, annual gatherings, and help with Latin), Sunny Harrison (for the many insightful discussions of scholarly, literary, and film matters during lengthy coffee breaks), and Vanessa Wright (for repeated help with bizarre French). Many others offered their warm friendship through trying times, including Florence Scott, Jacob Deacon, James Hill, James Titterton, Joanna Phillips, Rachael Gillibrand, and Vicky Cooper.

Two activities at the University of Leeds, besides the Leeds International Medieval Congress, have positively affected the writing of this thesis over the years. The Medieval Warfare Colloquium, or, Fight Club, has been an invaluable resource since its foundation on 23 October 2014 by Alan V. Murray, one of my supervisors. My papers have been patiently listened to and helpfully commented upon over the years by the Colloquium's members, including Alan V. Murray, Jason Tzouriadis, Jacob Deacon, James Titterton, Joanna Phillips, Natalie Anderson, Sam Bradley, and Sophie Harwood. In 2016 the Medieval Culture and War conference was co-organised by Jason Tzouriadis, Sophie Harwood, and myself. It has since evolved into an international series, with the second being held at the Universidade de Lisboa in 2017 (co-organised by António Martins Costa and Inês Meira Araújo) and the third just recently being held at the Université Saint-Louis – Bruxelles (co-organised by Eric Bousmar, Michael Depreter, and Quentin Verreycken) in 2018. These conferences brought together scholars from countries around the world to engage with the many issues of medieval war and share their diverse perspectives, approaches, and sources, from which my work has benefitted greatly.

I had the pleasure of attending many conferences and going on short trips afterwards with colleagues. These were both useful for academic purposes but they also helped me to relax and find my neutral space during stressful times. Of particular note was the 'Killing and Being Killed' conference at Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz in 2015, with the company of Georgia McMillan, Iain MacInnes, and Jason Tzouriadis, for the memory of sparkling water and rapping on tables. 'The Kalamazoo Experience' in 2017 will be forever burned into my memory, especially thanks to the week long road trip to Kentucky afterwards with Sunny Harrison. We

ran a savage burn on the Bluegrass State. Locals were upset, bourbon was imbibed, and guns were shot (with an early draft of Chapter Three as a target), in no particular order.

Many experts have been kind enough to offer their friendship, advice, and sometimes feedback on my work over the years. These include Andrew Ayton, Andy King, Christopher Allmand, Cliff Rogers, Godfried Croenen, Heather Pagan, Ilana Krug, Kat Tracy, Kelly DeVries, Matthew Bennett, and Mike Livingston, as well as many current and former members of the Institute for Medieval Studies at the University of Leeds, including Axel Müller, Emilia Jamroziak, Iona McCleery, Jack Litchfield, Jason Tzouriadis, Matthew Beckman, Richard Thomason, Sunny Harrison, and William T. Flynn. Several scholars have kindly shared their work with me in advance of publication, including Anders Winroth, Andrew Lynch, Godfried Croenen, Joanna Bellis, John Hosler, and Pierre Courroux, and others have shared their doctoral theses with me, including James Freeman, Michele Poellinger, and Olivier de Laborderie. My thesis examiners, Chris Given-Wilson and William T. Flynn, asked many wise, probing, and difficult questions, and highlighted some embarrassing errors that have helped to improve this thesis immensely.

My supervisors, Alan V. Murray and Catherine Batt, were incredibly helpful throughout the thesis. They offered sage advice and helped me develop my provisional research project to the present, far more tenable one. On many instances they challenged me to look at my sources from new angles that I would never have thought of myself. In particular, Catherine helped me to write more effectively (no participles, please) to better communicate my arguments. Alan accidentally encouraged me to start looking at manuscripts, which soon occupied far too much time, but has since turned into a fruitful research strand. He also put up with my many visits to his office to chat about various ideas, not all of which were entirely academic. I have particularly benefitted from their kind patience and gentle inspiration, without which this thesis would have surely foundered.

Most of all, I owe thanks to my girlfriend, Georgia McMillan, for coming with me to Leeds from California in the heady days of 2013 and sticking with me through the whole PhD. She has been an unending font of support, despite the sometimes (frequent?) long hours that I worked and my eventual (inevitable?) failure to help out with domestic duties. She has selflessly put up with me arranging our 'vacations' around conferences or trips to libraries to examine manuscripts. Without her love and encouragement I could not have gotten through the thesis.

Abstract

This thesis argues against the common assumption that English writers ignored the ethical problems of war during the particularly brutal wars of Edward III, king of England, 1327–77. English historical literature in this period is typically mined for 'facts' to create visions of the past, or read as literature with little context, but never properly considered for its engagement with the morality of warfare.

Chapter One shows that the many uncertain aspects of war, such as intention, are those that most affect how military acts are judged. Chapter Two argues that writers use theoretical frameworks in a more nuanced and rhetorical sense than commonly believed. Chapter Three argues against the common belief that there was no concept of civilian immunity in the period, and demonstrates how writers present these civilian victims in different ways to attach moral value to those who attack them. Chapter Four examines how writers show the English to only attack enemy civilians, in their campaigns of devastation on a day-to-day basis, to force the enemy to do battle, and thereby end war. Chapter Five shows that writers avoid any of the morally unsavoury aspects of violence but revel in the suffering endured by their own men as meritorious asceticism. Chapter Six assesses how writers engage with the difficulties of ending hostilities and offering mercy, especially when martial culture encouraged bellicosity and vengeance. The thesis focuses throughout on the often nuanced and sensitive perspectives of English writers in this period before the age of Chaucer.

The Appendix introduces each of the main sources used throughout this thesis and provides a detailed list of their manuscripts. The many errors and poor descriptions repeated in scholarship are corrected throughout. Several previously unidentified manuscripts, variant versions, and previously unknown texts have been described.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments iii
Abstract vii
Table of Contents ix
Abbreviations xi
Notes xv

Introduction 1

I. Epistemology and Writing War 13
The Reality of War 13
Representation and Realism 23

II. Theoretical Frameworks 37
Divine Will 37
National Identity and 'the Other' 50
Just War and Rebellion 67

III. Civilian Distinction and Immunity 79
Innocence and Culpability 79
Canon Law and Civilians 86
English Civilians 91
Enemy Civilians 102
Ethics in Bias 106

IV. Ethical Strategies 111
Propaganda and Reality 113
Bellicosity and Challenges 121
Objectives of War 131

V. Violence and Killing 139
Capable Combatants 139
Doing Violence 149
Enduring Suffering 158

VI. Defeat and Victory 171
Courage 171
Surrender 179
Treatment of Captives 192

Conclusions: Ethical Sensitivity 201

Appendix: Historical Literature 205
Acta bellicosa 206
Anonimalle Chronicle 206
Robert of Avesbury, *De gestis mirabilibus Edwardi III* 207
Geoffrey le Baker, *Chronicle* 208
Geoffrey le Baker, *Chroniculum* 209
Jean le Bel, *Chronicle* 209

St Benet at Holme Annals 209
Bridlington Chronicle Continuation to 1377 210
The Brut 211
Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut 211
Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut Continuation to 1347 213
Short Anglo-Norman Prose Brut 214
Short Anglo-Norman Prose Brut Continuation to 1377 217
Canterbury Latin Prose Brut 218
Durham Latin Prose 'Brut' 219
Prophetic Latin Prose 'Brut' 220
Canterbury Chronicle 220
Croxden Annals 221
William Dene, *Rochester History* 221
Eulogium historiarum 222
Gesta regum Angli compendiose compilata 223
Gesta Scotorum contra Anglicos 224
De gestis Anglorum regum, Gallicorum, et Scotorum bellis et aliis infinitis miseriis 225
Thomas Gray, *Scalacronica* 225
Hailes Annals 226
Ranulf Higden, *Polychronicon* and Continuations 226
Ranulf Higden, *Polychronicon A Continuation* 249
Ranulf Higden, *Polychronicon St Albans A Continuation* 251
Kirkstall Abbey Long Chronicle 252
Lanercost Chronicle 252
London French Chronicles 253
London St Paul's Annals 253
Minorite Chronicle 254
Adam Murimuth, *Continuatio chronicarum* 255
Northampton St Andrew's Chronicle 257
Osney Chronicle 258
Parallel Chronicle 258
Peterborough Chronicle 259
Pipewell Abbey Chronicle 259
John of Reading, *Chronicle* 259
Southern Chronicle 261
John of Tynemouth, *Historia aurea* 261
Woburn Chronicle 264
York Short Chronicle 265

Bibliography 267
Primary Sources: Manuscripts 267
Primary Sources: Edited 279
Secondary Sources 292

Abbreviations

Texts marked with an asterisk are described in entries with their full titles in the Appendix, sorted in alphabetical order, with all 'Brut's and pseudo-'Brut's under 'Brut', organised by language and then title.

Acta bellicosa *	'Acta bellicosa', in *Le Prince Noir en Aquitaine, 1355/56–1362/70*, ed. by Joseph Moisant (Paris: Picard, 1894), pp. 157–74
Anonimalle *	*Anonimalle Chronicle, 1333 to 1381, from a MS Written at St Mary's Abbey, York*, ed. by Vivian H. Galbraith, rev. edn (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1970)
Avesbury, *De gestis mirabilibus* *	Robert of Avesbury, 'De gestis mirabilibus regis Edwardi Tertii', in *Adae Murimuth; Robertus de Avesbury*, ed. by Edward Maunde Thompson, RS, 93 (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1889), pp. 279–471
Le Baker, *Chronicle* *	Geoffrey le Baker, *Chronicon*, ed. by Edward Maunde Thompson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889)
Le Bel, *Chronicle* *	Jean le Bel, *Chronique*, ed. by Jules Viard and Eugène Déprez, ShF, 317, 324, 2 vols (Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1904–05)
St Benet at Holme *	*St Benet at Holme Annals* [unedited]
Bible	*Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem*, ed. by Robert Weber, Roger Gryson, and Bonifatius Fischer, 5th edn (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007)
Bridlington Chronicle *	'Gesta Edwardi de Carnarvan, auctore canonico Bridlingtoniensi, cum continuatione ad AD 1377', in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, ed. by William Stubbs, RS, 76, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1882–83), II, 25–151 (continuation at 93–151)
BT	Biblioteca teubneriana, or, Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum teubneriana
Canterbury Chronicle *	Canterbury Anonymous, *Chronicle, 1346–1365*, ed. by Charity Scott-Stokes and Chris Given-Wilson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2008)
Dene, *Rochester* *	William Dene, *History of Rochester* [unedited]
Durham LPB *	*Durham Latin Prose 'Brut'* [unedited]
EETSes	Early English Text Society, Extra Series
EETSos	Early English Text Society, Original Series

Eulogium *	*Eulogium (historiarum sive temporis), ab orbe condito usque ad annum Domini .mccclxci.*, ed. by Frank Scott Haydon, RS, 9, 3 vols (London: Longman, 1858–63)
Froissart, *Chronicles, 'A'*	Jean Froissart, 'Besançon, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 864', ed. by Valentina Mazzei, in *The Online Froissart*, ed. by Peter Ainsworth and Godfried Croenen, v. 1.5 (Sheffield: HRIOnline, 2013) <hrionline.ac.uk/online froissart> For information on recensions of Book 1 of Froissart's *Chronicles* ('A', 'Amiens', 'B', 'C', 'N', and 'Rome') see p. 9 n. 40 below.
Froissart, *Chronicles, 'Amiens'*	Jean Froissart, *Chroniques, Livre I: Le Manuscrit d'Amiens, Bibliothèque municipale, no. 486*, ed. by George Diller, 5 vols (Genève: Librairie Droz, 1991–98)
Froissart, *Chronicles, 'B'*	Jean Froissart, 'Chroniques, Livre premier', in *Chroniques*, ed. by Siméon Luce, ShF, 147, 148, 154, 159, 164, 169, 180, 188, 15 vols (Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1869–1975), I–VIII
Froissart, *Chronicles, 'C'*	Jean Froissart, 'New York, Morgan Library, MS M.804', ed. by Rob Sanderson, in *The Online Froissart*, ed. by Peter Ainsworth and Godfried Croenen, v. 1.5 (Sheffield: HRIOnline, 2013) <hrionline.ac.uk/onlinefroissart>
Froissart, *Chronicles, 'N'*	Jean Froissart, 'Chroniques abrégées', in *Oeuvres*, ed. by Joseph Kervyn de Lettenhove, 25 vols (Bruxelles: Devaux, 1867–77), XVII
Froissart, *Chronicles, 'Rome'*	Jean Froissart, *Chroniques, dernière rédaction du premier livre: Édition du manuscrit de Rome, Reg. lat. 869*, ed. by George Diller (Genève: Librairie Droz, 1972)
Gesta regum Angli *	*Gesta regum Angli compendiose compilata* [unedited]
Gesta Scotorum *	*Gesta Scotorum contra Anglicos* [unedited]
Gestis Anglorum regum *	*De gestis Anglorum regum, Gallicorum, et Scotorum* [unedited]
Gray, *Scalacronica* *	Thomas Gray, *Scalacronica, 1272–1363*, ed. by Andy King, Surtees Society, 209 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005)
Hailes *	*Hailes Annals* [unedited]
Higden, *Polychronicon* *	Ranulf Higden, *Polychronicon*, ed. by Churchill Babington and Joseph Rawson Lumby, RS, 41, 9 vols (London: Longman, 1865–86), through VIII, 346 [Long Version]
Higden, *Polychronicon A Continuation* *	Ranulf Higden, 'Historia Eduardi Tertii, e codice veteri MS describendam curavit cl. Tannerus, cap. 56–62', in *Historia de rebus gestis Eduardi I, Eduardi II, et Eduardi III*, ed. by Thomas Hearne (Oxford: Sheldonian Theatre, 1731), pp. 421–52 [for 1353–77 only, 1344–52 text, not edited here, is essentially the same as *Polychronicon*, Long Version]

Higden, *Polychronicon SAA Continuation* *	Ranulf Higden, *Polychronicon St Albans A Continuation* [unedited]
Kirkstall *	*Kirkstall Abbey Long Chronicle* [unedited]
Lanercost *	*Chronicon de Lanercost, .mcci.–.mcccxlvi., e codice cottoniano*, ed. by Joseph Stevenson (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Printing Company, 1839)
London French *	*Croniques de London, depuis l'an 44 Hen. III jusqu'à l'an 17 Edw. III*, ed. by James Aungier, Camden Old Series, 28 (London: Nichols, 1844)
London St Paul's *	'Annales paulini', in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, ed. by William Stubbs, RS, 76, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1882–83), I, 255–370
Long ANPB *	*Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut*: 'The Anglo-Norman Prose *Brut*: An Edition of British Library, MS Cotton Cleopatra D III', ed. by Marcia Lusk Maxwell (unpublished PhD dissertation, Michigan State University, 1995)
Long ANPB Continuation *	*Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut Continuation to 1347* [unedited]
Minot, *Poems*	Laurence Minot, *Poems*, ed. by Joseph Hall, 3rd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914)
Murimuth, *Continuatio* *	Adam Murimuth, 'Continuatio chronicarum', in *Adae Murimuth; Robertus de Avesbury*, ed. by Edward Maunde Thompson, RS, 93 (London: Eyre, 1889), pp. 3–276
Northampton St Andrew's *	*Northampton St Andrew's Chronicle* [unedited]
OCT	Oxford Classical Texts, or, Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis
OMT	Oxford Medieval Texts
Osney *	'Annales de Oseneia', in *Annales monastici*, ed. by Henry Richards Luard, RS, 36, 5 vols (London: Longman, 1864–69), IV, 3–352
Parallel Chronicle *	*Parallel Chronicle* [unedited]
Peterborough *	*Chronicon Angliae Petriburgense*, ed. by John A. Giles (London: Nutt, 1845)
Pipewell *	*Pipewell Chronicle* [unedited]
Prophetic LPB *	*Prophetic Latin Prose 'Brut'* [unedited]
Reading, *Chronicle* *	John of Reading, 'Chronicon, 1346–1367', in *Johannis de Reading et Anonymi Cantuariensis*, ed. by James Tait (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1914), pp. 99–186

RS	Rolls Series, or, The Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages
ShF	Société de l'histoire de France
Short ANPB *	*Short Anglo-Norman Prose Brut*: *Anonimalle Chronicle, 1307 to 1334, from Brotherton Collection MS 29*, ed. by Wendy R. Childs and John Taylor, Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Record Series, 147 (Leeds: Yorkshire Archaeological Society, 1991) [variant for 1307–34 only]
Short ANPB Continuation *	*Short Anglo-Norman Prose Brut Continuation to 1377* [unedited]
Tynemouth, *Historia* *	John of Tynemouth, *Historia aurea*: John of Tynemouth, 'De gestis regis Edwardi Tertii, et caeteris eventibus', in Walter of Guisborough, *Chronicon*, ed. by Hans Claude Hamilton, 2 vols (London: English Historical Society, 1848–49), II, 297–426 ['edn' in footnotes, variant for 1327–46 only]
Woburn *	*Woburn Chronicle* [unedited]
York Short Chronicle *	*York Short Chronicle* [unedited]

Notes

For persons from England or Scotland, the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*'s name forms are deferred to in most cases. English toponymic surnames are presented in their English forms (such as John of Reading, not Johannis de Reading), but occupational and other surnames are retained in their original forms (such as Geoffrey le Baker, not Geoffrey the Baker). Name and toponymic forms for continental persons are presented in their native forms (such as Philippe de Valois, not Philip of Valois), or those in which they would have preferred (such as Jean l'Aveugle, not John the Blind). The common English forms of saint and Church writer names are used. In the Appendix both toponymically and occupationally named writers are sorted by their second name (such as Avesbury, Robert of, and Le Bel, Jean).

I expand abbreviation marks in manuscripts and early editions within [brackets]. I silently expand 'æ' to 'ae' because in every case where I have checked this ligature is not found in manuscripts but is imposed by editors to 'classicise' the Latin. However, I leave standard Middle English characters (such as 'þ' and 'ȝ') unchanged because they are not editorial changes, but are found in their manuscripts, and it is convention to include them in critical editions (such as the Early English Text Society). I silently add punctuation to passages quoted from manuscripts and occasionally silently alter punctuation from printed primary sources.

Barring the rare occasion where I explicitly discuss printed translations their inaccuracies, all translations are my own. This allows me to sidestep problematic published translations and also to more clearly demonstrate reuse of text and ideas if the translations are consistent.[1] I attempt to use distinct translations for each word whenever possible to better illustrate the diversity or simplicity of narratives. I translate the problematic Latin word *miles* as 'man-at-arms' to best represent the ambiguous meaning of the word.[2]

---

[1] See for example pp. 132–34, 166 below.

[2] Although commonly translated as 'knight', the word might refer to a man's military function ('a mounted combatant'), his equipment ('a heavily armed warrior'), his training, experience, or higher social status: William M. Delehanty, '*Milites* in the Narrative Sources of England, 1135–1154' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, 1975), pp. 12–48; Michael Prestwich, *Armies and Warfare in the Middle Ages: The English Experience* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), pp. 12–18; Stephen Morillo, '*Milites*, Knights and Samurai: Military Terminology, Comparative History, and the Problem of Translation', in *The Normans and their Adversaries at War: Essays in Memory of C. Warren Hollister*, ed. by Richard Abels and Bernard S. Bachrach (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2001), pp. 167–84; John D. Hosler, *John of Salisbury: Military Authority of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), pp. 12–22.

Introduction

Into Tuskane he tournez, when þus wele tymede,
takes townnes full tyte with towrres full heghe.
Walles he welte down, wondyd knyghtez,
towrres he turnes and turmentez þe pople,
wroghte wedewes full wlonke, wrotherayle synges,
ofte wery and wepe and wryngen theire handis.
And all he wastys with werre thare he awaye rydez,
thaire welthes and theire wonny(n)ges wandrethe he wroghte.
Thus they spryngen and sprede and sparis bot lyttill,
spoylles dispetouslye and spillis theire vynes.[1]

The *Alliterative Morte Arthure* (*c.* 1400) shows, in stark and brutal detail, the destruction, violence, and victims of campaigns of devastation. This passage does not describe an enemy's raids, but King Arthur's campaign in Italy. It is peculiar that a literary text, ostensibly meant to praise the acts of Arthur and his knights as a parallel to contemporary warfare, includes these realistically violent and evidently cruel details instead of the standard chivalrous deeds of knights.[2] McGlynn highlights this and other passages with details of the less-savoury effects of war to show the period to be devoid of humanity.[3] Other scholars ask why such passages are emphasised in literary or more historical narratives instead of the typical jousts or single combats of such texts. They contextualise the *Alliterative Morte Arthure* with contemporary ideas of politics and war to argue that the text intentionally explores and sometimes criticises the ethics of English kingship, martial culture, and war.[4]

---

1 *The Alliterative Morte Arthure: A Critical Edition*, ed. by Valerie Krishna (New York: Franklin, 1976), lines 3150–60 (pp. 125–26).

2 See for example Margaret Adlum Gist, *Love and War in the Middle English Romances* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1947), pp. 155–90; Catherine Hanley, *War and Combat, 1150–1270: The Evidence from Old French Literature* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2003), pp. 163–225.

3 See for example Sean McGlynn, *By Sword and Fire: Cruelty and Atrocity in Medieval Warfare* (London: Weidenfeld, 2008), esp. pp. 141–253.

4 Williams Matthews, *The Tragedy of Arthur: A Study of the Alliterative 'Morte Arthure'* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960); Karl Heinz Göller, 'Reality versus Romance: A Reassessment of the Alliterative *Morte Arthur*', in *The Alliterative 'Morte Arthure': A Reassessment of the Poem*, ed. by Karl Heinz Göller (Cambridge: Brewer, 1981), pp. 15–29, 157–59; Göller, 'Arthurian Chivalry and War in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries: History and Fiction', in *Spätmittelalterliche Artusliteratur: Ein Symposion der neusprachlichen Philologien auf der Generalversammlung der Görres-Gesellschaft Bonn, 25.–29. September 1982*, ed. by Karl Heinz Göller (Paderborn:

Scholars attempt to resolve this sort of problematic representation through research on late fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century English literature. Such studies focus on the nuanced and layered writings of Geoffrey Chaucer (*c.* 1343–1400), John Gower (*c.* 1330–1408), Thomas Hoccleve (*c.* 1368–1426), and John Lydgate (*c.* 1370–*c.* 1451).[5] The most famous of these writers, Chaucer, describes the visualisation of war in the Temple of Mars in blunt and seemingly immoral terms in his 'Knight's Tale':

> Ther saugh I first the derke ymaginyng
> of Felonye, and al the compassyng:
> the crueel Ire, reed as any gleede,
> the pykepurs, and eek the pale Drede,
> the smylere with the knyf under the cloke,
> the shepne brennynge with the blake smoke,
> the tresoun of the mordrynge in the bedde,
> the open werre, with woundes al bibledde,
> contek, with blody knyf and sharp menace.
> Al ful of chirkyng was that sory place.[6]

This imagery is described in more explicitly negative language than that of the *Alliterative Morte Arthure*. Although these actions are not exclusive to military action, Chaucer makes them all an

---

Schöningh, 1984), pp. 53–68; Krista Sue-Lo Twu, 'The *Awntyrs off Arthure at the Terne Wathelyne*: Reliquary for Romance', *Arthurian Literature*, 20 (2003), 103–22; Dorsey Armstrong, 'Rewriting the Chronicle Tradition: The Alliterative *Morte Arthure* and Arthur's Sword of Peace', *Parergon*, 25 (2008), 81–101. See also Yuri Fuwa, 'A "Just War"? A Further Reassessment of the Alliterative *Morte Arthure*', in *War and Peace: Critical Issues in European Societies and Literature, 800–1800*, ed. by Albrecht Classen and Nadia Margolis (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), pp. 349–76; Michele Poellinger, 'Violence in Later Middle English Arthurian Romance' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Leeds, 2013), pp. 196–97.

5 Terry Jones, *Chaucer's Knight: The Portrait of a Medieval Mercenary*, 1st edn (London: Weidenfeld, 1980); William R. J. Barron, 'Knighthood on Trial: The Acid Test of Irony', *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 17 (1981), 181–97; Karl Heinz Göller, 'War and Peace in the Works of Chaucer and his Contemporaries', in *Die Geisteswissenschaften stellen sich vor*, ed. by Wolfram Krömer and Osmund Menghin (Innsbruck: Kommissionsverlag der Österreichischen Kommissionsbuchhandlung, 1983), pp. 213–22; Göller, 'War and Peace in the Middle English Romances and Chaucer', in *War and Peace in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Brian Patrick McGuire (København: Reitzel, 1987), pp. 118–45; Robert F. Yeager, '*Pax poetica*: On the Pacifism of Chaucer and Gower', *Studies in the Age of Chaucer*, 9 (1987), 97–121; T. Jones, *Chaucer's Knight: The Portrait of a Medieval Mercenary*, 2nd edn (London: Methuen, 1994); Nigel Saul, 'A Farewell to Arms? Criticism of Warfare in Late Fourteenth-Century England', in *Fourteenth-Century England II*, ed. by Chris Given-Wilson (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2002), pp. 131–45; David Wallace, 'Chaucer, Langland, and the Hundred Years' War', in *The Medieval Python: The Purposive and Provocative Work of Terry Jones*, ed. by Robert F. Yeager and Toshiyuki Takamiya (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), pp. 195–205. See also Dongchoon Lee, 'Church Reformers' Ideas of Warfare and Peace in Fourteenth-Century England: William Langland', *Medieval and Early Modern English Studies*, 14 (2006), 115–37; William A. Quinn, 'The "Silly" Pacifism of Geoffrey Chaucer and Terry Jones', in *The Medieval Python: The Purposive and Provocative Work of Terry Jones*, ed. by Robert F. Yeager and Toshiyuki Takamiya (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), pp. 167–79.

6 Geoffrey Chaucer, 'The Canterbury Tales, Fragment I (Group A)', in *The Riverside Chaucer*, ed. by Larry D. Benson, 3rd edn (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987), pp. 23–86, 795–853, 1118–25 (here lines 1995–2004, p. 52).

integral part of war. These scholars argue that these and other literary descriptions of knights and war reveal criticisms of the ideals of chivalry by showing them as unrealistic, self-contradictory, and immoral. They assume that these attitudes arise from a growing disenchantment in late fourteenth-century England with the long-lasting wars against France and Scotland, which demanded extensive taxation but offered few tenable gains for the country as a whole.[7] They argue that these writers' ideas developed into an anti-war pacifism in this period of relative peace, and for clear evidence point to poems by Gower (*c.* 1400) and Lydgate (1422–43) that praise peace and condemn war.[8] Others, drawing on similar lines of thought, assume that during Edward III's reign (1327–77) writers did not care about the ethics of war because England was rarely defeated by their enemies.[9]

Cultural historians and interdisciplinary medievalists have criticised these interpretations of problematic descriptions of war on the grounds that they ignore context.[10] They rightly point out that the passages used as evidence of pacifism and condemnation of chivalry are limited to the canon of English literature that was written over a short period of time and not representative. Such texts typically relate to historical or legendary settings with added layers of meaning that obscure the writer's attitude. These scholars argue that many of the claimed contradictions of chivalry are unfairly constructed by scholars by comparison of different genres and audiences to support their own biased attitudes towards war and violence. Equally, they argue that these scholars' arguments ignore the medieval intellectual context to read modern

---

7 John Barnie, *War in Medieval Society: Social Values and the Hundred Years War, 1337–99* (London: Weidenfeld, 1974), pp. 127–38; Christopher Allmand, *The Hundred Years War: England and France at War, c. 1300–c. 1450*, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 130–32, 153–55; Saul, 'Farewell to Arms'.

8 John Gower, 'To King Henry the Fourth, in Praise of Peace', in *English Works*, ed. by George C. Macaulay, EETSes, 81–82, 2 vols (London: Paul, 1900–01), II, 481–92, 550–54; John Lydgate, 'A Praise of Peace', in *Minor Poems*, ed. by Henry MacCracken and Merriam Sherwood, EETSos, 107, 192, 2 vols (London: Oxford University Press, 1911–34), II, 785–91. See also Sara V. Torres, '"In Praise of Peace" in Late Medieval England', in *Representing War and Violence, 1250–1600*, ed. by Joanna Bellis and Laura Slater (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2016), pp. 95–115.

9 Christopher Allmand, 'The War and the Non-Combatant', in *The Hundred Years War*, ed. by Kenneth Fowler (London: Macmillan, 1971), pp. 163–83; Joanna Bellis, '"The reader myghte lamente": The Sieges of Calais (1346) and Rouen (1418) in Chronicle, Poem and Play', in *War and Literature*, ed. by Laura Ashe and Ian Patterson (Woodbridge: Brewer, 2014), pp. 84–106 (here 96, claims that only many years later would writers ask ethical questions); Rory Cox, *John Wyclif on War and Peace* (London: Royal Historical Society, 2014), p. 13.

10 Maurice Keen, 'Chaucer's Knight, the English Aristocracy and the Crusade', in *English Court Culture in the Later Middle Ages: Papers from the Colston Research Society Symposium, Bristol University, 1981*, ed. by Vincent J. Scattergood and James W. Sherborne (London: Duckworth, 1983), pp. 45–61; Elizabeth Porter, 'Chaucer's Knight, the Alliterative *Morte Arthure*, and the Medieval Laws of War: A Reconsideration', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 27 (1983), 56–78; Keen, 'Chaucer and Chivalry Revisited', in *Armies, Chivalry and Warfare in Medieval Britain and France: Proceedings of the 1995 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. by Matthew Strickland (Stamford: Watkins, 1998), pp. 1–12; Derek Brewer, 'Understanding Chivalry in Earlier English Literature', in *Rethinking Middle English: Linguistic and Literary Approaches*, ed. by Nikolaus Ritt and Herbert Schendl (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2005), pp. 1–16; Stephen H. Rigby, *Wisdom and Chivalry: Chaucer's 'Knight's Tale' and Medieval Political Theory* (Leiden: Brill, 2009). See also Keith Haines, 'Attitudes and Impediments to Pacifism in Medieval Europe', *Journal of Medieval History*, 7 (1981), 369–88.

pacifist ideals into layered and complicated descriptions. They show that much of this sort of unsavoury behaviour is actually pragmatic and necessary to pre-modern warfare, and argue that such actions were therefore accepted and even praised by medieval writers as a means to an end. They often point to theoretical frameworks of divine will, national identity, and just war (*ius ad bellum*) that precluded medieval writers from considering the ethics of military actions at all.[11] Scholars of chivalry sometimes side-step the problem of attacks on civilians and other unsavoury aspects of war by focusing on how chivalry as an ideal was unconcerned with lesser members of society who made up the bulk of the civilian population.[12]

Recent discussions of medieval attitudes to war rely on these earlier studies and offer no decisive methods to understand problematic descriptions of military action.[13] They only consider medieval attitudes to war, as a whole rather than to its parts, that was evaluated as either good or bad, with no possibility for more nuanced positions. Lowe argues that English dissatisfaction with war originated in the Middle Ages and developed into 'true' pacifism only in the early modern period, but does not provide any convincing supporting evidence.[14] Cox likewise draws on these simplified ideas and assumes that medieval thinkers could either entirely accept or be completely against warfare.[15] He brings together ideas from texts written by the English thinker John Wyclif (d. 1384) in Latin, English, and French, in several genres, across several decades, with varied rhetorical intentions, for varied audiences, conflates crusade and secular war, and unsurprisingly concludes that Wyclif held inconsistent attitudes towards war.[16] Cox argues that Wyclif intentionally set out his contradictory conditions for just war to subtly show to his readers that war could never be just and was thus always immoral.

Scholars who argue against medieval pacifism present their case in equally simplified and decontextualised terms. Some set English writings against the more explicit and seemingly heartfelt criticisms in French texts to suggest that the English were not truly opposed to war.[17]

---

[11] See pp. 37–77 below.

[12] See for example Richard W. Kaeuper, 'Medieval Warfare: Representation Then and Now', in *Representing War and Violence, 1250–1600*, ed. by Joanna Bellis and Laura Slater (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2016), pp. 23–38 (here 24): asks 'whether it matters that such wanton destruction was common medieval practice'?

[13] For a synthesis of these studies see Albrecht Classen, 'Introduction', in *War and Peace: Critical Issues in European Societies and Literature, 800–1800*, ed. by Albrecht Classen and Nadia Margolis (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), pp. 1–78.

[14] Ben Lowe, *Imagining Peace: A History of Early English Pacifist Ideas* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997), esp. pp. 13–146.

[15] Cox, *John Wyclif*. See also Josiah Leeds, *Wiclif's Anti-War Views*, 2nd edn (London: Friends Tract Association, 1902); Roland H. Bainton, *Christian Attitudes toward War and Peace: A Historical Survey and Critical Re-Evaluation* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1960), p. 119; Haines, 'Attitudes and Impediments', p. 370.

[16] See also Trevor Russell Smith, 'Review of: Rory Cox, *John Wyclif on War and Peace* (London: Royal Historical Society, 2014)', *De re militari*, 2015 <deremilitari.org/2015/10/rory-cox-john-wyclif-on-war-and-peace-smith>.

[17] Allmand, 'The War and the Non-Combatant', pp. 177–79; Kate L. Forhan, 'Poets and Politics: Just War in Geoffrey

Other scholars point to the specific details mentioned by writers that they claim can only result from support of war. Pratt argues that Chaucer would only have employed his seemingly realistic military terminology if he were keenly interested in and in favour of war.[18] However, he unfairly amalgamates Chaucer's texts with ideas from other writers to portray him as a more militaristic writer. Medieval writers, even military men, do not consistently describe war in any of the detail or specifically varied terminology in their prose texts, as Pratt presumes they should.[19] Varied terminology in poetry is more likely to have resulted from the demands of metre than any keen support, and in any case it would have been difficult to describe military equipment as unrealistic.[20]

Studies of medieval ethics of war generally reach unconvincing conclusions because of how they establish and approach their limited body of sources. Recent studies on history writing and rhetoric ignore national identity, propaganda, and the ethics of war almost entirely.[21] Studies of violence and war in narratives rarely consider those written in contemporary and real settings, and do not relate their fantastical narratives to real action.[22] Recent examinations of non-literary violence, especially in civic or judicial contexts, tend to side-step the difficult issue of attitudes and representations, and therefore offer few ideas or transferrable methodologies for the present study.[23] Only a few comparative studies have been undertaken, and these cover

---

Chaucer and Christine de Pizan', in *Ethics, Nationalism, and Just War: Medieval and Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. by Henrik Syse and Gregory M. Reichberg (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2007), pp. 99–116; Diana B. Tyson, 'Aspects of War in Medieval French Occasional Verse', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 59 (2015), 49–76 (here 69). See also Helen Cooper, 'Speaking for the Victim', in *Writing War: Medieval Literary Responses to Warfare*, ed. by Corinne J. Saunders, Françoise Le Saux, and Neil Thomas (Cambridge: Brewer, 2004), pp. 213–31; Françoise Le Saux, 'War and Knighthood in Christine de Pizan's *Livre des faits d'armes et de chevallerie*', in *Writing War: Medieval Literary Responses to Warfare*, ed. by Corinne J. Saunders, Françoise Le Saux, and Neil Thomas (Cambridge: Brewer, 2004), pp. 93–105.

18 John H. Pratt, *Chaucer and War* (Lanham: University Press of America, 2000).

19 See pp. 139–41 below.

20 See the seemingly realistic portrayal of siege warfare and equipment in romance: Malcolm Hebron, *The Medieval Siege: Theme and Image in Middle English Romance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).

21 See for example Matthew Kempshall, *Rhetoric and the Writing of History, 400–1500* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011).

22 See for example Raymond Cormier, 'Brutality and Violence in Medieval French Romance and its Consequences', in *Violence in Medieval Courtly Literature: A Casebook*, ed. by Albrecht Classen (New York: Routledge, 2004), pp. 65–79; Siegfried Christoph, 'Violence Stylized', in *Violence in Medieval Courtly Literature: A Casebook*, ed. by Albrecht Classen (New York: Routledge, 2004), pp. 110–19; Jean Jost, 'Why is Middle English Romance so Violent? The Literary and Aesthetic Purposes of Violence', in *Violence in Medieval Courtly Literature: A Casebook*, ed. by Albrecht Classen (New York: Routledge, 2004), pp. 223–47; Kevin S. Whetter, 'Warfare and Combat in *Le Morte Darthur*', in *Writing War: Medieval Literary Responses to Warfare*, ed. by Corinne J. Saunders, Françoise Le Saux, and Neil Thomas (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004), pp. 169–86; Helen L. M. Neat, 'Depictions of Violence in *Floriant et Florete*: Inter- and Intratextual Patterns', in *Battle and Bloodshed: The Medieval World at War*, ed. by Lorna Bleach and Keira Borrill (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013), pp. 177–97; Anne Baden-Daintree, 'Visualising War: The Aesthetics of Violence in the Alliterative *Morte Arthure*', in *Representing War and Violence, 1250–1600*, ed. by Joanna Bellis and Laura Slater (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2016), pp. 56–75.

23 See for example Helen Lacey, 'Protection and Immunity in Later Medieval England', in *Peace and Protection in the*

either a large span of time or many countries.[24] Because none of these consider a comprehensive body of sources it is impossible to know whether these texts are representative or merely those that support preconceived or exceptional arguments. Some scholars claim that it is only necessary to check whether actions exceed the threshold of acceptability to understand how writers would evaluate them, but do not offer any guidance on how this test might be accurately established.[25] Indeed, most studies of writings about war are more concerned with how they portray the reality of war than with their attitudes to violence, even though these surely affect how texts depict reality.[26] Recent studies on texts dealing with the moral issues of war and violence artificially restrict their scope to medieval sources written in the vernacular, especially English, but offer no reasonable justification for doing so.[27] These studies are mostly limited to poems and other literature because few chronicles on contemporary events were written in English in this period. Indeed, the only major chronicle on contemporary events written in English during the fourteenth century is the *Middle English Prose Brut* (to 1333 and continued to 1377), but it was written after the reign of Edward III.[28] Although these scholars offer close readings, they do not compare the *Brut* with the Anglo-Norman and Latin texts that it often translates from, or even with the vast body of non-English narratives that it was surely inspired by. The artificially limited selection of sources examined in these studies prevents any proper understanding of the meaning of details, rhetorical turns, or, least of all, attitudes towards war.[29]

Middle Ages, ed. by Thomas B. Lambert and David Rollason (Durham: Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, Durham University, 2009), pp. 78–96; Hannah Skoda, *Medieval Violence: Physical Brutality in Northern France, 1270–1330* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), esp. pp. 1–49 (on the difficulties of understanding violence from her body of sources). See also Guy Halsall, 'Violence and Society in the Early Medieval West: An Introductory Survey', in *Violence and Society in the Early Medieval West*, ed. by Guy Halsall (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1998), pp. 1–45.

[24] Christopher Allmand, 'Some Writers and the Theme of War in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries', in *Krieg im Mittelalter*, ed. by Hans-Henning Kortüm (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2001), pp. 167–80; Corinne J. Saunders, 'Medieval Warfare', in *The Cambridge Companion to War Writing*, ed. by Kate McLoughlin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 83–97; Warren Brown, *Violence in Medieval Europe* (Harlow: Longman, 2011), pp. 1–30, 255–87; Kaeuper, 'Medieval Warfare'.

[25] Matthew Strickland, *War and Chivalry: The Conduct and Perception of War in England and Normandy, 1066–1217* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 303–04; Daniel Baraz, *Medieval Cruelty: Changing Perceptions, Late Antiquity to the Early Modern Period* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003), pp. 6–8; Baraz, 'Violence or Cruelty? An Intercultural Perspective', in *'A Great Effusion of Blood'? Interpreting Medieval Violence*, ed. by Mark D. Meyerson, Daniel Thiery, and Oren Falk (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), pp. 164–89.

[26] See the many studies discussed at pp. 13–23 below.

[27] Ardis Butterfield, *The Familiar Enemy: Chaucer, Language, and Nation in the Hundred Years War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), p. xxiv: 'An even longer and better book would bring Latin properly into the picture as well, since in a sense this is the most important linguistic perspective of all'; Joanna Bellis, *The Hundred Years War in Literature, 1377–1600* (Woodbridge: Brewer, 2016). See also Trevor Russell Smith, 'Review of: Joanna Bellis, *The Hundred Years War in Literature, 1377–1600* (Woodbridge: Brewer, 2016)', *De re militari*, 2017 <deremilitari.org/2017/12/joanna-bellis-the-hundred-years-war-in-literature-1337-1600-smith>.

[28] See pp. 43 n. 39, 43–44 n. 40 below.

[29] See also the oft-cited collection of essays that ignores Latin entirely in favour of the vernacular literary canon of

In summary, writings of the later Middle Ages present complicated and problematic descriptions of warfare that do not easily allow us to understand their ethical understanding of military action or war as a whole. Despite the importance of these problems, little progress has been made in resolving them. In 2016, three years after work on this thesis began, Kaeuper declared the value of a comprehensive and nuanced study to understand late medieval attitudes to war.[30] I aim to provide such a study here. This thesis seeks to better understand medieval ethics of war through a close and comprehensive examination of all historical literature written over a long but manageable period of time.[31] It investigates texts written in England written during the reign of Edward III, during which the English enjoyed great military success and supposedly had little reason to reflect on the ethics of their actions. The corpus includes the chronicle of Jean le Bel (from Liège in the Low Countries) because he was in England for some time and ostensibly wrote his chronicle for an English audience. These writings have varying attitudes and are presented in many styles that demand careful attention. People from different places in England, including Monks, clerks, 'seculars' attached to the government, and possibly even poets following armies, all wrote about contemporary events. Attitudes are not monolithic but vary greatly within these 'groups' of writers. In most cases, we know nothing of who wrote any given text, except what can be seen in the narrative's interests and details, because writers rarely named themselves.[32] Some, such as Ranulf Higden and Thomas Gray, even hid their names in acrostics or other textual puzzles out of humility or sometimes, when espousing contentious political views, to avoid punishment.[33] Attempts to identify either the place a text was written or the

---

England and France: Denise N. Baker, ed., *Inscribing the Hundred Years' War in French and English Cultures* (New York: State University of New York Press, 2000).

30 Richard W. Kaeuper, *Medieval Chivalry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), p. 180: 'Scholars would give much to possess a survey on attitudes to war and its practices at the time, with standard Likert scales, boxes all ticked, rating actions in warfare and likely consequences worldly or otherworldly'.

31 I defer to the term used by Kingsford and Taylor to encompass these related genres: Charles Kingsford, *English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913); John Taylor, *English Historical Literature in the Fourteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), p. 1: 'The historical literature of fourteenth-century England consists principally of the chronicles, the letter collections, and the political poems of the period'.

32 Chris Given-Wilson, *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England* (London: Hambledon, 2004), pp. 147–52; Alastair Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*, 2nd edn (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010); Atle Kittang, 'Authors, Authorship, and Work: A Brief Theoretical Survey', in *Modes of Authorship in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Slavica Ranković (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2012), pp. 17–29. See also Cristian Bratu, '"Je, aucteur de ce livre": Authorial Persona and Authority in French Medieval Histories and Chronicles', in *Authorities in the Middle Ages: Influence, Legitimacy, and Power in Medieval Society*, ed. by Sini Kangas, Mia Korpiola, and Tuija Ainonen (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013), pp. 183–204.

33 The first letter of each chapter of the first book spell out a message proclaiming authorship in Higden, *Polychronicon*: 'presentem cronicam conpilavit frater Ranulphus Cestrensis monachus'; a puzzle poem is included in the prologue to Gray, *Scalacronica*, pp. 2–4 (here 2): 'soit .viii. ioynt apres .xix. / si mettez .xii. apres .xiiii. / vn et .xviii. encountrez, / soun propre noun ensauerez / .vii. a .xvii. y mettez, / le primer vowel au tierce aioignez, / soun droit surnoun entrouerez, / solunc lalphabet'. See also Vivian H. Galbraith, 'An Autograph MS of Ranulph Higden's *Polychronicon*',

affiliation of its writer (such as which religious order he belonged to) are mostly conjecture based on disparate and inconsistent evidence.[34] Therefore, with few exceptions it is impossible to connect people in the historical record with the writers of historical literature. It is dangerous to try to glean additional significance from these partial contextualisations, as any firm position will skew how the text is read and what its details are meant to signify.[35]

This study investigates texts written in all three of England's languages (Latin, Anglo-Norman, and English) because writers typically read and wrote in all of them.[36] The longer historical narratives that are variously, and sometimes erroneously, labelled chronicles, histories, and annals are the primary focus of the study because of their rich and layered narratives, but also because they are rarely considered for this purpose.[37] Other types of historical literature are occasionally used, including letters and newsletters, political treatises, sermons, and poems on contemporary events, some of which were used by or inspired chroniclers. Writings that are unconcerned with war or national events are silently ignored. Texts (or sections of texts) that cover events in 'fictional' settings, or those before 1327, are not considered so that the investigation can focus on attitudes towards contemporary events without having to navigate the many additional layers of these other settings.[38] Similarly, these sources are not compared to details of what happened, established through meticulous examination of 'record' sources, as there is little proof that writers had a detailed knowledge of events in the form that we do.[39] It would be unsound

---

Huntington Library Quarterly, 23 (1959), 1–18 (here 4–5); Barnie, *War in Medieval Society*, pp. 142–45; Antonia Gransden, 'Silent Meanings in Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon* and in Thomas Elmham's *Liber Metricus de Henrico Quinto*', *Medium Ævum*, 46 (1977), 231–40; Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, pp. 147–50, 209–10.

[34] See for example the debate on whether *Lanercost* was written by an Augustinian at Lanercost Priory or a Minorite of Carlisle in the Appendix at p. 252 below.

[35] See for example attempts to identify the English poet Lawrence Minot: Samuel Moore, 'Lawrence Minot', *Modern Language Notes*, 35 (1920), 78–81; Minot, *Poems*, pp. x–xiii; Anthony S. G. Edwards, 'The Authorship of the Poems of Laurence Minot: A Reconsideration', *Florilegium*, 23 (2006), 145–53. For a summary of the varied debates see Laurence Minot, *Poems, 1333–1352*, ed. by Richard H. Osberg (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University, 1996), pp. 3–8.

[36] See pp. 64–65, 76–77 below.

[37] For all these texts I provide brief summaries of their writers, audience, style, coverage, and general narrative objectives, along with references to key scholarship and comprehensive manuscript lists in the Appendix at pp. 205–65 below. The only chronicle to receive any sustained attention for its attitudes to war is by the Hainaulter Jean Froissart, written in the late fourteenth century. See for example Kristel Mari Skorge, 'Ideals and Values in Jean Froissart's *Chroniques*' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Bergen, 2006), pp. 68–123.

[38] The most prominent narratives of non-contemporary events written 1327–77 are Thomas Castleford, *Chronicle, or the Boke of Brut*, ed. by Caroline D. Eckhardt, EETSos, 305–06, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996); Robert Mannyng, *Chronicle*, ed. by Idelle Sullens (Binghamton: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1996); Nicholas Trevet, 'The Anglo-Norman Chronicle: Text, with Historical, Philological and Literary Study', ed. by Alexander Rutherford (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of London, Birkbeck, 1932), a critical edition of which is under preparation by Heather Pagan and Geert De Wilde.

[39] For a study of the political and rhetorical significance of these records see Andrea Ruddick, *English Identity and Political Culture in the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013). See also the problematic comparison of a narrative source to reality, which is here derived from chronicles: Laurence Minot, 'Poems', ed. by

to read deviations from historic fact as intentional changes that might have simply resulted from poor knowledge. The few instances when the investigation strays beyond these limits, such as some important passages from the *Chronicles* of Jean Froissart (1337–*c*. 1404), are explicitly stated and qualified.[40]

Chapter One provides a conservative overview of how war was conducted during the reign of Edward III. I first provide an overview of the reality of war based not on the narrative sources that military historians commonly rely upon, but on record sources only, unless otherwise stated. I engage with the problems of using different types of sources to understand the intricacies of war. I show that we have only a limited understanding of many aspects of fourteenth-century warfare. I demonstrate that the elements of war that are not well-understood or described by record sources, and are widely debated amongst narrative writers, are those that had the greatest potential to affect the moral evaluation of war. I argue that these sources need to be treated as narrative texts that require nuanced and careful readings, rather than as objective presentations of reality that can be mined for 'facts'. I show the need to properly consider the classical texts, biblical stories, and medieval theoretical texts that were commonly read by writers

---

[40] Carolyn P. Collette (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 1971), pp. xxxvii–lxvii. Froissart's *Chronicles* survives in several major recensions, including 'A' (1381), 'Amiens' (1384–91), 'N' (1384–91, after 'Amiens'), 'B' (1391–99, probably 1391), 'C' (1395–99), and 'Rome' (completely rewritten, 1404–15). Each of the above versions is in one way or another related to those that precede them. For the development and composition dates of these versions see: Godfried Croenen, 'La Guerre en Normandie au XIV^{e} siècle et le problème de l'évolution textuelle des *Chroniques* de Jean Froissart', in *La Guerre en Normandie, XI^{e}–XV^{e} siècles*, ed. by Anne Curry (Caen: Presses Universitaires de Caen, 2018 forthcoming). For Book 1 MSS (with additions, corrections, and identification of recensions, many of which are thanks to the generous help of Godfried Croenen) see Alberto Varvaro, 'Il Libro I delle *Chroniques* de Jean Froissart: Per una filologia integrata dei testi e delle immagini', *Medioevo romanzo*, 19 (1994), 3–36: 'A' in 47 MSS (according to Varvaro's sigils: Ant [now MS M 15.4], Arr [now MS 1063], Bes, Bre, B88, B25, B51, Car, Cha [now MSS 873–874], Gla [now MS Hunter 42], H25, Le1, L58, L67 [heavily mutilated, Godfried Croenen and I have identified a leaf from this MS added to *Eulogium*, MS 3 as fol. 3; another added to London, British Library, MS Claudius B VI, as fol. 3; and many leaves bound in Higden, *Polychronicon*, MS 76 as fols 306^{r}–313^{r}], LR2–3, NY4, Oxf, P04, P40, P41, P42, P43, P47, P49, P51, P55, P57, P62, P63, P65–7, P71, P74, P75, P77, P86, P474, P486, PA7, R26, Rom, Sto, T41, Tou, X [most recently sold in lot 549, Gros & Delettrez, 2011], Y [now Austin, Harry Ransom Center, MS 48], and add: Cambridge [Mass.], Harvard University Houghton Library, MS Fr. 152; Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Institut, MS 326), 'Amiens' in 1 MS (Ami), 'N' in 1 MS (add: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 10144), 'B' in 5 MSS (P06, P13, P356–7, P477–9, and add: Kortrijk, Stadsbibliotheek, Codex 329), 'C' in 1 MS (Chi), 'Rome' in 1 MS (R69), 'Valenciennes' in 1 MS (Val), non-authorial abridgments in 8 MSS (B86, Ber, Bra [mistakenly repeated as W], P05, PA9, and add: *Short ANPB*, MS 23, fols 119^{r}–202^{r}; Bruxelles, Bibliothèque royale, MS 6943; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 24038), and incorrectly attributed to Froissart in 1 MS (Tux). Scholars have yet to produce a satisfactory list of Book 2 MSS and it is beyond the scope of this thesis to do so here, but for Book 3 MSS see Croenen, for Book 4 MSS see Varvaro, and for transcriptions of many MSS (mostly partial, but the most important witnesses are transcribed in full) and current scholarship see *Online Froissart*: Croenen, 'La Tradition manuscrite du troisième livre des *Chroniques* de Froissart', in *Froissart à la cour de Béarn: L'Écrivain, les arts et le pouvoir*, ed. by Valérie Fasseur (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009), pp. 15–59; Alberto Varvaro, 'Problèmes philologiques du Livre IV des *Chroniques* de Jean Froissart', in *Patrons, Authors and Workshops: Books and Book Production in Paris around 1400*, ed. by Godfried Croenen and Peter Ainsworth (Louvain: Peeters, 2006), pp. 255–77; Varvaro, *La Tragédie de l'histoire: La Dernière œvre de Jean Froissart*, trans. by Amélie Hanus (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2011), pp. 173–78; *The Online Froissart*, ed. by Peter Ainsworth and Godfried Croenen, v. 1.5 (Sheffield: HRIOnline, 2013) <hrionline.ac.uk/onlinefroissart>.

of such historical literature as their intertextual context. Here and throughout the thesis I pay careful attention to literary tropes and allusions that are often ignored by scholars because of their colourful nature and detracting from any 'objectivity', but are important for how they modify the ethical meaning of events that they are attached to.

Chapter Two examines the intellectual frameworks that are often claimed to prevent medieval writers from questioning the ethics of war. I show that these ideas are not fully accepted to such extreme conclusions that they would make all war inherently justified and beyond censure. I argue that writers use notions of divine will, national identity, and just war in a rhetorical sense to amplify English victories or praise the suffering endured in their defeat.

Chapter Three argues against the common assumption that there was no concept of civilian immunity in the Middle Ages. Through careful analysis of legal and narrative sources I show that the idea of civilian distinction, rather than the widely used but problematic 'non-combatant' status, developed in response to the destructive and violent conduct of war in high-medieval France and was later eagerly appropriated by English writers. I argue that the often nuanced descriptions of attacks on civilians in fourteenth-century English sources reveal a sensitivity to the ethical problems of attacks against people who were not involved in war, regardless of whether they were English, French, or Scottish.

Chapter Four demonstrates that the varying descriptions of military leaders' intentions and objectives for campaigns do not reflect the reality of war, as is commonly believed, but are instead rhetorical strategies that reveal ethical concerns. The English are shown to only want to do battle with the enemy so that they can end war, while the enemy, conversely, seek to destroy England, its people, and its language in something approaching genocide, but avoid battle whenever possible. Armies of all affiliation attacked civilians on a daily basis, but are evaluated differently because of their supposedly different intentions. I argue that writers are aware of these problems and portray the English in the best light so that they appear to be only defending themselves against cruel enemies, in order to side-step the moral problems of devastation and attacks on civilians.

Chapter Five examines the careful descriptions of violent actions and combatant suffering. I argue that the explicit portrayal of violence is rare and typically devoid of human victims so that writers can focus on the more abstract elements of feats of arms. Suffering, on the other hand, is shown to be entirely positive when endured by the English, typically in imitation of Christ's asceticism. I examine the difficulty writers had reconciling these two understandings,

and show how they alter agency and perspective to best allow the English to be praised and the enemy to be criticised.

Chapter Six considers the tensions between the desire to kill the enemy and the need to offer mercy and restraint when the enemy surrenders. I argue that varied depictions of compliance with, or disregard of these conventions are used to praise the English and condemn the enemy. Added details and context allow an act to be depicted in either way, even though all forces alternated between mercy and harsh treatment of the enemy, sometimes seemingly at random. I show how the English carefully did away with some of their most despised enemies through carefully portraying them as traitors or rebels, but loudly complained about the French and Scots treating their own men harshly.

In my Conclusions I bring together the many strands examined throughout my thesis to show that during Edward III's reign there was a keen awareness of the ethical problems of war amongst English writers. The common-place attacks on civilians, rather than combatants, were not blindly accepted and praised, as is widely believed. English writers sought to portray their leaders' campaigns as more ordered and sanitised than those of their enemies. I stress the importance of reading these texts as rhetorical narratives rather than objective reports. I offer a brief reassessment of the problematic descriptions of warfare in late medieval English literature that I began my thesis with.

My examination of rhetorical strategies, and the varied moral understanding of violent acts, in English historical literature will better allow us to understand attitudes to war and warfare in the Middle Ages. I show that medieval writers did not treat war as a single act or event, but they instead saw its constituent actions in a more nuanced fashion that depended on varied context and details. I argue that English writers were sensitive to the ethical problems of warfare, as can be clearly seen through their contrasting descriptions of acts done by the English and their enemies. They do not abstract war down to a singular event or state that is viewed as either 'good' or 'bad', as studies of the ethics of war frequently assume. Their attitudes are more nuanced and varied than previous studies may have assumed, and although they rarely explicitly condemn the actions of Edward III's campaigns, their careful descriptions reveal anxieties over the moral implications of warfare's bloody results.

CHAPTER ONE:
EPISTEMOLOGY AND WRITING WAR

How battles and other events are reconstructed by scholars impacts how the actions within them are understood within the framework of expected conventions. Intention and motivation similarly affect how one understands the ethical value of particular actions, but are only discussed in narrative sources, which, as I argue, require careful investigation. I consider how attempts to better understand how and why acts happened within devastation, sieges, and battles are inherently problematic, given the nature of our evidence, and affect how we read narratives that describe them. I examine the problems that narrative sources and manuals present as sources for understanding the uncertain aspects of war, despite their common use by scholars. In the process, I show the various ways that medieval writers of historical literature constructed their texts from the sources available to them, as well as their own imagination. I argue that medieval writers were more concerned with presenting to their audiences exemplary stories and allusive rhetorical descriptions of events to engage with the ethics of war, rather than listing objective facts or recreating reality.

1. THE REALITY OF WAR

The enterprise of warfare was well-developed and organised in fourteenth-century England. Military leaders raised large armies that could effectively campaign against their enemies. Administrators stockpiled arms, bows, arrows, siege engines, and other items for campaigns in key locations, such as the Tower of London.[1] Armies were carefully recruited and varied in size depending on what was needed and who might be available to participate. Muster rolls and other nominal records survive for English campaigns from 1369 and later that offer a reasonably accurate picture of the composition and recruitment of each army.[2] The only earlier muster roll is that for the 1345–46 campaign of Henry of Grosmont (*c.* 1310–61), duke of Lancaster, but it does not cover the large contingent of allied forces within it, and only scattered information,

---

[1] Herbert J. Hewitt, *The Organization of War under Edward III, 1338–62* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1966), pp. 50–74; Thom Richardson, *The Tower Armoury in the Fourteenth Century* (Leeds: Royal Armouries, 2016).

[2] Adrian R. Bell and others, *The Soldier in Later Medieval England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), esp. pp. 7–22, 216–74 (also see sources cited), summary table of 1369–1453 armies at 260–74. See also James W. Sherborne, 'Indentured Retinues and English Expeditions to France, 1369–1380', *English Historical Review*, 79 (1964), 718–46.

primarily drawn from pay records and letters of protection and pardon, survives for some earlier campaigns and their armies.[3] Although records survive for English armies only occasionally, and then mostly partially, before 1369, they suggest a decline in the proportion of knights and men-at-arms to archers and other combatants.[4] The increasing costs of outfitting men-at-arms surely contributed to this change, but it is unknown whether leaders actually wanted more archers in their armies or just made do with what they could.[5] Leaders were at the mercy of sometimes fluid 'military communities' because no large standing armies were kept until the seventeenth century.[6] These groups of men often fought together through many campaigns and their experience and cohesion surely contributed to Edward III's success. English armies had a sense of expertise and professionalism, especially as opposed to collections of individually trained warriors.[7] Despite medieval and modern attempts to blame the unsavoury aspects of war on non-knightly combatants, especially archers, the records of army composition suggest this was not the case.[8]

---

3 David Simpkin, *The English Aristocracy at War: From the Welsh Wars of Edward I to the Battle of Bannockburn* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008), for 1277–1314; Ranald Nicholson, *Edward III and the Scots: The Formative Years of a Military Career, 1327–1335* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), pp. 245–47 (1334–35, Scotland), 248–54 (1335, Scotland), 255 (1335, Ireland); Andrew Ayton, *Knights and Warhorses: Military Service and the English Aristocracy under Edward III* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1994), pp. 93 (1322, Scotland), 257 (1336, Scotland), 258–64 (1342–43, Brittany), 265–71 (1359–60, Rheims); Nicholas A. Gribit, *Henry of Lancaster's Expedition to Aquitaine, 1345–46: Military Service and Professionalism in the Hundred Years War* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2016), pp. 23–74 (1345–46, Aquitaine); Ayton, 'The English Army at Crécy', in *The Battle of Crécy, 1346*, ed. by Andrew Ayton and Philip Preston (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005), pp. 159–251 (1346–47, Normandy).

4 Andrew Ayton, 'English Armies in the Fourteenth Century', in *Arms, Armies and Fortifications in the Hundred Years War*, ed. by Anne Curry and Michael Hughes (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1994), pp. 21–38. Records do not survive for Scottish armies, and only irregularly for French armies: Philippe Contamine, *Guerre, état et société à la fin du Moyen Âge: Études sur les armées des rois de France, 1337–1494* (Paris: Mouton, 1972), esp. pp. 3–131.

5 Ayton, *Knights and Warhorses*, pp. 224–29; Andrew Ayton, 'Arms, Armour, and Horses', in *Medieval Warfare: A History*, ed. by Maurice Keen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 186–208; Bell and others, *Soldier in Later Medieval England*, pp. 59–72.

6 Andrew Ayton, 'Armies and Military Communities in Fourteenth-Century England', in *Soldiers, Nobles and Gentlemen: Essays in Honour of Maurice Keen*, ed. by Peter Coss and Christopher Tyerman (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2009), pp. 215–39. On the development of professional standing armies see Malcolm Vale, *War and Chivalry: Warfare and Aristocratic Culture in England, France and Burgundy at the End of the Middle Ages* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1981), pp. 147–69; Bert S. Hall, *Weapons and Warfare in Renaissance Europe: Gunpowder, Technology, and Tactics* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), esp. pp. 201–35, 259–63; Philippe Contamine, *La Guerre au Moyen Âge*, 6th edn (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2003), pp. 296–306; David Parrott, 'From Military Enterprise to Standing Armies: War, State, and Society in Western Europe, 1600–1700', in *European Warfare, 1350–1750*, ed. by Frank Tallett and David J. B. Trim (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 74–95.

7 On the tensions between individualism and collectivism in war see Strickland, *War and Chivalry*, pp. 113–17; Trevor Russell Smith, 'Warfare in Jean Froissart's *Chroniques*: Representation and Realism' (unpublished master's thesis, University of York, 2010), pp. 32–33, 46–51; Craig Taylor, 'Military Courage and Fear in the Late Medieval French Chivalric Imagination', *Cahiers de recherches medievales et humanistes*, 24 (2012), 129–47 (here 134–35, 142).

8 See Nicholas A. R. Wright, '"Pillagers" and "Brigands" in the Hundred Years War', *Journal of Medieval History*, 9 (1983), 15–24; Maurice Keen, *Chivalry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984), p. 233; Prestwich, *Armies and Warfare*, pp. 242–43; Strickland, *War and Chivalry*, pp. 325–26; N. A. R. Wright, *Knights and Peasants: The Hundred Years War in the French Countryside* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1998), pp. 25, 49–50, 116; Craig Taylor, *Chivalry and the Ideals of Knighthood in France during the Hundred Years War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), p. 227;

Once armies left England to campaign in enemy territory the sources become more scattered and less reliable but offer a general picture. Armies campaigning in Scotland typically marched north, and those fighting overseas gathered on the coast to await requisitioned ships to convey them, their horses, and supplies, but on arrival travelled on horseback and on foot.[9] English armies devastated as much land as possible by spreading out on a wide front. In the course of each campaign armies attacked the populace, seized foodstuffs, livestock, and valuables, and burned whatever they could not carry off.[10] Civilians could either resist and be killed, flee and hide, or attempt to get inside a fortified church or city, most of which, however, were in disrepair during the early stages of the conflicts.[11] This English practice is distinguished by its increased scale from other types of destructive warfare through the term *chevauchée*, although it is only very rarely used in medieval sources.[12]

Campaigns of devastation had wide-reaching effects on the regions they passed through and often reduced them to poverty for many years.[13] The Italian humanist Petrarca (1304–74) wrote to an unnamed friend upon returning to France in 1360 after many years of English devastation:

> I could barely be convinced that it was the same kingdom which I had seen. There was everywhere such unfortunate deprivation and grief and desolation, there was everywhere so wild and uncultivated fields, there were destroyed and deserted homes, except those spared by being encircled by the walls of castles or cities, so in the end, there was in every place the sad vestiges of the English, and the recent and loathsome scars of defeat, stood out.[14]

Kaeuper, 'Medieval Warfare', p. 30.

9 Hewitt, *Organization of War*, pp. 75–92.

10 Christopher Allmand, 'War and the Non-Combatant in the Middle Ages', in *Medieval Warfare*, ed. by Maurice Keen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 259–69; N. A. R. Wright, *Knights and Peasants*, pp. 25–44; C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, pp. 208–30.

11 For the state of fortifications see Michael Wolfe, 'Siege Warfare and the *bonnes villes* of France during the Hundred Years War', in *The Medieval City under Siege*, ed. by Ivy A. Corfis and Michael Wolfe (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1995), pp. 49–66.

12 See for example throughout Kelly DeVries, *Infantry Warfare in the Early Fourteenth Century: Discipline, Tactics, and Technology* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1996); Prestwich, *Armies and Warfare*; Clifford J. Rogers, *War, Cruel and Sharp: English Strategy under Edward III, 1327–1360* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000). For devastation in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries see John Gillingham, 'Richard I and the Science of War', in *War and Government in the Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of J. O. Prestwich*, ed. by John Gillingham and James C. Holt (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1984), pp. 78–91; Strickland, *War and Chivalry*, pp. 258–90.

13 Robert Boutruche, 'La Dévastation des campagnes pendant la guerre de Cent Ans et la reconstruction agricole de la France', in *Mélanges 1945. III, études historiques*, ed. by Prosper Alfaric, Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, 106 (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1947), pp. 127–63.

14 Francesco Petrarca, 'Ad eundem, de mutatione Fortune eamque ex morum et presertim rei militaris mutatione procedere', in *Le Familiari: Edizione critica*, ed. by Vittorio Rossi, 4 vols (Firenze: Sansoni, 1933–42), IV, 138–52 (here lines 18–23): 'vix persuaderi posset regnum illued esse quod videram, sic ubique solitudo infelix et meror et vastitas,

Although it might seem that this is merely sensationalist hyperbole, the many studies of French local records indicate that this description is not unrealistic.[15] An analysis of the 1355 Gascony campaign of Edward of Woodstock (1330–76, later called the 'Black Prince') shows that over 500 locales were burned.[16] The unique Detroit continuation to Higden's *Polychronicon* claims that in 1339 the English 'devastated, destroyed, burned, and despoiled in the kingdom of France 1,706 towns, of which [the people] made a complaint to the parochial church'.[17] The destruction and suffering of this English campaign was so extensive that it attracted the papacy's attention, and in 1340 Pope Benedict XII (*r.* 1334–42) sent a commission to Cambrésis to relieve the area with alms. The surviving records of the losses, detailed by victims and the papacy's payments, show that the damage was enormous, even after accounting for exaggeration.[18]

Devastation and attacks on civilians served many purposes and were necessary for offensive warfare. The provisions and booty seized in the course of devastation allowed English campaigns to be largely self-sustained and move more quickly through the countryside.[19] It was difficult for enemy armies to pursue and catch the devastating army, as they were unable to draw supplies from devastated territory or even know precisely in which direction to go.[20] Once devastated, a region's ability to furnish taxes and supplies to the enemy was diminished for many years, especially as some regions were repeatedly attacked, season after season.[21] These attacks also put the English in better positions to negotiate after military action had relaxed.[22] In a more

---

sic ubique horrida et inculta arva, sic dirute deserteque domus nisi que, cincte arcium menibus aut urbium, evasissent, sic demum locis omnibus Anglorum mesta vestigia et recentes fedeque cicatrices clacium extabant'.

15 For scepticism see Bridbury, discussed by Rogers, and for analyses of local records see Denifle and studies cited by Jones: Anthony R. Bridbury, 'Before the Black Death', *Economic History Review*, 30 (1977), 393–410; Clifford J. Rogers, 'By Fire and Sword: *Bellum hostile* and "Civilians" in the Hundred Years War', in *Civilians in the Path of War*, ed. by Mark Grimsley and Clifford J. Rogers (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002), pp. 33–78 (here 34–35, 64 n. 5); Heinrich Denifle, *La Guerre de Cent Ans et la désolation des églises, monastères & hopitaux en France*, 2 vols (Paris: Picard, 1897–99); Michael C. E. Jones, 'War and Fourteenth-Century France', in *Arms, Armies and Fortifications in the Hundred Years War*, ed. by Anne Curry and Michael Hughes (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1994), pp. 103–20 (here 103 n. 2, 105 n. 3).

16 Herbert J. Hewitt, *The Black Prince's Expedition of 1355–57* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1958), pp. 72–75.

17 Higden, *Polychronicon*, MS 62, fol. 221^{v}: 'deuastauit destruxit co[m]bussit [et] spoliauit i[n] regno Francie villas mille .dcc. [et] .vi. q[uorum] quest[um] h[ab]uit eccl[es]iam p[ar]ochiale[m]'.

18 Città del Vaticano, Archivio segreto vaticano, MS Introitus et exitus 184; Louis Carolus-Barre, 'Benoit XII et la mission charitable de Bertrand Carit dans les pays dévastatés du nord de la France (Cambrésis, Vermandois, Thiérache)', *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, 62 (1950), 165–232; C. J. Rogers, 'By Fire and Sword'.

19 For lure of spoils aiding recruitment see Hewitt, *Organization of War*, p. 105; Prestwich, *Armies and Warfare*, pp. 83–113 (esp. 100–13); Nigel Saul, *For Honour and Fame: Chivalry in England, 1066–1500* (London: Bodley Head, 2011), pp. 117–28. Note, however, that it was often difficult and risky to rely entirely on foraging: Yuval Noah Harari, 'Strategy and Supply in Fourteenth-Century Western European Invasion Campaigns', *Journal of Military History*, 64 (2000), 297–333.

20 See p. 124 below.

21 Boutruche, 'Dévastation'; M. C. E. Jones, 'War and Fourteenth-Century France', pp. 105–06.

22 Hewitt, *Organization of War*, pp. 116–18; Allmand, *Hundred Years War*, pp. 54–58.

abstract sense, these attacks served to undermine French authority in the lands that they claimed to rule.[23]

Armies occasionally halted their fast-moving campaigns to besiege walled cities or castles, often to secure their gains. Evidence for the conventions of siege warfare is mostly limited to narrative sources, but these texts consistently present the basic elements.[24] A besieging force first approached the city and asked it to surrender. If this request were rejected the army would then surround the city to cut it off from any supplies. The aim was to take the place as quickly as possible and with the lowest expenditure of men, materiel, and money. To stay in one place for too long increased the chance of disease from poor sanitation, starvation after the countryside was picked clean of supplies, and attack from the besieged and relief forces on all sides.[25] In rare cases leaders decided to wait out a long siege when they were in good positions, such as Edward III's eleven-month siege of Calais in 1346–47 that was easily resupplied on the coast and difficult to attack from land without major losses.[26]

Sources suggest that leaders did not want to directly attack the city or massacre its citizens, but instead slowly increased their pressure on the besieged to convince them to surrender. Armies might attack the fortifications by mining, with improvised siege weapons, or artillery if brought along.[27] These were generally designed to either attack the wall or the infrastructure of the town, depending on their trajectory.[28] Gunpowder artillery is first mentioned in 1326 and was occasionally used at sieges in the fourteenth century to intimidate the defenders into surrender, but not as any sort of revolutionary or decisive weapon.[29] It is impossible to have an

---

[23] Hewitt, *Organization of War*, pp. 93–110. See also C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, pp. 208–12.

[24] For a typical siege's sequence see Bernard S. Bachrach, 'Medieval Siege Warfare: A Reconnaissance', *Journal of Military History*, 58 (1994), 119–33 (here 125).

[25] Bert S. Hall, 'The Changing Face of Siege Warfare: Technology and Tactics in Transition', in *The Medieval City under Siege*, ed. by Ivy A. Corfis and Michael Wolfe (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1995), pp. 257–75; Joanna Phillips, 'The Experience of Sickness and Health during Crusader Campaigns to the Eastern Mediterranean, 1095–1274' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Leeds, 2017), pp. 175–216.

[26] Jules Viard, 'Le Siège de Calais, 4 septembre 1346–4 août 1347', *Le Moyen Âge*, 39 (1929), 129–89; Craig L. Lambert, 'Edward III's Siege of Calais: A Reappraisal', *Journal of Medieval History*, 37 (2011), 245–56.

[27] On siege attacks see Simon Pepper, 'The Underground Siege', *Fort*, 10 (1982), 31–38; Richard L. C. Jones, 'Fortifications and Sieges in Western Europe, *c*. 800–1450', in *Medieval Warfare: A History*, ed. by Maurice Keen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 163–85; Kelly DeVries and Robert Douglas Smith, *Medieval Military Technology*, 2nd edn (North York: University of Toronto Press, 2012), pp. 117–29, 134–36, 165–81, 261–72, 278–80. Pounds argues that the rarity of attack during sieges was due to the time and cost of transporting engines: Norman J. G. Pounds, *The Medieval Castle in England and Wales: A Social and Political History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 113.

[28] Rogers shows that writers defined siege engines by their trajectory or size: Randall Rogers, *Latin Siege Warfare in the Twelfth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), pp. 251–55, 266.

[29] José Finó, *Forteresses de la France médiévale: Construction, attaque, défense*, 3rd edn (Paris: Picard, 1977), pp. 290–91; Robert Douglas Smith, 'Artillery and the Hundred Years War: Myth and Interpretation', in *Arms, Armies and Fortifications in the Hundred Years War*, ed. by Anne Curry and Michael Hughes (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1994), pp. 151–60; Kelly DeVries, 'The Impact of Gunpowder Weaponry on Siege Warfare in the Hundred Years War', in *The*

accurate idea of the strength and effect of siege engines, however, because wooden engines were broken down after they were no longer useful and the earliest surviving gunpowder weapons are from the late fourteenth century.[30] Manuscript illuminations and other iconographic evidence are too imprecise to offer any insight, and terminology used to describe engines is vague and varies greatly between writers.[31] The majority of publications, especially monographs, on siege warfare are written by non-academic enthusiasts and focus almost entirely on assaults and sacks, and thereby suggest that this was the norm.[32] However, such attacks were rare in the fourteenth century.[33] Leaders recognised the importance of leaving both the walls and infrastructure (such as mills) intact so that the city might be inhabited and defended by the occupying force.[34] Accordingly, most sieges ended when the city surrendered, in which case its citizens were expected to be spared. If the besieging force managed to break in then the city was expected to be sacked, which allowed the leaders to expend the pent up frustration of their men who had suffered for weeks or months during the siege, offer reward through booty, and, most importantly, serve as an ever-present threat to the defenders and encourage surrender.[35] However, this so-called 'right

---

Medieval City under Siege, ed. by Ivy A. Corfis and Michael Wolfe (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1995), pp. 227–44; DeVries and R. D. Smith, *Medieval Military Technology*, pp. 137–56, 160–62, 272–78, 280–81. See also Malcolm Vale, 'New Techniques and Old Ideals: The Impact of Artillery on War and Chivalry at the End of the Hundred Years War', in *War, Literature and Politics in the Late Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of G. W. Coopland*, ed. by Christopher Allmand (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1976), pp. 57–72; DeVries, 'French and English Acceptance of Medieval Gunpowder Weaponry', *Journal of Medieval Military History*, 11 (2013), 259–70.

30 For records of wooden engine production, decay, and repair in England see Pounds, and for the melting down of obsolete gunpowder weapons see Smith: Pounds, *Medieval Castle*, pp. 108–12; R. D. Smith, 'Artillery', p. 159 n. 27.

31 See the earliest illumination of a gunpowder weapon from England (1326–27) in Oxford, Christ Church, MS 92, fol. 70^{v}, although a similar illumination possibly made slightly earlier is in London, British Library, MS Add. 47680, fol. 44^{v}: Pamela Porter, 'The Ways of War in Medieval Manuscript Illumination: Tracing and Assessing the Evidence', in *Armies, Chivalry and Warfare in Medieval Britain and France: Proceedings of the 1995 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. by Matthew Strickland (Stamford: Watkins, 1998), pp. 100–14 (here 112–14). Rogers argues that problems with siege narratives 'stems from a desire to extract clarity from difficult material and the imposition of anachronistic conceptions on to the medieval period and evidence' and Dupuy shows how monastic writers had difficulty understanding and using terminology: R. Rogers, *Latin Siege Warfare*, pp. 3 (quote), 266; Mark Dupuy, 'A "Clock-and-Bow" Story: Late Medieval Technology from Monastic Evidence', *Journal of Medieval Military History*, 5 (2007), 70–83. See also Jim Bradbury, *The Medieval Siege* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1992), pp. 241–70, 251, 253, 261–62.

32 See for example Bradbury's focus on the most popular of narratives that allows him to create a skewed and unrepresentative description of siege warfare, which Hebron compares against English literature to argue that it is realistic: Bradbury, *Medieval Siege*, p. xiii (states his focus on translated, popular narratives); Hebron, *Medieval Siege*. See also Peter F. Purton, *A History of the Late Medieval Siege, 1200–1500* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2010); Konstantin Nossov, *Ancient and Medieval Siege Weapons: A Fully Illustrated Guide to Siege Weapons and Tactics* (Guilford: Lyons Press, 2012); Purton, *The Medieval Military Engineer: From the Roman Empire to the Sixteenth Century* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2018). Despite their clear methodological issues these works are widely cited.

33 R. L. C. Jones, 'Fortifications', esp. p. 165; Kelly DeVries, '"The walls come tumbling down": The Campaigns of Philip the Good and the Myth of Fortification Vulnerability to Early Gunpowder Weapons', in *The Hundred Years War: A Wider Focus*, ed. by L. J. Andrew Villalon and Donald J. Kagay (Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 429–46 (esp. 445); Contamine, *Guerre au Moyen Âge*, pp. 207–08.

34 Pounds, *Medieval Castle*, p. 112 (repair costs and time); R. Rogers, *Latin Siege Warfare*, p. 5.

35 Maurice Keen, *The Laws of War in the Late Middle Ages* (London: Routledge, 1965), pp. 119–33; Strickland, *War and Chivalry*, pp. 222–24; C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, pp. 192–93.

of storm' custom is not found in any document, legal or otherwise, and might be a narrative convention that overly systematised a more complex and variable process.[36]

Battles, long the focus of military history as the epitome of warfare, in both modern scholarship and pre-modern literature, were rare in the fourteenth century and less well understood than other aspects of war.[37] To engage in battle risked the considerable investments of resources, equipment, supplies, and experienced combatants and their leaders that made up armies.[38] Battlefield geography is crucial to understand the course of battles, what elements contributed to victory and defeat, and how people were killed, but we have only a vague idea in most cases.[39] The sites of sieges are mostly well known through an abundance of references in record and narrative sources, and the effects of siege engines can be seen in the physical remains, although they are understudied.[40] In contrast, battlefield locations remain debated, despite the existence of journals or diaries for the 1346 Normandy and 1356 Gascony campaigns that ended with the battles of Crécy and Poitiers.[41] In some cases, such as the battle of Neville's Cross outside Durham in 1346, engagements took place near cities, which allows for an easier fix of the location.[42] Newsletters, campaign letters, and even chronicles by combatants do not provide any

---

[36] Keen notes that the right of storm is found only in narratives but does not consider its rhetorical function: Keen, *Laws of War*, p. 122 n. 3.

[37] Stated succinctly by Contamine, *Guerre au Moyen Âge*, p. 207: 'la guerre médiévale était faite d'une succession de sièges, accompagnés d'une multitude d'escarmouches et de dévastations, à quoi venaient se surajouter quelques combats majeurs, quelques rencontres solennelles, dont la relative rareté venait compenser le caractère souvent sanglant'. See also Raymond C. Smail, *Crusading Warfare, 1097–1193* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), pp. 14–17; B. S. Bachrach, 'Medieval Siege Warfare', pp. 121–22; Wolfe, 'Siege Warfare', pp. 51–52.

[38] Hewitt, *Organization of War*, pp. 28–92. Prestwich, *Armies and Warfare*, pp. 306–10; Allmand, *Hundred Years War*, pp. 54–55; Allmand, *The 'De re militari' of Vegetius: The Reception, Transmission and Legacy of a Roman Text in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 320–21.

[39] For a critical analysis of the sites of Crécy and Agincourt that convincingly argues against the traditional sites see Livingston and Sutherland, for the known battlefield of Aljubarrota, Portugal (1385) see Afonso do Paço, and for the chance discovery of Bosworth see Foard and Curry: Michael Livingston, 'The Location of the Battle of Crécy', in *The Battle of Crécy: A Casebook*, ed. by Michael Livingston and Kelly DeVries (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2015), pp. 415–38; Tim Sutherland, 'The Battle of Agincourt: An Alternative Location', *Journal of Conflict Archaeology*, 1 (2005), 245–63; Manuel Afonso do Paço, 'The Battle of Aljubarrota', *Antiquity*, 37 (1963), 264–69; Glenn Foard and Anne Curry, *Bosworth, 1485: A Battlefield Rediscovered* (Oxford: Oxbow, 2013).

[40] For the oft-cited evidence of mining damage to Rochester Castle in 1215 see Brown, for a survey of fortification evidence see Coulson, and for continental fortifications and repairs see Contamine: R. Allen Brown, *Rochester Castle* (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1969), pp. 12–15; Charles L. H. Coulson, *Castles in Medieval Society: Fortresses in England, France, and Ireland in the Central Middle Ages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), p. 48; Contamine, *Guerre au Moyen Âge*, pp. 214–26.

[41] 'Kitchen Journal', in *The Battle of Crécy: A Casebook*, ed. by Michael Livingston and Kelly DeVries (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2015), pp. 20–23, 339 (for 1346 Normandy campaign); 'Kitchen Journal', in Geoffrey le Baker, *Chronicon*, ed. by Edward Maunde Thompson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889), pp. 252–53 (imperfect s. XIX copy in London, British Library, MS Add. 25461, fols 11^{r}–11^{v}); 'Cleopatra Itinerary', in *The Battle of Crécy: A Casebook*, ed. by Michael Livingston and Kelly DeVries (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2015), pp. 22–27, 339–40 (for 1346 Normandy campaign); *Eulogium*, 5.185 (III, 215–26, for 1356 Gascony campaign, interpolated). See also Le Baker, *Chronicle*, pp. 128–39 (for 1355 Gascony campaign, integrated).

[42] Richard A. Lomas, 'The Durham Landscape and the Battle of Neville's Cross', in *The Battle of Neville's Cross, 1346*, ed. by David Rollason and Michael Prestwich (Stamford: Tyas, 1998), pp. 66–77.

definitive answers. Only two battle plans survive from the later Middle Ages. The first of these is seemingly for an aborted encounter shortly before the battle of Agincourt (1415).[43] Despite its near-universal acceptance it is highly suspect, as it was easier to deliver such basic instruction orally, and the sole extant copy is in an English manuscript and not the original. The second, a 1417 battle plan for the duke of Burgundy, is vague and orders only that the army should be organised and prepared to respond to changing situations in battle.[44] Taking into account these difficulties, the general course of a battle seems to be that the armies would meet, or one would wait for the other, and the victor held the field after combat.[45]

The amount of risk faced by combatants and the situations in which they were killed have profound ethical implications, but are difficult to gauge. Heralds identified the slain prominent persons and knights and supposedly created a final list of those killed on either side, but often omitted the lesser combatants due to their large number.[46] The surviving casualty lists invariably show that the defeated endured considerably greater casualties than the victors. They do not clarify whether this disparity is because the defeated suffered so many casualties that they fled, or were killed while fleeing or attempting to surrender.[47] It has been suggested that the 'longbow' was the major cause of the large-scale killing and injury of enemy forces in many of these English victories.[48] Rogers summarises the supposed power of the 'longbow' as:

> It could fire at least three times as fast as a contemporary composite-bowed crossbow, could shoot farther and (beyond point-blank distance) with much greater accuracy, and could strike with enough impact to penetrate armor and inflict serious or even lethal wounds on men or horses.[49]

---

[43] London, British Library, MS Cotton Caligula D V, fols 43^{v}–44^{r}; 'The French Plan of Battle during the Agincourt Campaign', ed. by Christopher Phillpotts, *English Historical Review*, 99 (1984), 59–66.

[44] 'Un plan de bataille du duc de Bourgogne (14 septembre 1417) et la tactique de l'époque', ed. by Jean F. Verbruggen, *Revue internationale d'histoire militaire*, 20 (1959), 443–51 (here 443–47).

[45] For an examination of battle with only careful use of narrative sources see Prestwich, *Armies and Warfare*, pp. 305–33. See also Contamine, *Guerre au Moyen Âge*, pp. 379–89.

[46] Maurice Keen, 'Chivalry, Heralds, and History', in *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Richard William Southern*, ed. by Ralph H. C. Davis (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), pp. 393–414; Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, pp. 102–07.

[47] See also Contamine, *Guerre au Moyen Âge*, pp. 413–18.

[48] See for example Jim Bradbury, *The Medieval Archer* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1985); Clifford J. Rogers, 'The Efficacy of the English Longbow: A Reply to Kelly DeVries', *War in History*, 5 (1998), 233–42; Matthew Strickland and Robert Hardy, *The Great Warbow: From Hastings to the Mary Rose* (Thrupp: Sutton, 2005); C. J. Rogers, 'The Battle of Agincourt', in *The Hundred Years War (Part II): Different Vistas*, ed. by L. J. Andrew Villalon and Donald J. Kagay (Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 37–132 (here 109–13); C. J. Rogers, 'The Development of the Longbow in Late Medieval England and "Technological Determinism"', *Journal of Medieval History*, 37 (2011), 321–41.

[49] Clifford J. Rogers, '"As if a new sun had arisin": England's Fourteenth-Century RMA', in *The Dynamics of Military Revolution, 1300–2050*, ed. by MacGregor Knox and Williamson Murray (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 15–34 (here 19).

Although the English clearly thought these weapons important enough to spend large sums of money producing and maintaining them, they label them simply as bows (*arcus*) and their bearers archers (*sagittarii*), not as distinctly more powerful tools.[50] Narrative sources variously describe the purpose of English archery as to disorganise, demoralise, injure, or kill the enemy, and it is impossible to reconcile these understandings.[51]

The key point of contention in the longbow debate is how effective the bows were against armoured combatants. Although the earliest surviving longbow has been contentiously dated to 1464, the bulk are from the 1545 wreck of the Mary Rose, a Tudor navy carrack.[52] These cannot be supposed to be representative of fourteenth-century bows, as it is unlikely that their size and strength would have remained static as armour improved through the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.[53] It seems more reasonable to presume that earlier bows were smaller and weaker, and only became more powerful as armour strengthened. Several attempts at experimental archaeology have given variable results that the bow could either easily pierce plate from a distance or could only do so at a direct angle at near point-blank range.[54] It is difficult to gauge 'average' quality armour, as most extant material is later, ornamental, and high quality, and museums are understandably reluctant to allow testing and destruction of period armour.[55] Modern day archers have demonstrated the ability to loose a large number of arrows in a short period of time, and argue that English armies used these 'storms of arrows' to kill the enemy.[56] However, archers had only a limited supply of arrows on campaigns, such as the 45.6 per bow for the well-equipped 1346 Normandy campaign, and would expend these in less than three minutes if they loosed them at the maximum rate.[57] They would then be physically exhausted and quickly massacred by the onrushing enemy men-at-arms. Pictorial evidence offers no convincing evidence of the size, strength, or use of these weapons.[58] The remains of combatants provide no

---

[50] Prestwich, *Armies and Warfare*, pp. 129–33, 140–41.

[51] See for example narrative sources on Agincourt, analysed by Kelly DeVries, 'Technological Determinisms of Victory at the Battle of Agincourt', *British Journal for Military History*, 2 (2015), 2–14 (here 7, 9–14).

[52] Robert E. Kaiser, 'The Medieval English Longbow', *Journal of the Society of Archer-Antiquaries*, 23 (1980), 21–29; Strickland and Hardy, *Great Warbow*; DeVries and R. D. Smith, *Medieval Military Technology*, pp. 34–41, 50.

[53] Claude Blair, *European Armour, circa 1066 to circa 1700* (London: Batsford, 1958), esp. pp. 53–140; M. Vale, *War and Chivalry*, pp. 104–21; DeVries and R. D. Smith, *Medieval Military Technology*, pp. 74–93, 96–98.

[54] For an extensive list of experiments and studies see Strickland and Hardy, and for a recent experiment see Bourke and Whetham, and DeVries' justifiably critical commentary: Strickland and Hardy, *Great Warbow*, pp. 491–514; Paul Bourke, David Whetham, and Kelly DeVries, 'A Report of the Findings of the Defence Academy Warbow Trials, Part 1, Summer 2005', *Arms and Armour*, 4 (2007), 53–81.

[55] Contamine, *Guerre au Moyen Âge*, p. 236.

[56] See for example Paul Hitchin, 'The Bowman and the Bow', in *The Battle of Agincourt, 1415*, ed. by Anne Curry (Stroud: Tempus, 2000), pp. 37–52 (here 44–45). See also Kaiser, 'Medieval English Longbow'.

[57] T. Richardson, *Tower Armoury*, p. 211.

[58] Some treat visual representation as if it were authentic enough to compare against other evidence. See for example

representative evidence, as the few known mass graves from medieval battles are atypical. The one such find from this period at Visby, Gotland (1361) cannot shed much light on the Anglo-French and Anglo-Scottish wars, as it is of a massacred militia that wore low-quality armour while the enemy wielded different weapons.[59] Its findings suggest that combatants were killed in a variety of settings and not exclusively in combat, fleeing, or attempting to surrender.[60]

To accept the longbow as a weapon consistently meant to kill, before massed and standardised production, is questionable given the lack of evidence and conflicting reports.[61] If we accept that the bow was employed as a rapid-fire killing machine then we can infer an intention to kill the enemy in most situations and attach an ethical value to varied descriptions, but also argue that French knights and chivalry were out of touch with reality for charging the English in these battles.[62] We can assume, at the least, that archers were considered valuable to English military leaders because they were employed in great numbers, although we do not know whether this was always intended. Battles and other military situations were dangerous for knights and combatants of all rank, regardless of their armour quality or the ability of weaponry.[63] In most cases we do not know how combatants died and thus are unable to compare narrative accounts against any sort of common practice.

Bernard S. Bachrach, '*Caballus et caballarius* in Medieval Warfare', in *The Study of Chivalry: Resources and Approaches*, ed. by Howell Chickering and Thomas H. Seiler (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University, 1988), pp. 173–211 (on warhorses); Robert Hardy, 'The Longbow', in *Arms, Armies and Fortifications in the Hundred Years War*, ed. by Anne Curry and Michael Hughes (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1994), pp. 161–82 (here 179). For related problems of connecting the image to the text or reality see Christiane Raynaud, *La Violence au Moyen Âge, XIII^e–XV^e siècle: D'après les livres d'histoire en français* (Paris: Leopard d'or, 1990), pp. 189–257; Richard Abels, 'Cultural Representations of Warfare in the High Middle Ages: The Morgan Picture Bible', in *Crusading and Warfare in the Middle Ages: Realities and Representations. Essays in Honour of John France*, ed. by Simon John and Nicholas Morton (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), pp. 13–35.

59 Bengt Johan Nerén Thordeman, Bo Eric Ingelmark, and Poul Nørlund, *Armour from the Battle of Wisby, 1361*, 2 vols (Stockholm: Kungl, 1939). See also Christopher Knüsel and Anthea Boylston, 'How Has the Towton Project Contributed to our Knowledge of Medieval and Later Warfare?', in *Blood Red Roses: The Archaeology of a Mass Grave from the Battle of Towton, AD 1461*, ed. by Veronica Fiorato, Anthea Boylston, and Christopher Knüsel (Oxford: Oxbow, 2000), pp. 169–88.

60 On the difficulty of using remains to understand war see Mark R. Geldof, '"And describe the shapes of the dead": Making Sense of the Archaeology of Armed Violence', in *Wounds and Wound Repair in Medieval Culture*, ed. by Larissa Tracy and Kelly DeVries (Leiden: Brill, 2015), pp. 57–80.

61 For arguments against the longbow as decisive see Kelly DeVries, 'Catapults Are Not Atomic Bombs: Towards a Redefinition of "Effectiveness" in Premodern Military Technology', *War in History*, 4 (1997), 454–70; DeVries, 'Technological Determinisms'.

62 For such an argument see Kilgour, and for a discussion of these problems see Allmand: Raymond Kilgour, *The Decline of Chivalry as Shown in the French Literature of the Late Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937), pp. 58–83; Allmand, *Hundred Years War*, pp. 65–67.

63 Robert C. Woosnam-Savage and Kelly DeVries, 'Battle Trauma in Medieval Warfare: Wounds, Weapons and Armor', in *Wounds and Wound Repair in Medieval Culture*, ed. by Larissa Tracy and Kelly DeVries (Leiden: Brill, 2015), pp. 27–56.

Surviving record sources show that war was a violent and ethically problematic enterprise. It posed risks to both combatants and civilians alike in most situations. However, many aspects of warfare are omitted from the reliable record sources, including the intention of campaigns, risk posed to combatants in battle, and how people were killed in encounters. It is necessary to turn to the narratives of historical literature to find contemporary engagement with these problems.

2. REPRESENTATION AND REALISM

The only way to fill the gaps in our understanding of fourteenth-century warfare is to turn to historical literature. Narrative sources frequently contradict each other and seem realistic rather than obviously untrue.[64] Verbruggen asserts that it is only necessary to sort out the biased from the unbiased, and thus reliable, narrative sources to use them to understand warfare.[65] The Bachrachs have a similar perspective and argue that through comparison with the immutable facts of human experience and the world it is a straightforward process to understand which sources are realistic, in an approach known as *Sachkritik*.[66] However, Morillo and Phillips show that the relationship between the past and supposedly universal 'facts', largely reliant on oversimplified structures that fail to take into account variables, is not so straightforward.[67] DeVries argues that different parts of a source that might otherwise be deemed unreliable can be judged accurate by a careful comparison with other narrative and record sources.[68] Some scholars, taking into account these problems, base their reconstructions of war on record sources, but still take a rather uncritical approach to using narrative sources.[69] Despite these considerations, little

---

[64] See for example Richard Barber, *Edward III and the Triumph of England: The Battle of Crécy and the Company of the Garter* (London: Lane, 2013), pp. 3–29 (here 29): the sources are 'hugely variable in origin and quality, often a minefield of contradictions, a range of voices so different that it is hard to weigh one against another'; Strickland, *War and Chivalry*, pp. 7–12.

[65] Jean F. Verbruggen, *The Art of Warfare in Western Europe during the Middle Ages, from the Eighth Century to 1340*, trans. by Sumner Willard and Sheila C. M. Southern (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1998), p. 1–18.

[66] Bernard S. Bachrach and David S. Bachrach, *Warfare in Medieval Europe, c. 400–c. 1453* (London: Routledge, 2017), pp. 6–32, esp. 14–22, 26–31; B. S. Bachrach, 'Writing Military History from Narrative Sources: Norman Battlefield Tactics, *c.* 1000', in *Understanding Medieval Primary Sources: Using Historical Sources to Discover Medieval Europe*, ed. by Joel T. Rosenthal (London: Routledge, 2012), pp. 86–97 (here 86–87). For a methodology that similarly rests on subjective interpretation of evidence as fact see Nikolai Berdyaev, *The Divine and the Human*, trans. by Reginald M. French (London: Bles, 1949), p. 7 n. 1.

[67] Stephen Morillo, 'Contrary Winds: Theories of History and the Limits of *Sachkritik*', in *The Medieval Way of War: Studies in Medieval Military History in Honor of Bernard S. Bachrach*, ed. by Gregory I. Halfond (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), pp. 205–22; Phillips, 'Experience of Sickness', pp. 83–104.

[68] Kelly DeVries, 'The Use of Chronicles in Recreating Medieval Military History', *Journal of Medieval Military History*, 2 (2004), 1–16.

[69] See for example Adrian R. Bell, 'Medieval Chroniclers as War Correspondents during the Hundred Years' War: The Earl of Arundel's Campaign of 1387', in *Fourteenth-Century England VI*, ed. by Chris Given-Wilson (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2010), pp. 171–84; Gribit, *Henry of Lancaster's Expedition*, pp. 133–51.

attention is paid to the conceptions of reality and truth that the writers of historical literature held themselves.[70]

Chroniclers typically claim that they write with impartiality and intend to present only factual accounts.[71] In his prologue, Jean le Bel derides the use of verse and fantastical stories for misrepresenting history. He claims that poets diminish the praise earned by those doing such actions. It is important, therefore:

> That one should speak as accurately as one can, and as closely as possible to the truth. For history is so noble, it seems to me, and of such gentlemanly prowess, that it is much to be revered and worthy to be put in writing so that it may be held in the memory as close to the truth as possible.[72]

This is in contrast to the earlier trust in verse as more accurate because its form was less apt to change due to the restrictions of metre.[73] Le Bel then states his objectives and methods in opposition to these untruthful narratives:

> And while in these rhymed histories one finds a large amount of deceit. I intend, when I can have the opportunity, to take pain and effort to write in prose that which I have seen and have heard recounted by those who have been there when I have not, [and so write] as close to the truth as I may.[74]

Occasionally he cites his eyewitness sources in his chronicle, but often presents these actions in such detail that they appear less impartial than he claims. Many English chronicles served as continuations of others and were therefore unable to include prologues with such methodological statements. A few writers of universal chronicles do make such declarations, but instead emphasise their humility and the superior ability of their predecessors.[75]

---

[70] Given-Wilson suggests, only in passing, that writers describe war allusively to better engage with questions of proper conduct: Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, pp. 2–3.

[71] Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, pp. 1–20.

[72] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, prologue (I, 2): 'on doibt parler le plus à point que on poeut et au plus prez de la verité. Car l'istoire est si noble, ce m'est advis, et de si gentile proesse, qu'elle est bien digne et merite d'estre mise en escript pour le en memoire retenir au plus prez de la verité'.

[73] Nicole Chareyron, *Jean le Bel: Le Maître de Froissart, grand imagier de la guerre de Cent Ans* (Bruxelles: De Boeck Université, 1996), pp. 58–60; Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, pp. 138–41, 143–47. On oral composition and its increased stability, see Albert B. Lord, *The Singer of Tales*, ed. by Stephen Mitchell and Gregory Nagy, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000); A. B. Lord, *The Singer Resumes the Tale*, ed. by Mary Louise Lord (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), esp. pp. 167–86; Philip Cohen, 'Textual Instability, Literary Studies, and Recent Developments in Textual Scholarship', in *Texts and Textuality: Textual Instability, Theory, and Interpretation*, ed. by Philip Cohen (New York: Garland, 1997), pp. xi–xxxiv.

[74] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, prologue (I, 3–4): 'et pourtant que en ces hystoires rimées treuve on grand plenté de bourdes, je veul mectre paine et entente, quant je pourray avoir loisir, d'escrire par prose ce que je ay veu et ouy recorder par ceulx qui ont esté làù je n'ay pas esté, au plus prez de la verité que je pourray'.

[75] Higden, *Polychronicon*, 1.1 (I, 2–20); *Eulogium*, 1.proemium (I, 1–5). See also Christiane Marchello-Nizia, 'L'Historien et son prologue: Forme littéraire et stratégies discursives', in *La Chronique et l'histoire au Moyen Âge.*

Writers turned to a number of authorities to recreate events in their historical literature, but the most important of these were the newsletters that were routinely sent back from campaigns for dissemination throughout England. The original typically arrived in London and copies of it were then sent to major centres throughout the country, such as York. Further copies were made in these centres and sent out to nearby towns and publicly read aloud so that they could be exposed to as many people as possible.[76] Newsletters were used in this fashion so that they could convey information and influence the attitudes of the people who read or heard them.[77] Copies of these widely disseminated documents were kept in church libraries and drawn upon later in the composition of historical and political writings.

Medieval English writers treat these sources as if they are entirely objective and truthful. Texts that include or are explicitly stated to be based upon such letters are made more authoritative to medieval readers in the process. Rogers claims that seemingly private letters between individuals are genuine and therefore entirely heartfelt and factual because their authors would have no reason to twist the truth, which then allows him to use these sources and those derived from them uncritically.[78] However, these sources are anything but objective. They were not distinguished from those that were clearly designated as public newsletters, but were likewise widely read, copied, and announced to the public in a variety of settings. Edward of Woodstock's letter to his wife, Joan of Kent, on his victory at the battle of Nájera (1367) survives in one copy that appears to be genuine, as it includes affectionate salutations in its opening, '[to my] very dear and sweetheart, well-loved companion. We greet you with all our desiring heart', and addresses her as 'very dear companion'.[79] This letter was employed by at least two English chroniclers to describe the battle, one of whom (in the north) wrote the *Anonimalle Chronicle*

Colloque des 24 et 25 mai 1982, ed. by Daniel Poirion (Paris: Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 1986), pp. 13–25; Antonia Gransden, 'Prologues in the Historiography of Twelfth-Century England', in *England in the Twelfth Century: Proceedings of the 1988 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. by Daniel Williams (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1990), pp. 55–81; Isabelle Heullant-Donat, 'Les Prologues des chroniques universelles à la fin du Moyen Âge', in *Les Prologues Médiévaux. Actes du colloque international organisé par l'Academia Belgica et l'École française de Rome avec le concours de la F.I.D.E.M. (Rome, 26–28 mars 1998)*, ed. by Jacqueline Hamesse (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), pp. 573–91.

[76] For the mechanics of news dissemination see William R. Jones, 'The English Church and Royal Propaganda during the Hundred Years War', *Journal of British Studies*, 19 (1979), 18–30; James A. Doig, 'Political Propaganda and Royal Proclamations in Late Medieval England', *Historical Research*, 71 (1998), 253–80.

[77] For the purpose of news dissemination see Hewitt, *Organization of War*, pp. 159–65; J. Taylor, *English Historical Literature*, pp. 217–35; Barber, *Edward III*, pp. 23–26; Ruddick, *English Identity*, pp. 33–36, 262.

[78] Clifford J. Rogers, 'Edward III and the Dialectics of Strategy, 1327–1360', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 6th ser., 4 (1994), 83–102 (here 96). Hoskins and the Bachrachs similarly believe letters are devoid of bias or rhetorical manipulation: Peter Hoskins, *In the Steps of the Black Prince: The Road to Poitiers, 1355–1356* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2013), p. 128; B. S. Bachrach and D. S. Bachrach, *Warfare in Medieval Europe*, p. 25.

[79] Edward of Woodstock, 'La Bataille de Nájera: Le Communiqué du Prince Noir', ed. by Eugène Déprez, *Revue historique*, 136 (1921), 37–59 (here 51): 'tres cher et tres entier coer, bien ame compaigne. Nous vous saluoms de tut nostre coer desiraunt etc. Tres chere compaigne'.

and the other (in the south) the *Canterbury Chronicle*.[80] Because these writers were extremely unlikely to both happen upon the original the letter must have been sent throughout the country. Private letters frequently functioned much the same as newsletters and were certainly used like them in at least one case that has been identified here.

All letters, including those addressed to religious or political figures, as well as general newsletters, were meant for a broad audience. These all present the 'official' version of events that was advocated by the government and represented English actions in the best light.[81] At the end of his letter to John Offord (*c.* 1290–1349), chancellor of Edward III, and others, which describes his 1346 Normandy campaign up to the sack of Caen, Edward includes instructions to forward additional copies to important persons throughout England and abroad.[82] In contrast to Edward of Woodstock's letter on the battle of Nájera, several other versions of these letters survive, all of which are subtly altered.[83] However, none of these include the instructions found at the end of the original. The various forms that these sorts of texts survive in, such as personal letters or newsletters, interpolated or incorporated into narratives to appear to be part of it, also show that different copiers intended them to be used or seen later as authoritative accounts of important events. Some chroniclers, such as Adam Murimuth and Robert of Avesbury, narrate military events almost exclusively through these documents, and elsewhere take on the attitudes that they promote.[84]

In some cases writers claim that they turn to personal eyewitnesses, rather than newsletters, to get the true version of events, untainted by any sort of government perspective or

---

[80] *Anonimalle*, pp. 53–55, 171–72; *Canterbury Chronicle*, pp. 148–50; Albert E. Prince, 'A Letter of Edward the Black Prince Describing the Battle of Nájera in 1367', *English Historical Review*, 41 (1926), 415–18.

[81] See for example the particular attitude towards civilians that was promoted by English military leaders: Trevor Russell Smith, 'Willing Body, Willing Mind: Non-Combatant Culpability According to English Combatant Writers, 1327–77', in *Killing and Being Killed: Bodies in Battle. Perspectives on Fighters in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Jörg Rogge (Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2017), pp. 79–107.

[82] Edward III, 'Letter to the Chancellor, Treasurer and Other Members of his Council in London, 29 July 1346', in Kenneth Fowler, 'News from the Front: Letters and Despatches of the Fourteenth Century', in *Guerre et société en France, en Angleterre et en Bourgogne, XIV^e–XV^e siècles*, ed. by Philippe Contamine, Charles Giry-Deloison, and Maurice Keen (Villeneuve d'Ascq: Centre d'histoire de la région du nord et de l'Europe du nord-ouest, Université Charles de Gaulle-Lille III, 1991), pp. 83–84 (here 84): 'd'autre parte, nouse vous mandons que noz lettres directes au markes de Julers, au Leo de Faukemont et a les bones gentz des trois villes de Flandres et a noz gentz qi serra en celles parties, que les nous vous envoians par [... illegible ...], les facez maintenant envoier, et facez aussint envoier avant noz lettres directes a l'evesque d'Everwyk et a les autres segnors envers le north'.

[83] A version addressed to the archbishop of York, interpolated in *Lanercost*, pp. 342–43; a similar version, but integrated without salutations into *Anonimalle*, pp. 19–20; to London and changed into third-person, in 'Lettre sur ses succès en Normandie (fin de juillet 1346), sequitur cedula', in Jean Froissart, *Oeuvres*, ed. by Joseph Kervyn de Lettenhove, 25 vols (Bruxelles: Devaux, 1867–77), XVIII, 286–87; reused and continued in 'Letter to Thomas de Lucy, 3 September 1346', in Chandos Herald, *The Black Prince: An Historical Poem, Written in French*, ed. by Henry Octavius Coxe (London: Shakespeare Press, 1842), pp. 351–55; which is also copied in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 302 (SC 2086), fol. 143^v, but is missing most of the text due to lost folios.

[84] See also Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, pp. 202–07.

invention. Texts by or derived from eyewitnesses are claimed to be the most valuable for understanding events, especially in warfare.[85] In the later Middle Ages people trusted such accounts over others, but put even greater faith in people who participated in such events or, ideally, had physically experienced the event.[86] Scholars assume that passages from texts can be identified as derived from eyewitness testimony because of their emotive content and level of detail.[87] However, writers could imagine these intensive descriptions themselves, as many had thorough education on formal rhetoric and classic Roman literature.[88] Geoffrey le Baker is commonly noted for his reliability because he claims to defer to eyewitness testimony, but his most vivid passages can be identified as paraphrases or direct quotations from classical sources.[89] Chroniclers often sought to have their accounts seem authoritative and gave them vivid details to make them appear like eyewitness accounts, which makes it difficult if not impossible to identify eyewitness accounts or passages based on them.[90] Even in the best cases, little can be learned from eyewitnesses because of the limited perspective of a combatant in the mêlée or a military leader on horseback, not to mention the general fragility of memory.[91]

---

[85] Verbruggen, *Art of Warfare*, pp. 16–18, 17: 'it is surely the case that eye-witness accounts are the best, and that all good descriptions of battle come from participants or people who were on the spot'.

[86] Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, pp. 11–14; Yuval Noah Harari, 'Scholars, Eyewitnesses, and Flesh-Witnesses of War: A Tense Relationship', *Partial Answers*, 7 (2009), 213–28.

[87] Janet Coleman, *English Literature in History, 1350–1400: Medieval Readers and Writers* (London: Hutchinson, 1981), p. 73; Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing in England*, 2 vols (London: Routledge, 1974–82), II, 14, 85, 108, 110, 111, 166, 191, 198, 199, 235, 271; J. Taylor, *English Historical Literature*, pp. 27, 168, 180, 184, 207; Andrew Ayton, 'Crécy and the Chroniclers', in *The Battle of Crécy, 1346*, ed. by Andrew Ayton and Philip Preston Bart (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005), pp. 287–350 (here 335). See also the innumerable claims by editors of texts.

[88] John O. Ward, 'Classical Rhetoric and the Writing of History in Medieval and Renaissance Culture', in *European History and its Historians. Papers from the Conference of Australasian Historians of Medieval and Early Modern Europe, Adelaide, 18–21 May 1976*, ed. by Frank McGregor and Nicholas A. R. Wright (Adelaide: Adelaide University Union Press, 1977), pp. 1–10; Keen, 'Chivalry, Heralds, and History', p. 403; Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, pp. 33–52, 133–71; Pierre Courroux, *L'Écriture de l'histoire dans les chroniques françaises (XII^e–XV^e siècle)* (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2016), pp. 115–27, 751–60.

[89] For uncritical trust in Le Baker see Thompson and Barber. Ayton, drawing on Gransden's criticisms, acknowledges that some aspects of the chronicle seem to be invented, but dismisses them by comparison with other sources only and does not identify the many passages derived from classical sources: Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. xi; Barber, *Edward III*, pp. 21–22; Gransden, *Historical Writing*, II, 77–80; Ayton, 'Crécy and the Chroniclers', pp. 334–42. See also pp. 158–60 below.

[90] Peter Ainsworth, 'Contemporary and "Eyewitness" History', in *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Deborah Mauskopf Deliyannis (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 249–76; Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, pp. 183–87; Courroux, *Écriture de l'histoire*, pp. 697–717, 734–38, 786–817. See also Tamar S. Drukker, 'An Eye-Witness Account or Literary Historicism? John Page's *Siege of Rouen*', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s., 36 (2005), 251–73; Joanna Bellis, '"I was enforced to become an eyed witnes": Documenting War in Medieval and Early Modern Literature', in *Emotions and War: Medieval to Romantic Literature*, ed. by Stephanie Downes, Andrew Lynch, and Katrina O'Loughlin (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), pp. 133–51.

[91] See the criticisms of eyewitness testimony, perspective, and supposedly objective accounts by the mid-fourteenth-century chronicler from Tournai, Gilles le Muisit, 'Chronique', in *Chronique et annales*, ed. by Henri Lemaître, ShF, 323 (Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1906), pp. 1–219 (here 160–64). See also Yuval Noah Harari, *Renaissance Military Memoirs: War, History, and Identity, 1450–1600* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004), pp. 27–42.

Despite the narrative accounts often being rhetorical in their presentation of events, the casualty lists made after military action should have been easily reproduced to serve as a solid foundation for chroniclers to understand events from. It would be a simple matter, after all, to understand who was captured or killed in battle based on heraldry, distinctive armour, or other features.[92] Writers copied these lists out in a variety of formats and even interpolated them directly into their chronicles. However, nearly all surviving copies have errors of some kind that comparison with the records reveals.[93] Even these seemingly bare facts, devoid of any narrative context that might provoke writers to alter them, can be affected and constituted by bias or scribal errors.

An oblique solution to the unreliability of facts available to chroniclers is to ascertain the reliability of each text's representation of war as a whole. In such approaches scholars often turn to military manuals to understand the general approaches and motivations of medieval military leaders. These manuals were widely read and are claimed to have influenced the conduct of war in the Middle Ages. If this were the case any narratives that resemble their advocated behaviour would be more reliable for their realism. Roman manuals on war were particularly popular, especially from the twelfth century onwards, in their original Latin versions: Valerius Maximus' *Factorum et dictorum memorabilium* (*c*. 14–37) survives in 475 manuscripts,[94] Sextus Julius Frontinus' *Strategemata* (*c*. 84–96) in around 130 manuscripts,[95] and Publius Flavius Vegetius Renatus' *Epitoma rei militaris* (alternatively titled *De re militari*, *c*. 383–450) in 198

---

[92] On identification by armour see Ralph Moffat, 'The Importance of Being Harnest: Armour, Heraldry and Recognition in the Melee', in *Battle and Bloodshed: The Medieval World at War*, ed. by Lorna Bleach and Keira Borrill (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013), pp. 5–24.

[93] Livingston's examination of fourteenth-century accounts of Crécy and their casualty lists reveals that none are without error, except those that state only that Bohemia was killed: Michael Livingston, 'Counting the Dead at Crécy', in *The Battle of Crécy: A Casebook*, ed. by Michael Livingston and Kelly DeVries (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2015), pp. 485–89.

[94] Valerius Maximus, *Factorum et dictorum memorabilium*, ed. by John Briscoe, BT, 2 vols (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1998). For reception see Paul Oskar Kristeller and others, eds, *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum: Medieval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries*, 11 vols so far (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1960–), V, 287–403, XI, 307–36; Leighton D. Reynolds, ed., *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), pp. 428–30; Dorothy Schullian, 'A Revised List of Manuscripts of Valerius Maximus', in *Miscellanea Augusto Campana*, ed. by Augustuo Campana, 2 vols (Padova: Antenore, 1981), II, 695–728. Note, however, that Schullian's list has many errors, per personal correspondence with Kyle Conrau-Lewis.

[95] Sextus Julius Frontinus, *Strategemata*, ed. by Robert Ireland, BT (Leipzig: Teubner, 1990). For reception see Reynolds, ed., *Texts and Transmission*, pp. 171–72; Christine Walde and Brigitte Egger, eds, *The Reception of Classical Literature*, trans. by Duncan Smart and Matthijs H. Wibier, Brill's New Pauly, Supplements, 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), pp. 138–41; Frontinus, *Strategematon, libro qui fertur quarto*, ed. by Gotthold Gundermann, BT (Leipzig: Teubner, 1881), pp. 93–110 (partial list of 72 MSS). Allmand is preparing a comphrensive list of *c*. 130 MSS for publication, per personal correspondence. See also Christopher Allmand, 'A Roman Text on War: The *Strategemata* of Frontinus in the Middle Ages', in *Soldiers, Nobles and Gentlemen: Essays in Honour of Maurice Keen*, ed. by Peter Coss and Christopher Tyerman (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2009), pp. 153–68 (here 155–56 states that there are *c*. 120 complete MSS).

manuscripts.[96] These writers collect the wisdom of their predecessors, and each other in turn, into formats that make the best military knowledge conveniently available to readers.[97] Valerius and Frontinus write in the style of florilegia that narrate exemplary stories in groups to debate questions, while Vegetius offers a didactic manual that receives the bulk of scholarly attention, but all three offered pragmatic advice on warfare.[98]

Bachrach argues that Vegetius was influential throughout the Middle Ages because narratives describe military leaders following the precepts of his manual. To demonstrate this, he considers only writers who appear to be unaware of Vegetius and narrate war without rhetorical embellishment, then shows that their descriptions of warfare, strategy, and tactics clearly follow the precepts of Roman manuals. Bachrach claims that military leaders, in line with manuals, attacked only if battle was inevitable, harassed superior forces rather than confront them directly, used surprise, held reserves, positioned their forces so the enemy faced the sun, held fortifications along lines of supply and communication, used fortifications to deter invasion, and took good care of their horses.[99] He argues that because these leaders were wise, as narratives relate, they would have understood the value of written wisdom and turned to Vegetius, not experience or veterans' advice, for their education.[100]

In support of the practical use of Vegetius some scholars point to manuscripts that they claim were used by military leaders in the field. Porter claims a few Vegetius manuscripts are small enough to bring on campaign, but does not consider their quality, wear, or other physical attributes that might indicate their use. [101] Whetham asserts that two other surviving

---

[96] Publius Flavius Vegetius Renatus, *Epitoma rei militaris*, ed. by Michael D. Reeve, OCT (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004). For reception see Kristeller and others, eds, *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum*, VI, 175–84, VIII, 336–40; Walde and Egger, eds, *Reception of Classical Literature*, pp. 497–500. See Allmand for MS list based on Shrader's with my own corrections noted, Bieler for date of Dresden, Landes-und Universitätsbibliothek, MS Dc 182 (destroyed) as *c.* 1000 that is noted without date as 'war damaged' by Allmand, and Wisman and Allen for medieval commentaries: Charles Shrader, 'A Handlist of Extant Manuscripts Containing the *De re militari* of Flavius Vegetius Renatus', *Scriptorium*, 33 (1979), 280–305; Allmand, *'De re militari'*, pp. 354–66 (duplicates nos 30, 120, 145, 159, 210, omits 43, 44, 86, 88, 121, 181, 183, 184, 197, 231, from Shrader's list); Ludwig Bieler, 'The Text Tradition of Dicui's *Liber de mensura orbis terrae*', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, Section C*, 64 (1965), 1–31 (here 4–5).

[97] Their prefatory remarks state this as their purpose: Valerius Maximus, *Factorum*, 1.praef. (pp. 7–8); Frontinus, *Strategemata*, 1.praef.2 (pp. 1–2); Vegetius, *Epitoma*, 1.praef.4 (p. 5).

[98] See for example Prestwich, *Armies and Warfare*, p. 186: 'there was only one treatise read in the medieval period that discussed military strategy'. These texts are often bound together: Philippe Richardot, *Végèce et la culture militaire au Moyen Âge, V^e^–XV^e^ siècles* (Paris: Institut de Stratégie Comparée EPHE IV-Sorbonne & Economica, 1998), pp. 29–32; Allmand, 'Roman Text', p. 155; Allmand, *'De re militari'*, pp. 56–62; C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, pp. 247–55.

[99] Bernard S. Bachrach, 'The Practical Use of Vegetius' *De re militari* during the Early Middle Ages', *The Historian*, 47 (1985), 239–55 (here 245–49); which on this point is accepted by Helen J. Nicholson, *Medieval Warfare: Theory and Practice of War in Europe, 300–1500* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), p. 15. See also the similar methodology used to argue for Vegetius' practical influence by Charles Shrader, 'The Influence of Vegetius' *De re militari*', *Military Affairs*, 45 (1981), 167–72.

[100] B. S. Bachrach, 'Practical Use', pp. 251–55.

[101] P. Porter, 'Ways of War', p. 105.

manuscripts were used in this way.[102] However, the first of these is not a pamphlet, as he claims, but only a fragment of a larger manuscript that was used in libraries.[103] He acknowledges but disregards the scholarly opinion against this because of the existence of a 'folding, pocket-sized' manuscript of Vegetius that made 'carrying and referring to it on campaign possible'.[104] He cites Murray, who describes it as a 'folded MS of Vegetius [...] for carrying in the pocket'.[105] Murray, likewise, relies on Bischoff, who discusses manuscripts that might be folded and put in pockets, and describes a few possible candidates, including this Vegetius manuscript. Bischoff asserts that the first 22 folios were carried on their own in the field because they are folded lengthwise and are in separate quires from the rest of the manuscript, and were only bound up with the rest later.[106] However, the manuscript is not 'pocket-sized' but is the size of volumes normally read in libraries (29 x 21 cm), and even then, pockets were not widely used until the eighteenth century.[107] The creases in the manuscript are strongest in the first few folios and become less pronounced throughout, but are still faintly present past folio 22, which shows that these quires were not a separate pamphlet. The manuscript probably fell from a shelf or was improperly stored for a time to suffer these creases from one side of the group. If it were consulted in the field it would undoubtedly have been repeatedly folded in different ways to be placed in its bag or chest after each use, which would have left a variety of creases on both sides of folios 1–22. It has none of the soiling or general wear that would suggest use in the field either as a pamphlet or girdle book.[108] The high-quality vellum without wear, sparse marginalia, and only slight damage from damp on folios 66–80 suggests the volume did not see much use, even in its library.

---

[102] David Whetham, *Just Wars and Moral Victories: Surprise, Deception and the Normative Framework of European War in the Later Middle Ages* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), pp. 127–28, 150–52. See also Craig Taylor, 'Review of: David Whetham, *Just Wars and Moral Victories: Surprise, Deception and the Normative Framework of European War in the Later Middle Ages* (Leiden: Brill, 2009)', *English Historical Review*, 126 (2011), 918–19.

[103] London, British Library, MS Lansdowne 285. See Geoffrey Lester, *Sir John Paston's 'Grete Boke': A Descriptive Catalogue, with an Introduction of British Library, Manuscript Lansdowne 285* (Cambridge: Brewer, 1984).

[104] Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek, Codex Guelf. 84 Gud. Lat.; Whetham, *Just Wars*, pp. 127–28 (quote), 128 n. 70 (miscites the MS as 'Wolfenbüttel, Cod. Lat. 84').

[105] Alexander Murray, *Reason and Society in the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), p. 446 n. 66, also see pp. 127–30.

[106] Berhard Bischoff, 'Über gefaltete Handschriften, vornehmlich hagiographischen Inhalts', in *Mittelalterliche Studien: Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte*, 3 vols (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1966–81), I, 93–100 (here 94, 98).

[107] See catalogue entry and MS itself. See also Allmand, *'De re militari'*, p. 346; Rebecca Unsworth, 'Hands Deep in History: Pockets in Men and Women's Dress in Western Europe, *c.* 1480–1630', *Costume*, 51 (2017), 148–70; Barbara Burman and Ariane Fennetaux, *The Artful Pocket: A Social History of an Everyday Object in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Britain* (London: Routledge, forthcoming).

[108] Noel Fallows, *Jousting in Medieval and Renaissance Iberia* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2010), pp. 18–23; Jim Bloxam, 'The Beast, the Book and the Belt: An Introduction to the Study of Girdle or Belt Books from the Medieval Period', in *Breaking and Shaping Beastly Bodies: Animals as Material Culture in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Aleksander Pluskowski (Oxford: Oxbow, 2007), pp. 80–97.

Despite the evidence against the use of military manuals in the field, it is clear that many military leaders in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries found these texts valuable. Until the mid-fourteenth century Vegetius' manual was almost exclusively owned by monks and other religious figures, but afterwards became more popular with secular owners, especially French military leaders.[109] As the English experienced setbacks in the fifteenth century their leaders likewise began to read Vegetius and other prescriptive texts in earnest.[110] This responsive reading has caused these manuals to be labelled as literature of defeat.[111] Leaders on both sides of the channel owned mostly French translations of these texts, although two English translations were somewhat available in the fifteenth century.[112] This ownership of vernacular manuscripts might imply a more pragmatic and practical use of these texts, as they were more directly accessible to military men than the original Latin texts.[113] The most pragmatic of these, the 1408 English prose translation that was probably made for the gentry, does not omit the irrelevant antiquary portions from the Latin text but expands them.[114] Similarly, the English verse translation (1457–60) focuses more on style than information, and omits key aspects of the Latin original, such as any mention of retreat, to create a more chivalrous text.[115] The nobility collected large libraries that included such manuals and other war narratives, but in some cases it is doubtful whether

---

[109] Allmand, *'De re militari'*, pp. 63–80; Richardot, *Végèce et la culture militaire*, pp. 43–54.

[110] Craig Taylor, 'English Writings on Chivalry and Warfare during the Hundred Years War', in *Soldiers, Nobles and Gentlemen: Essays in Honour of Maurice Keen*, ed. by Peter Coss and Christopher Tyerman (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2009), pp. 64–84; Allmand, *'De re militari'*, pp. 71–72; Catherine Nall, *Reading and War in Fifteenth-Century England: From Lydgate to Malory* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2012), pp. 29–36.

[111] C. Taylor, 'English Writings', p. 84; Nall, *Reading and War*, pp. 48–74.

[112] Valerius' text survives in 67 MSS of French translations, Frontinus' text survives in 9 MSS of French translations, and Vegetius' text survives in 43 MSS of French translations and 17 MSS of English translations: Claudio Galderisi, ed., *Translations médiévales: Cinq siècles de traductions en français au Moyen Âge, XI^e–XV^e siècles*, 2 vols (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), nos 94, 66, 96 (II, 253–55, Valerius MSS, 195–96, Frontinus MSS, 256–60, adds French Vegetius MS, Sankt-Peterburg, Rossiyskaya natsional'naya biblioteka, MS Fr. F v IX); Allmand, *'De re militari'*, pp. 152–68 (examination of French translations), 362–63 (French MSS, mislabels F43 as F4, duplicates F42 in two sections, per Shrader's numbering), 365–66 (English MSS); Shrader, 'Handlist'; Richardot, *Végèce et la culture militaire*, pp. 210–12 (adds French Vegetius MSS, MF27, MF42); Anthony S. G. Edwards and Daniel Davies, 'A New Manuscript of *Knyghthode and Bataile*', *Medium Ævum*, 87 (2018), 137-41 (adds English Vegetius MS). Note also that most texts in English secular libraries were in French, not English or Latin: Richard Firth Green, *Poets and Princepleasers: Literature and the English Court in the Late Middle Ages* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980), pp. 152–54.

[113] Robert H. Lucas, 'Mediaeval French Translations of the Latin Classics to 1500', *Speculum*, 45 (1970), 225–53 (here 227); Whetham, *Just Wars*, pp. 121–24, 149–61. See also Allmand, *'De re militari'*, pp. 148–52.

[114] See for example *The Earliest English Translation of 'De re militari'*, ed. by Geoffrey Lester (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 1988), 3.25 (p. 151, elephants), 3.26 (pp. 152–54, camels). Allmand, *'De re militari'*, pp. 185–87, 193; Allmand, 'The English Translations of Vegetius' *De re militari*: What Were their Author's Intentions?', in *The Fifteenth Century XI: Concerns and Preoccupations*, ed. by Linda Clark (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2012), pp. 1–8 (here 1–4).

[115] *Knyghthode and Bataile: A XVth-Century Verse Paraphrase of 'De re militari'*, ed. by Roman Dyboski and Zygfryd M. Arend, EETSos, 201 (London: Oxford University Press, 1935); Daniel Wakelin, 'The Occasion, Author and Readers of *Knyghthode and Bataile*', *Medium Ævum*, 73 (2004), 260–72; Allmand, *'De re militari'*, pp. 187–93; Allmand, 'English Translations of Vegetius', pp. 4–8.

these were read or used much at all.[116] These texts could very well have been used simply to demonstrate an owner's military prudence and patronage of mankind's collected wisdom.[117]

It is tempting to imagine military leaders in the Middle Ages making practical use of manuals. It would allow the often fragmentary, contradictory, and confusing representations of war to be filtered out by comparison. Manuals would answer many of the fundamental questions that the records overlook and reveal how medieval military men approached the problems of war. Scholars accordingly use these writings to fill the gaps in narrative and record sources, such as the training of young knights, technology in siege and naval warfare, and the intended meaning of actions in the field.[118] Although early in her monograph Nicholson doubts the practical influence of Vegetius, she continually discusses his theories on causation in war, and uses them as starting-points for resolving difficult problems, especially of intention.[119] In turning to Roman authorities to sort out what seems insensible in narratives, and focusing on seemingly realistic accounts, it is likely that one will paint medieval military conduct as practiced in a more ordered, capable, and deliberate fashion than it was in reality.

A close and contextualised reading of narrative sources suggests that they do not represent warfare that is inspired by the teachings of Vegetius, but rather that their writers turned to these Roman sources, both narratives and manuals, to gain an understanding of war so that they themselves could better write war. Raids, battles, and sieges were complicated and dense events that writers rarely had intimate knowledge of. Jean Froissart, the famous chronicler of chivalry from Hainault, describes warfare in elaborate detail throughout his chronicle and explains why

---

[116] Allmand notes that about a third of the Latin MSS appear unread, and Taylor notes that Charles V owned at least 10 French Vegetius MSS: Allmand, *'De re militari'*, pp. 13–46, esp. 13; C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, p. 272.

[117] Juliet Vale, *Edward III and Chivalry: Chivalric Society and its Context, 1270–1350* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1982), pp. 49–52; C. Taylor, 'English Writings', pp. 81–82; Allmand, *'De re militari'*, pp. 209–10, 343; C. Taylor, 'Henry V, Flower of Chivalry', in *Henry V: New Interpretations*, ed. by Gwilym Dodd (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2013), pp. 217–47 (here 244–46).

[118] See for example Nicholas Orme, *From Childhood to Chivalry: The Education of the English Kings and Aristocracy, 1066–1530* (London: Methuen, 1984), pp. 185–88; Bradbury, *Medieval Siege*, pp. 214–95; B. S. Bachrach, 'Medieval Siege Warfare'; Susan Rose, *Medieval Naval Warfare, 1000–1500* (London: Routledge, 2002), p. 30; Graham Cushway, *Edward III and the War at Sea: The English Navy, 1327–1377* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2011), pp. 91–92; B. S. Bachrach and D. S. Bachrach, *Warfare in Medieval Europe*, pp. 37, 83, 154, 189, 317, 380–81. In a parallel vein, Hosler argues that medieval manuals, often in non-traditional forms, can reveal far more about developments in strategy: John D. Hosler, 'Reframing the Conversation on Medieval Military Strategy', *Journal of Medieval Military History*, 16 (2018 forthcoming).

[119] H. J. Nicholson, *Medieval Warfare*, pp. 41, 43, 58, 69, 71, 90, 103, 111, 113, 114, 120, 125, 135, 136, 137, 140, 141, 142, 146, 156, reservations at 13–21, 138. See the similarly problematic use of Clausewitz, Christine de Pizan, Sun Tzu, and Vegetius by C. J. Rogers, *War, Cruel and Sharp*, pp. xi, 1, 10, 15, 16, 27, 38 n. 64, 48, 127, 137 n. 47, 157, 172 n. 91, 174, 199, 226–27, 231, 238, 273, 286, 325, 348, 385, 420–21; C. J. Rogers, 'Henry V's Military Strategy in 1415', in *The Hundred Years War: A Wider Focus*, ed. by L. J. Andrew Villalon and Donald J. Kagay (Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 399–427 (here 405, 411, 413–14, 422); C. J. Rogers, 'Battle of Agincourt', pp. 69, 105. See also C. J. Rogers, 'Clausewitz, Genius, and the Rules', *Journal of Military History*, 66 (2002), 1167–76.

events happened the way they did, but never witnessed a battle himself.[120] Even writers who had fought in war, such as Thomas Gray, turned to written authorities and offer no deep insight.[121] In order to understand the conduct of war in all its nuances it was necessary for medieval writers to go beyond their newsletter and record sources and look for exemplary models of war in Roman sources.[122] Since these Roman texts were viewed as authorities, medieval writers cite them to appear well read, lend authority to their writings, and make the military leaders they describe look all the better.[123] However, writers rarely demonstrate their reading of these texts through direct quotation or cited paraphrase, but instead use them in a broader sense to understand warfare.[124] If one looks for parallels in depictions of war between Roman and medieval texts it should come as no surprise that they will be found quickly. Correlation between Roman precepts and medieval descriptions of war proves only that medieval writers, not military leaders, had read and accepted classical ideas.[125] In the end, these manuals do not offer any detailed or specialised advice that might be applicable on the medieval battlefield, but only 'common sense'.[126] Likewise, the famous French knight Geoffroi de Charny repeatedly stresses the importance of practical experience and conversation with veterans as the best preparation for campaigning, not reading manuals, in his own chivalric treatise, *Livre de chevalerie* (*c.* 1350).[127]

---

[120] Philippe Contamine, 'Froissart: Art militaire, pratique et conception de la guerre', in *Froissart, Historian*, ed. by John J. N. Palmer (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1981), pp. 132–44, 180–81 (here 133–34).

[121] Gray, *Scalacronica*, pp. xliv–liii.

[122] Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, pp. 110–11. See also John Keegan, *The Face of Battle* (New York: Viking Press, 1976), pp. 61–62: 'Battles are extremely confusing; and confronted with the need to make sense of something he does not understand, even the cleverest, indeed pre-eminently the cleverest man, realizing his need for a language and metaphor he does not possess, will turn to look at what someone else has already made of a similar set of events as a guide for his own pen'.

[123] Richard Abels and Stephen Morillo, 'A Lying Legacy? A Preliminary Discussion of Images of Antiquity and Altered Reality in Medieval Military History', *Journal of Medieval Military History*, 3 (2005), 1–13 (here 11); C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, p. 256.

[124] See for example the varied use of Sallust, in particular for conceptions of war and pre-battle orations: Beryl Smalley, 'Sallust in the Middle Ages', in *Classical Influences on European Culture, AD 500–1500*, ed. by Robert R. Bolgar (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), pp. 165–75.

[125] Biblical and classical texts often served as models for medieval narratives of warfare: Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, pp. 110–11. See also Smail, *Crusading Warfare*, p. 121 n. 3; Stephen Morillo, *Warfare under the Anglo-Norman Kings, 1066–1135* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1994), pp. 118 n. 89, 135 n. 156, 155 n. 68; Guy Halsall, *Warfare and Society in the Barbarian West, 450–900* (London: Routledge, 2003), p. 268 n. 35.

[126] Matthias Springer, 'Vegetius im Mittelalter', *Philologus*, 123 (1979), 85–90; Richardot, *Végèce et la culture militaire*, pp. 145–88; Sydney Anglo, 'Vegetius's *De re militari*: The Triumph of Mediocrity', *Antiquaries Journal*, 82 (2002), 247–67. Sherwood, however, dismisses the practical use of Vegetius because his advice went against chivalric ideas of attack and individuality: Foster H. Sherwood, 'Studies in Medieval Uses of Vegetius' *Epitoma rei militaris*' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1980), pp. 1–6.

[127] Geoffroi de Charny, *The Book of Chivalry: Text, Context, and Translation*, ed. by Richard W. Kaeuper, trans. by Elspeth Kennedy (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996), esp. § 40 (pp. 174–76); Prestwich, *Armies and Warfare*, pp. 186–87; C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, pp. 239–40. Saul, however, argues that knights read these manuals after they gained experience in the field: Saul, *For Honour and Fame*, p. 144.

Writers of historical literature did not seek to present facts and the truth in the sense that modern military historians hope for. Instead they aim to present exemplary stories that might educate their readers, praise the military leaders acting in their narratives, or both, propped up by 'factual' details.[128] First and foremost they wrote their texts as narratives and had no qualms about inventing episodes or descriptions that employed rhetorical turns and subtle literary allusions throughout.[129] Numbers, often disregarded for being exaggerated or imagined, are often used for rhetorical purposes, as are other historical details.[130] Similarly, direct speech is invented or drawn from classical exemplars in order to amplify the speaker's qualities and righteousness, and should not be treated only as either forged or accurately transcribed, but instead with attention to its narrative role.[131] Even the writers furthest from the battlefield, monks, had a keen interest in stories of war because they saw in them a parallel to their own spiritual battle, which profoundly affected their thinking and writing.[132]

The evidence suggests there is a great danger in reading and evaluating texts in a binary fashion, as either biased or unbiased, reliable or unreliable. Texts do not include only details from reliable sources.[133] Historical literature is instead layered in its meaning and implications because of its selective choice of vocabulary, grammatical constructions, details, and level of description.[134] Thus, Rogers' choice of the *Gesta Henrici Quinti* (1416–17) as one of the most reliable texts on the battle of Agincourt because its writer 'as a priest and a historian' would be

---

[128] Suzanne Fleischman, 'On the Representation of History and Fiction in the Middle Ages', *History and Theory*, 22 (1983), 278–310; Courroux, *Écriture de l'histoire*, pp. 585–658.

[129] Monika Otter, 'Functions of Fiction in Historical Writing', in *Writing Medieval History*, ed. by Nancy Partner (London: Hodder Arnold, 2005), pp. 109–30.

[130] Hanley, *War and Combat*, pp. 72–76, 146–47; Pierre Courroux, 'Remarks on the Use of Numbers during Battles in Medieval Chronicles', in *The Medieval Chronicle XIII* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, forthcoming). Verbruggen, without any serious critical engagement, argues that the smallest numbers in texts must be the most accurate and Riley-Smith offers a more reasonable approach based on prosopography, but relies on conjecture to fill the numerous gaps in the records: Verbruggen, *Art of Warfare*, pp. 5–9, 164–69; Jonathan Riley-Smith, 'Casualties and the Number of Knights on the First Crusade', *Crusades*, 1 (2002), 13–28.

[131] Smalley, 'Sallust', p. 168: asks 'could the general's words have encouraged more than the first few lines of his men'?; Hanley, *War and Combat*, pp. 101–02; C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, pp. 170–72; Courroux, *Écriture de l'histoire*, pp. 760–66. For an unconvincing argument that apparent borrowings from other sources is mere coincidence and speeches are genuine see John R. E. Bliese, 'Rhetoric Goes to War: The Doctrine of Ancient and Medieval Military Manuals', *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 24 (1994), 105–30 (esp. 219 n. 2).

[132] Katherine Allen Smith, *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2011); Allmand, *'De re militari'*, pp. 13–14, 19, 64–68, 332–33. The reverse is also true, as knights took an interest in religious tracts: Richard W. Kaeuper, *Holy Warriors: The Religious Ideology of Chivalry* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009).

[133] Matthews unconvincingly dismisses the rhetorical intentions of writers by arguing that Minot was not 'a fourteenth-century master of spin' because he was reliant on official announcements for his information: David Matthews, 'Laurence Minot, Edward III, and Nationalism', *Viator*, 38 (2007), 269–88 (here 284).

[134] Gabrielle Spiegel, *Romancing the Past: The Rise of Vernacular Prose Historiography in Thirteenth-Century France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993); Nancy Partner, 'The Hidden Self: Psychoanalysis and the Textual Unconscious', in *Writing Medieval History*, ed. by Nancy Partner (London: Hodder Arnold, 2005), pp. 42–64.

reluctant to 'lie', demonstrates a misunderstanding of medieval writers' notions of 'truth' and fact.[135] Equally, assessing narrative sources is not merely a matter of judging sections of each text against others to arrive at historical consensus through weight of evidence, especially considering how many late medieval sources are unedited and rarely considered.[136] This does not mean that these texts cannot be used to understand aspects of medieval culture or war.[137] With a more nuanced reading of these texts a greater spectrum of meaning beyond bare fact can be learnt, and engaged with, from narratives on war.[138] Texts with more 'literary' aspects should not be dismissed for being unrealistic, as exaggerated accounts still engage with problems that are central to the late medieval world.[139] These moments of brash abuse or exaggerated feats, written with unhindered creativity, allow for deeper engagement with the problems of war.

* * *

War was a violent enterprise that affected all levels of society. The records alone do not tell us precisely how the various acts of war occurred, their effects, or any greater ramifications, although we can arrive at a general idea. There are still many aspects of war for which there are no unimpeachable sources. It is here in these unknown areas, especially those concerned with intention and effect, that writers typically engage with the ethics of warfare. Indeed, the

---

[135] C. J. Rogers, 'Battle of Agincourt', p. 120; *Gesta Henrici Quinti*, ed. by Frank Taylor and John Roskell, OMT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975).

[136] Galbraith argues against weight of evidence because sources can often be copied from eachother or variant versions: Thomas Walsingham, *The St Albans Chronicle, 1406–1420, from Bodley MS 462*, ed. by Vivian H. Galbraith (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937), pp. xxiii–xxiv.

[137] Robert M. Stein, 'Literary Criticism and the Evidence for History', in *Writing Medieval History*, ed. by Nancy Partner (London: Hodder Arnold, 2005), pp. 67–87. On the value and uses of narratology in historical literature see Hayden White, 'The Historical Text as Literary Artifact', *Clio*, 3 (1974), 277–303; White, 'The Fictions of Factual Representation', in *The Literature of Fact: Selected Papers from the English Institute*, ed. by Angus Fletcher (New York: Columbia University Press, 1976), pp. 21–44; White, 'The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality', *Critical Inquiry*, 7 (1980–81), 5–27.

[138] See for example Hanley, *War and Combat*, pp. 53–104; DeVries, 'Use of Chronicles'; Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, pp. 99–111.

[139] The Bachrachs unfairly dismiss 'unrealistic' texts because they claim their audience would not believe them while simultaneously condemning scholars who call for a more nuanced approach to historical literature as 'pessimists', B. S. Bachrach unreasonably argues that the *Song of Roland* is a satire because it is 'unrealistic', and Villalon and Kagay omit colourful passages from their translation of Walter of Peterborough's poem on Nájera due to laziness: B. S. Bachrach and D. S. Bachrach, *Warfare in Medieval Europe*, esp. pp. 21–22; Bernard S. Bachrach, 'Is the *Song of Roland*'s Roncevalles a Military Satire?', in *Prowess, Piety, and Public Order in Medieval Society: Studies in Honor of Richard W. Kaeuper*, ed. by Craig M. Nakashian and Daniel P. Franke (Leiden: Brill, 2017), pp. 15–35; L. J. Andrew Villalon and Donald J. Kagay, *To Win and Lose a Medieval Battle: Nájera (April 3, 1367), a Pyrrhic Victory for the Black Prince* (Brill: Leiden, 2017), p. 545: the 'Latin of this poem is exceedingly difficult to translate', 'hyperbolic passages in the poem that have nothing to do with the campaign or battle [...] have been omitted', 'where we are simply unable to make sense of the Latin, we have resorted to that useful tool of scholarship—the ellipse'.

sometimes-unsavoury results of attacks are judged differently if they are understood as mere side effects or as their intended purpose and as ends in themselves. It is accordingly dangerous for us to accept any given position on these uncertainties, as it would have profound implications for how we approach narratives that portray war. If we view such depictions as only either realistic or unrealistic then there is little reason to consider them for their engagement with morally problematic military action, or to understand them properly, in their cultural, intellectual, and literary contexts, as their writers intended. We must consider how writers engage with ethical issues while providing details of these debated elements of war in order to properly understand late medieval attitudes to war.

CHAPTER TWO:
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

Historical literature, especially sermons and other colourful texts, often frame their descriptions of war with ideas of divine will, national identity, and just war. God was believed to be all-powerful and all-knowing, and accordingly was thought to take a role in military actions. The English saw themselves as a group in opposition to enemy peoples, such as the French and the Scots. Edward III promoted ideas of just war against the French and the Scots that were widely copied and seemingly accepted by his subjects. If these frameworks were widely accepted and taken to their logical conclusions, in which all actions in war would be inherently acceptable, then there would be no reason for medieval writers to consider the ethical issues of war. The implicit promotion of these mindsets in scholarship has contributed to the ethical problems of war being mostly overlooked, especially amongst military historians focused on how and why events happened, rather than related attitudes.[1] In this chapter I argue that historical literature does not blindly accept these theoretical frameworks and therefore ignore the ethics of war, but rather engages with them all to reinforce the ethical evaluation of military actions. To examine these problems I engage with sources of all genres, but focus particularly on 'abuse literature' because of its heavy engagement with these ideas to supposedly express hatred of the enemy.

1. DIVINE WILL

In the opening to his much read monograph on the Hundred Years War, Allmand asserts that people of 'the Middle Ages accepted war with fatalism [because it was seen as] part of the divine plan, linked with famine, flood, and plague as a manifestation of God's punishment for sins committed'.[2] Thus is explained the endemic, brutal, and seemingly unquestioned warfare of the later Middle Ages. Some scholars, such as Goodich, build off of this and suggest that people who were routinely attacked put increasing faith in divine will and the saints rather than secular

---

[1] See for example Hewitt, *Organization of War*, pp. 121–22: 'An incident which writers of later centuries would discreetly conceal or mention only with reasoned justification or extenuation or shame, can be related with relish by a chronicler provided it is the nation's enemies who are killed'.

[2] Allmand, *Hundred Years War*, p. 6. See also Allmand, ed., *Society at War: The Experience of England and France during the Hundred Years War*, rev. edn (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1998), pp. 40–43; Nicholas A. R. Wright, 'The *Tree of Battles* of Honoré Bouvet and the Laws of War', in *War, Literature and Politics in the Late Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of G. W. Coopland*, ed. by Christopher Allmand (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1976), pp. 12–31 (here 14–15); Contamine, *Guerre au Moyen Âge*, pp. 447–48.

authorities.[3] Because people in the Middle Ages did not actively challenge the pervasive warfare of the period through active protest it is therefore assumed that they accepted war and its actions as being willed by God. If this were the case, then there would be no room for criticism or complaint. Even setbacks and defeat would need to be accepted and, sometimes, praised. This rationalisation is found mostly in French texts, most succinctly by the French Benedictine monk Honoré Bouvet, who asserts in his *Arbre des batailles* (*c*. 1386–89) that wars

> Are all on account of the sin of the world, because of which God, to punish [sinners], allows wars, for so the Scripture says this. And so men-at-arms are the scourge of God, and with God's permission they administer punishment to sinners and sins and carry out [this punishment] against them.[4]

Bouvet here focuses on suffering in war as a *flagellum Dei* (scourge of God), sent to chastise a person or group for their transgressions.[5] This fatalistic framework would have allowed a society to make sense of insensible events that stood in stark contrast to the ideals of restrained chivalry and seemingly peaceful Christianity.[6] All actions could be seen as personally willed (or at least accepted) by God, and would be irreproachable.

Chroniclers, however, often demonstrate a more nuanced view of divine will than the intellectual debates would suggest. There is little indication that chroniclers had theological arguments at the forefront of their minds while writing because they rarely comment upon them. The most common expression of ideas of divine will, although indirect, is prophecies.[7] Events often occurred that appeared to carry portents of the future, such as comets or drought, as their

---

[3] Michael E. Goodich, *Violence and Miracle in the Fourteenth Century: Private Grief and Public Salvation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), pp. 121–46, 185–90.

[4] Honoré Bouvet, '*L'Arbre des batailles*: Étude de l'oeuvre et édition critique des textes français et occitan', ed. by Hélène Biu, 3 vols (unpublished doctoral thesis, Université Paris-Sorbonne, Paris IV, 2004), ch. 121, 4.54 (p. 791): 'toutez sont pour le piechié du siegle, dont Dieux pour les punir permet les guerrez, car ainsi le dit l'Escripture. Si sont les gens d'armes flaigel de Dieu et par permission de Dieu il font punicion dez pecheurs et dez peichiéz et si font excecucion contre eux', also see ch. 120, 4.53 (p. 791): 'et si les pecheurs aucunez fois ont victorie, nous ne savons mie dont cella vient quar Dieux le permet, mez confesser nous faut que de Dieu vient et par ordenance de son secret conseil ou par permission, dont il permet que une bonne personne soit misse au bas par ung meschant homme, et c'est pour lui coroner de pacience et pour prover sa vertu'. See also pp. 49, 89–90 below. On the confusion over the spelling of Bouvet's name see Gilbert Ouy, 'Honoré Bouvet (appelé à tort Bonet), prieur de Selonnet', *Romania*, 95 (1959), 255–59; N. A. R. Wright, *Knights and Peasants*, p. 9 n. 22.

[5] Interpreting hardship as divine retribution for sin was not uncommon: Allmand, 'War and the Non-Combatant in the Middle Ages', p. 264; Lesley A. Coote, *Prophecy and Public Affairs in Later Medieval England* (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2000), pp. 15–19; Baraz, *Medieval Cruelty*, pp. 185–86; Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p. 81; Ruddick, *English Identity*, pp. 169–70, 272–74, 279–80.

[6] Huizinga and Kilgour investigate the function of the ideal in relation to harsh reality, but Keen questions their sometimes explicit criticisms of chivalry: Johan Huizinga, *The Autumn of the Middle Ages*, trans. by Rodney J. Payton and Ulrich Mammitzsch (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), pp. 61–125 (first published in Dutch in 1919); Kilgour, *Decline of Chivalry*; Maurice Keen, 'Huizinga, Kilgour and the Decline of Chivalry', *Medievalia et Humanistica*, 8 (1977), 1–20.

[7] On the relationship between prophecy and divine will see Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, p. 46. Coote, *Prophecy*, p. 37.

cause was unidentified. Because it was not immediately obvious what exactly they were meant to reveal, chroniclers often recorded these extraordinary events with little or no comment so that later readers could link them to their foretold events after they came to pass.[8] Chroniclers recorded these prophetic omens in their constant attempts to make sense of events and show an overall order, or plan, to history.[9] Even though the prophecies or the events related might have little to do with religious matters, they engaged constantly with problems of agency.[10]

So-called 'political prophecies' were widespread in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century England. These prophecies were sometimes invented for the occasion, or drew upon real and seemingly auspicious events, but they were mostly inserted into more formally written texts.[11] They were widely consumed amongst 'intellectuals, the wealthy, and the politically powerful', and did not represent, as Coote argues, popular culture.[12] The earliest manuscript of Geoffrey le Baker's chronicle is bound with several prophecies that could be read to comment on contemporary events, and are occasionally alluded to throughout the chronicle's narrative.[13] Prophecies are invoked by chroniclers for varied rhetorical purposes, but are mostly used to reinforce the justness of English kings.[14] The *Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* adds to its source, the *Oldest Anglo-Norman Prose Brut*, a series of prophecies given by Merlin to Arthur during its narrative of the legendary period.[15] These prophecies are modified from the original version of the Anglo-Norman *Prophecy of the Six Kings to Follow John* (alternatively titled *Six Last Kings of the English*), which was probably first written shortly after 1312 to suit the chronicle's purposes.[16] The

---

8 See Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, pp. 21–56 (esp. 28–31).

9 See for example the careful structure and direction of universal histories: John Taylor, *The Universal Chronicle of Ranulf Higden* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966), pp. 33–39; J. Taylor, *English Historical Literature*, pp. 90–109.

10 There was an inherent relation between portents (as well as other prophecies) and divine will: Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, p. 41.

11 I only consider prophecies used by chroniclers or clearly intended to comment upon Edward III's actions, as it is difficult to date any given prophecy or determine what it referred to. This uncertainty is exacerbated by an inability to date the texts and each subsequent copy being significantly adjusted to fit each scribe's interests and focus: Coote, *Prophecy*, pp. 13–42.

12 Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, p. 40 (quote); Victoria Flood, *Prophecy, Politics and Place in Medieval England: From Geoffrey of Monmouth to Thomas of Erceldoune* (Woodbridge: Brewer, 2016), pp. 87–88 (argues against Coote's position); Coote, *Prophecy*, pp. 109–11.

13 Le Baker, *Chronicle*, MS 2, fols 180^{r}–183^{r}, 184^{v}–186^{r}.

14 Rupert Taylor, *The Political Prophecy in England* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1911), pp. 1–5. See also Coote, *Prophecy*, pp. 1–7; Ruddick, *English Identity*, pp. 40–42; Flood, *Prophecy*, pp. 1–17.

15 *Long ANPB*, ch. 75 (pp. 92–98). On the intended meaning of these prophecies, but through references to the Middle English translation, see Coote, Drukker, and Flood, and for the use of prophecies in the text, see Marvin: Coote, *Prophecy*, pp. 101–09; Tamar S. Drukker, 'Vision and History: Prophecy in the Middle English Prose *Brut* Chronicle', *Arthuriana*, 12 (2002), 25–49; Flood, *Prophecy*, pp. 88–109; Julia Marvin, 'Arthur Authorized: The Prophecies of the Prose *Brut* Chronicle', *Arthurian Literature*, 22 (2005), 84–99; J. Marvin, *The Construction of Vernacular History in the Anglo-Norman Prose 'Brut' Chronicle: The Manuscript Culture of Late Medieval England* (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2017), pp. 239–56.

16 'Merlin's Prophecy of the Six Kings', in Rupert Taylor, *The Political Prophecy in England* (New York: Columbia

first three prophecies describe in succession 'the Lamb' (*agnelle*), 'the Dragon' (*dragoun*), and 'the Goat' (*cheure*), which are identified as Henry III, Edward I, and Edward II through the additional chapters inserted after each of the reigns, in which the writer shows how these historical events fulfilled the prophecy.[17] The writer matches incidents previously narrated in the text with elements of the prophecy and praises each of the kings for their governance of England.

The writer of the *Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* had Edward III in mind when including the prophecy in the earlier section of his text and heaps optimistic praise on him, indirectly, as 'the Boar' (*sengler*). It begins with a few general statements on his role as a semi-divine figure and swiftly moves on to describe his actions.[18] It alludes to the problems at the beginning of Edward's reign by asserting that 'he will have great difficulty putting to justice the disloyal and in these times there will be a multitude of aliens', which is clearly meant to allude to Roger Mortimer (1287–1330) and the many Hainaulters then at court.[19] It then enumerates more of his qualities, especially piety, and suggests he might eventually go on crusade, as a king ideally would. It spends most of the second half of the prophecy on how the king will conquer France and other lands:

> He will sharpen his teeth on the gates of Paris and on four lands. Spain will tremble for fear of him, Anjou will sweat, in France he will put his battle formation. His great tail will rest comfortably in England. Germany will shake for fear of him [...] and he will make streams run with blood and brains and he will make several meadows red.[20]

The prophecy then summarises all the actions of his reign as 'he will gain whatever his ancestors before him lost', which alludes to Edward winning back his rule from his mother and Mortimer, but more importantly recovering what had been lost by his forebears.[21] The prophecy concludes with his symbolic death and burial, and declares: 'his land will then remain filled with all virtues'.[22] The use of prophecies was thought particularly important for this chronicle, so much that

University Press, 1911), pp. 160–64; Thomas M. Smallwood, 'The Prophecy of the Six Kings', *Speculum*, 60 (1985), 571–92 (commentary and corrections). Flood, *Prophecy*, pp. 87–88; Coote, *Prophecy*, p. 102 (argues for 1327 composition).

17 *Long ANPB*, chs 140 (pp. 202–04, Henry III), 186 (229–31, Edward I), 211 (270–74, Edward II).

18 *Long ANPB*, ch. 75 (p. 95).

19 *Long ANPB*, ch. 75 (p. 95): 'auera graunt payne a iustizer de desloialx [et] a ceste temps serra mulpliez de aliens'.

20 *Long ANPB*, ch. 75 (pp. 95–96): 'anguissera ses dentz sur les portez de Paris [et] sur quatre terres. Espaigne tremblera pur pour de luy, Angou tressura, en Fraunce mettra son eschele. Sa graunt cowe resposera en Engleterre tot suef. Almaigne fremura pur pour de luy [...] fra rushels curre de saunk [et] de ceruelle [et] ferra plusurs preez rouges'.

21 *Long ANPB*, ch. 75 (p. 96): 'gaignera quanquez ses auncestres auaunt luy perderent'.

22 *Long ANPB*, ch. 75 (p. 96): 'sa terre demurra donque repleine de tous biens'.

a scribe who added its 1308–28 narrative to an incomplete version of an Anglo-Norman chronicle also copied afterwards all the prophecies of Merlin, not just those evidently relating to Edward II.[23]

The *Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* ends in 1333, well before the death of Edward III in 1377, and thereby prevents the narrator from matching the prophecy with deeds in his style of retrospective analysis used on the other kings. Its continuation ends at 1347, and the *Middle English Prose Brut* has a continuation up until 1377 but includes only a short eulogy, without any mention of prophecy.[24] The lengthier eulogies and retrospective analyses of Edward III's reign, such as in the later continuations of Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon*, were not written until well into Richard II's reign. This did not, however, prevent other writers from drawing connections between the popular prophecy and Edward's actions. The English poet Laurence Minot (*fl.* 1333–52) draws on a version of this prophecy when he repeatedly labels Edward as 'the Boar' (*bare*, but in three instances *bore*), and sometimes even relates him directly to Merlin and his prophecies.[25] The sole manuscript in which Minot's poems survive also has a Middle English version of the prophecy, which serves to reinforce Edward as a prophesied king, although it is not the version drawn upon in the poems.[26] Geoffrey le Baker likewise describes the actions of Edward of Woodstock at the battle of Poitiers as 'thus raged the Boar of Cornwall'.[27] Reference to Merlin and the boar imagery is particularly important for these texts, as it connects Edward III to Arthur, who is himself depicted as the Boar of Cornwall in earlier prophecies by Geoffrey of Monmouth (*c.* 1095–*c.* 1155).[28] This connection allowed writers to suggest Edward III was the heir to Arthur and thereby just in his actions.[29]

Chroniclers often use prophecies to comment more directly on the justness of contemporary events. The *Bridlington Prophecy* (1349–50, traditionally attributed to John of Bridlington), the most widely cited prophecy in fourteenth-century English chronicles, survives

---

[23] *Long ANPB*, MS 8, fols 311^{r}–335^{v} (*Long ANPB* section), 336^{r}–343^{v} (prophecies). For information on the Anglo-Norman chronicle it continues see *Short ANPB*, MS 29 note.

[24] *The Brut, or the Chronicles of England*, ed. by Friedrich W. D. Brie, EETSos, 131, 136, 2 vols (London: Paul, 1906–08), pp. 333–34.

[25] Minot, *Poems*, 6.3 ('bore'), 6.53, 7.9, 7.21 ('bore'), 7.42, 7.44, 7.47, 7.52, 7.96, 7.97, 7.106, 7.150, 7.167, 8.19, 8.25, 8.49, 8.87, 9.8, 11.34 ('bore'). See also use of boar imagery for destruction and devastation at pp. 108–09 below.

[26] London, British Library, MS Cotton Galba E IX, fols 49^{r}–50^{v} (prophecies), 52^{r}–57^{v} (Minot's poems). See also 'Prophecies of Merlin', in Laurence Minot, *Poems*, ed. by Joseph Hall, 3rd edn (London: Oxford University Press, 1914), pp. 103–11, 123–26; Smallwood, 'Prophecy' (commentary and corrections).

[27] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 152: 'sic furit aper Cornubiensis'. See also Coote, *Prophecy*, p. 132.

[28] Geoffrey of Monmouth, *De gestis Britonum*, ed. by Michael D. Reeve, trans. by Neil Wright (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), bk 7 (pp. 143–59).

[29] Coote, *Prophecy*, pp. 105–07; J. Marvin, 'Arthur Authorized', p. 95; Flood, *Prophecy*, pp. 89–91, 96–99, 104–06.

in thirty-three manuscripts and received a commentary by John Ergome (*c.* 1362–64) that survives in four manuscripts and explains in detail how it relates to historical events.[30] The *Bridlington Chronicle* draws on and quotes several prophecies to resolve complicated events, and then concludes Edward II's reign, when he is deposed, with an extract from an early version of the *Prophecy* that relates the prophecy to his reign.[31] The chronicle's continuation to 1377 opens with three passages from different prophecies, the third of which is from another early version of the *Prophecy*, and relates them to Edward III's expected future successes, especially in war.[32] Throughout the rest of the continuation the writer adds extracts from the prophecy to comment on local and international events, but focuses on praise of English acts.[33] The *Kirkstall Abbey Long Chronicle* also draws upon the *Prophecy* (and other prophecies) to understand events, but does so in a more explicitly political manner. The chronicler only invokes the prophecy during Edward III's reign and in many cases for military actions in particular. These prophetic passages are all used for events related to Edward III's early successes and defence of England against his enemies and serve as legitimising sources that are quoted at length after each success.[34]

Prophecy is not used to suggest that all events are willed by God, or are simply employed for rhetorical flourish, but to lend authority to colourful narratives of the English kings.[35] Drawing on the general structure established by the *Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut*, chroniclers narrate events in detail and follow immediately with commentary on how prophecy anticipates them. Chronicles draw upon prophecies that often leave many years or kings' reigns yet to be fulfilled, as with the *Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* and its prophecies on Edward III. They always show how their earlier preordained events match up with the prophecies, which thereby suggests divine endorsement of successful English kings in their present and future deeds.[36] In

---

[30] John of Bridlington, 'Versus propheciales, prophecia', ed. by Michael Curley (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1973). There is much debate on the authorship and date of composition of the prophecies and their commentary, but here I follow Rigg's compelling arguments: R. Taylor, *Political Prophecy*, pp. 51–58; Arthur G. Rigg, 'John of Bridlington's *Prophecy*: A New Look', *Speculum*, 63 (1988), 596–613; Rigg, *A History of Anglo-Latin Literature, 1066–1422* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 265–68, 382–83; Coote, *Prophecy*, pp. 121–28, 138–44; Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, pp. 209–11.

[31] *Bridlington*, pp. 76, 89, 91–92. See also Coote, *Prophecy*, pp. 118–19; Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, p. 43.

[32] *Bridlington*, pp. 93–96. The first of these is also found in Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus*, MSS 1–3.

[33] *Bridlington*, pp. 97–98, 100, 100, 101, 102, 102–03, 107 (after Dupplin Moor, 1332). See also p. 165 n. 116 below.

[34] *Kirkstall*, fols 77^{r} (Edward III's coronation), 77^{v} (Edward III's reign), 78^{r} (Mortimer's downfall), 78^{r} (David II's marriage), 78^{v} (Dupplin Moor), 79^{r} (Halidon Hill), 80^{v} (Philippe VI's coronation), 81^{r} (1339 campaign), 81^{v} (alliances), 82^{r} (Sluys), 82^{v} (Caen), 83^{r} (Crécy), 83^{v} (Calais), 84^{r} (Neville's Cross), 84^{r} (capture of Charles de Blois), 86^{r} (Philippe VI), 87^{r} (Poitiers). See also John Taylor, *The Kirkstall Abbey Chronicles*, Thoresby Society, 42 (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1952), pp. 50–51.

[35] The use of prophecy is limited to chroniclers in northern England, with the exception of *Eulogium*, written in Malmesbury Abbey: *Eulogium*, 2.115, 5.60, 4.42 (I, 406–07, II, 417–20, 284–301). See also Coote, *Prophecy*, pp. 136–37.

[36] J. Marvin, 'Arthur Authorized', pp. 93, 96–97.

most cases they better connect the past and the future with the present to praise Edward and his actions for playing a major role in history.[37] In many cases, such as in the *Kirkstall Abbey Long Chronicle*, prophecy sidesteps ethical problems and praises victory in English military actions. The structured use of prophecy juxtaposed with events in chronicles suggests that readers were expected to understand their meaning and rhetorical power, even if it was not explicitly stated.

While chroniclers often employ prophecies to legitimise the actions of Edward III, they sometimes use them to delegitimise enemy rulers. Many English sources interpret the story of David II (born 1324, *r.* 1329–71) defecating in the baptismal font, or on his coronation altar, as prophetic. The *Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* (*c.* 1333–35) supplies the earliest version of the story when, during its critical account of the 1328 treaty of Northampton, it labels him as 'David shit-on-altar'.[38] However, the passage is largely unknown to scholars because the text has only been edited in an unpublished doctoral dissertation (omits title from the translation) and editions of the later translation into Middle English (*Middle English Prose Brut*, Common Version–1333), all of which make no attempt to explain the title.[39] The confusion over the meaning of the title is largely due to the reliance of scholars on Brie's 1906–08 edition, which mistranscribes the title, probably due to unfamiliarity with the more colloquial vocabulary used here.[40] The reference to the vulgar disregard for ritual is meant to delegitimise the Scottish king

---

[37] See Flood, *Prophecy*, esp. p. 3.

[38] The spelling of this title varies between manuscripts and the second recension manuscripts (MSS 7, 8, 10, and 11) move it to the chapter immediately after that in which it is used in the first recension: *Long ANPB*, MS 2 fol. 108^{r}: 'dauid dryt on auter', MS 3 fol. 150^{r}: 'Dauid Dritonautier', MS 4 fol. 62^{r}: 'Dauid Dritonauter', MS 5 fol. 92^{v}: 'Dauid dryt on auter', MS 6 fol. 225^{v}: 'Dauid Dritonauter', MS 7 fol. 170^{r}: 'dauid dritoun auter', MS 8 fol. 332^{v}: 'dauid Dritonaut[er]', MS 10 fol. 98^{r}: 'Dauid Dritonauter', MS 11 fol. 94^{v}: 'Dauid Dritonauter'. Other insular copies do not include the title because they are fragments of other sections of the text (MS 9) or are abridged copies that end before this point in the narrative (MSS 1, 12, and 13).

[39] *Long ANPB*, ch. 217 (pp. 284, p. 580): 'Dauid Dritoun Anter'; *The Brut*, p. 255: 'Dauid Dritonanter' (no explanation); *Le Brut Moyen-Anglais en prose (version commune des origines à 1333)*, ed. by Marie-Françoise Alamichel (Turnhout: Brepols, 2016), pp. 426–27, 526 n. 795 (no explanation and omitted from facing-page modern French translation of the Middle English text). See also Lister M. Matheson, *The Prose 'Brut': The Development of a Middle English Chronicle* (Tempe: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1998), pp. 47–49, 79–87; Trevor Russell Smith, 'Ethics and Representation of War in the *Lanercost Chronicle*, 1327–46', *Bulletin of International Medieval Research*, 20 (2018 forthcoming).

[40] Brie's edition is based on Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson B 171 (SC 11539), fols 1^{r}–171^{r} (here 150^{v}, *c.* 1400): 'dauid dritonauter'. The spelling varies greatly between MSS of this version of the *Middle English Prose Brut*: Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, MS Peniarth 398D, pp. 3–274 (here 258, s. XV): 'dauid Britonaut[er]'; Dublin, Trinity College, MS 490 (E II 15), fols 13^{r}–132^{v} (here 119^{r}, s. XV): 'Dauid dritonauter'; Manchester, Rylands Library, MS Eng. 103, fols 9^{r}–126^{v} (here 111^{v}, s. XV ¼): 'dauid Dritonaut[er]'; New Haven, Yale University Beinecke Library, MS 494, fols 3^{r}–103^{r} (here 87^{r}, s. XV ¼): 'Dauid Dritonaunter'; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 840 (SC 27654), fols 1^{r}–117^{r} (here 104^{r}, *c.* 1420–30): 'Dauid Drytonautere'; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 323 (SC 21897), fols 1^{r}–101^{v} (here 89^{v}, s. XV 2): 'Dauid Ditonautier'. The title is not in three MSS: London, British Library, MS Harley 3945, fols 1^{r}–117^{v} (imperf. end due to lost leaves, s. XV); Manchester, Rylands Library, MS Eng. 206, fols 3^{r}–104^{v} (imperf. end due to lost leaves, s. XIV/XV); Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson C 155 (SC 12019), fols 89^{r}–

and suggest he will not keep the treaty, and also that he is not fit to make agreements with at all. The three copies of the text in continental French omit all reference to this scurillous story to minimise criticisms of the later ally of the French.[41] The terseness of this reference suggests that the story was already in wide enough circulation at the time of writing that readers would understand what it alluded to only a few years after the mishap was supposed to have taken place. A variant manuscript of Adam Murimuth's *Continuatio chronicarum* includes the defamatory label in four instances at and near the same point that they appear in the *Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut*'s narrative, but all of them are scraped so thoroughly that they are visible only through multispectral imaging (only a few letters of each are visible under ultraviolet light), and have thus remained unknown until I discovered them in the course of my research.[42] It was probably first written in the form of a political prophecy, like those described above, or as a popular poem on contemporary events. There is evidence it was disseminated throughout England, as it is used in many northern texts, but also by southern chroniclers, Geoffrey le Baker and Murimuth, in a variant manuscript, all with varying rhetorical purposes and details.

Many of the other English sources that reference the story of David II's defecation use it as a prophecy in a more traditional sense. These later sources were able to show that the prophecy had been fulfilled as the Scottish king had, indeed, broken his treaty with the English and had invaded in 1346. The Calais Anonymous' poem on the battle of Neville's Cross (*c.* 1346–47) gives a greatly elaborated and insulting version of the story, wherein both the font and altar are defiled, amongst much scatological humour and biblical allegory. The poet concludes by commenting on how it relates to David's invasion of England:

93^{v} (extracts that do not include this passage, 1606, Henry Spelman). I have not yet examined the other two MSS listed in Matheson, *Prose 'Brut'*, items 3 and 6 (pp. 80–81, 82).

41 The title should be in one of two places: *Long ANPB*, MS 14 fols 142^{r} or 142^{v}, MS 15 fols 213^{v} or 214^{v}, MS 16 fols 189^{r} or 189^{v}.

42 Italic text scraped, struck through text is crossed out in ink similar to that used for contemporary marginal notes: Murimuth, *Continuatio*, pp. 54 n. 13, 56 and n. 11, and 57 and n. 7, MS 4 fol. 215^{r}: 'cui successit Dauid *Dryteaucter* fil[ius] eius adult[er] et om[n]i iniquitate [et] malicia repletus' and a marginal note at this point in the same hand 'Rob[er]tus / de Brus / obiit succ[essit] / Dauid *Dryt / aucter filius* / eius' (there might have been a final 'e' for 'Dryt' but the leaf has been recut too closely), 'Dauid *Dryteaucter* fil[ius] Rob[ert]i de Brus vir adult[er] [et] om[n]i iniquitate [et] malicia repletus duxit Johannam de la Tour sororem regis Angl[ie] in ux[or]em', 'post nupc[ias] int[er] d[i]c[tu]m ~~adult[er]um~~ Dauid *Dryteaucter* [et] sororem regis Angl[ie]'. The editor was not thorough in his comparison of manuscripts and therefore misrepresents the text here and elsewhere, so I have re-transcribed these passages. He ignores these, and nearly all of the many other instances of text scraped from this manuscript, and only mentions those that are visible to the naked eye. The other text scraped from the manuscript is typically only a word or two in length and nearly always anti-Scottish in character, but scraped lightly enough to be clearly visible under ultraviolet light: Murimuth, *Continuatio*, MS 4, fols 114^{v} (number scraped and written over in contemporary hand), 116^{r} (three instances), 116^{v}, 117^{r} (two instances), 117^{v}, 121^{r} (three instances, one of which is a sentence scraped and written over in contemporary hand), 125^{r} (three instances, one of which is written over in a contemporary hand), 131^{v} (three instances, all of which are written over in a contemporary hand), 137^{v} (two instances). None of the other MSS of Murimuth's *Continuatio* have any text scraped.

I believe it was prophesied that he violated God's holy things,
in fact, by his deeds he confirmed that evil grace blew out from him.
The son violated the altar along with the holy font,
with blood the father hurried to defile the church.
From all this they committed this desecration because they spoiled the kingdom's law:
truly, sacrilegeously, they were devoid of reverence for the Lord.[43]

The *Lanercost Chronicle* mentions the story twice in its narrative of the Scottish invasion to better criticise the Scots' attacks on English civilians.[44] It has many similarities in content and vocabulary with the Calais Anonymous' poem and therefore probably drew on it. Geoffrey le Baker utilises the story's prophetic potential, and also invokes the title given in the *Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut*, when, after describing the defecation, he states that 'one of the Scots, James Douglas [*c.* 1289–1330, also known as the 'Black Douglas'], said to his friends: "I fear", he said, "that he will defile the whole kingdom of Scotland". He was called, because of this accident, by blasphemers, "David altar shitter"'.[45]

The stories of David II's mishap all draw on the literary trope of baptismal defecation. Some twelfth-century chronicles describe Æthelred II, the 'ill-counselled' (*unraed*, commonly mistranslated as 'unready', *r.* 978–1013), as persisting in his wickedness, despite the symbolic warning of his foul deed.[46] These might have drawn inspiration from the baptismal defecation of the Byzantine emperor Constantine V, the 'Dung-Named' (*Kopronymos*, *r.* 741–75), as recounted by the papal librarian Anastasius Bibliothecarius in his *Chronographia tripartita* (871–74), which translated its account from Theophanes the Confessor's *Chronographia* (810–15).[47]

---

[43] Calais Anonymous, 'Durham', in 'Propaganda of the Hundred Years War: Poems on the Battles of Crécy and Durham (1346), a Critical Edition', ed. by Arthur G. Rigg, *Traditio*, 54 (1999), 188–96, 205–11 (here lines 85–108, quote at 103–08): 'credo prophetauit quod sacra Dei violaret, / facto firmauit quod ei mala gracia flaret. / Filius altare cum fonte sacro temerauit, / sanguine fedare pater ecclesiam properauit. / Ergo prophanarunt quod ius regni viciarunt: / sacrilege vere cultu domini caruere'.

[44] See *Lanercost*'s references to David II's defecation in its accounts of his attacks on civilians at p. 96 below.

[45] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 40: 'unde quidam Scotorum, Iacobus Dowglas, dixit suis amicis: "Timeo," inquiens, "ne iste totum regnum Scocie sit fedaturus". Vocabatur ab illo casu a blasfemantibus "David dryt hauter"'.

[46] William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum Anglorum*, ed. by Roger A. B. Mynors, Rodney M. Thomson, and Michael Winterbottom, OMT, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998–99), 2.164 (I, 326); Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, ed. by Diana Greenway, OMT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 5.28 (p. 326); Björn Weiler, 'William of Malmesbury on Kingship', *History*, 90 (2005), 3–22.

[47] Anastasius Bibliothecarius, 'Chronographia tripertita', in Theophanes the Confessor, *Chronographia*, ed. by Carl de Boor, BT, 2 vols (Leipzig: Teubner, 1883–85), II, 31–346 (here 259). For reception see Réka Forrai, 'Anastasius Bibliotecarius and his Textual Dossiers: Greek Collections and their Latin Transmission in 9th Century Rome', in *L'Antiquité tardive dans les collections médiévales: Textes et représentations, VI^e–XIV^e siècle*, ed. by Stéphane Gioanni and Benoît Grévin (Roma: École française de Rome, 2008), pp. 319–37.

Similarly, David's defecation was meant to serve as a prophetic warning against his potentially immoral conduct. However, it is clear here that the warning suggests that the prophecy was not absolutely fixed, and the king was able, and ought, to avoid going down the route of evil action. Monks and religious writers might have taken particular interest in employing this sort of story because of their own personal experiences with such situations. Baptismal accidents are not uncommon in reality, more so with boys, and, because holy water is used and the font cannot be readily moved or tipped over, a churchman would have to remove the befouled contents of the font, cup by cup, for special disposal.[48] Chronicles allowed for different levels of interpretation in their use of prophecy but by pairing it with David's invasion of England they were able to forcefully condemn his actions in such a way that would undoubtedly bring up vivid, multisensory memories for many of their readers.

Rather than praising actions and the individuals who perform them, and thus putting store in military action that was so often criticised for the sin of pride, chronicles sometimes praise divine will.[49] In these texts individuals and their actions are largely absent from military events, in contrast to those given by more 'secular' or 'chivalric' chroniclers, such as Jean le Bel and Geoffrey le Baker. The *Canterbury Chronicle*, for example, invokes divine will as an aid to the English in nearly every battle it describes. It concludes the battle of Crécy by asserting that Edward III won 'with the hand of God assisting him'.[50] The writer similarly summarises Edward of Woodstock's victories in Gascony in 1355 and 1356: 'God gave to him victory and triumph from his enemies in many places' and 'by the assisting power of the only God, the same prince obtained victory in the said battle [of Poitiers]'.[51] He states that at the battle of Auray in 1364 'the victory of the said battle remained in the hands of the same John de Montfort, by the Lord helping'.[52] The enemy is defeated at the battle of Nájera in the short continuation to the chronicle: 'in the end, with the aid of God, the same bastard [Enrique II] with all of his army had been vanquished, and [also] by the favour of God'.[53] These repeated details of God aiding the outcome of battle suggest an overriding belief in divine will.

---

48 Per the unfortunate personal experiences of Matthew Beckman, OFM.

49 See for example Richard W. Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence in Medieval Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 253–72.

50 *Canterbury Chronicle*, ch. 14 (p. 12): 'assistente sibi manu Dei'.

51 *Canterbury Chronicle*, chs 27, 30 (pp. 20, 20–22): 'cui Deus de inimicis suis in multis locis dedit uictoriam et triumphum', 'solius Dei assistente potencia, idem princeps in dicto bello uictoriam reportauit'.

52 *Canterbury Chronicle*, ch. 109 (p. 136): 'uictoria dicti belli penes eundem Iohannem Montford, domino adiuuante, remansit'.

53 *Canterbury Chronicle*, p. 150: 'tandem cum Dei adiutorio idem bastardus cum toto exercitu suo et gratia Dei deuictus fuerat'.

Some chroniclers take a firmer view and almost completely remove the role of mankind from military events. After describing the desire of Philippe VI (*r.* 1328–50), king of France, to personally fight with Edward III at the battle of Crécy, the *Canterbury Chronicle* states that 'finally, by the hand of God helping, in that battle [many French military leaders] fell by the sword'.[54] The writer here draws on biblical imagery and means to deny the efficacy of French knights through the superior power of divine will.[55] The *London St Paul's Annals* similarly emphasises the supremacy of divine will during the 1332 Scotland campaign of Edward Balliol, pretender to the Scottish throne (born *c.* 1283, *r.* 1314–56), by adding a statement that asserts it was 'by God helping' that the English succeeded, and also omitting the only phrase that describes action of the battle from its source, Adam Murimuth's *Continuatio chronicarum*.[56] The chronicler adds emphasis to his source's claim that 'they said that this had been done, not by [the English army's] virtue but by divine influence, and therefore the English themselves praised God', by changing 'they *said* that this had been done' to 'they *believed* that this had been done'.[57] In conclusion the writer adds a long, unique passage to his source about the prayer and thanksgiving made in London for the successful outcome of the campaign, which ends: 'they were rejoicing greatly over the victory achieved by the omnipotent God'.[58]

These writers sometimes take a theological position that inherently clashes with those that praise military actions and the details of feats performed by prominent knights. They claim that victories are demonstrations of divine support for the victors, and thus promote their justness. They do not praise the means of victory, but simply the bloodless results. Thomas Bradwardine, in his so-called 'Victory Sermon' (late 1346), describes the many English victories over their enemies in 1346 but then asks 'surely they were not done through the power of the king of England nor his men? No. God forbid fully that anybody should say or think thus. God forbid'.[59] The *Lanercost Chronicle*, after a lengthy interpolated letter by Edward III that describes

---

[54] *Canterbury Chronicle*, ch. 14 (p. 10): 'tandemque, cooperante manu Dei, in illo conflictu ceciderunt in gladio'.

[55] See for example *Bible*, Isaiah 13.15, Jeremiah 44.12, Lamentations 2.21, Ezekiel 39.23, Hosea 7.16, Amos 7.17: 'cadet in gladio', 'cadent in gladio', 'ceciderunt in gladio', 'ceciderint in gladio', 'cadent in gladio', 'in gladio cadent'.

[56] Italic text added, bracketed text omitted. *London St Paul's*, p. 357: '*auxiliante Deo*, duo milia Anglicorum vicerunt .xl. milia Scotorum [prae multitudine et pressura se ipsos etiam opprimentium]'; Murimuth, *Continuatio*, pp. 66–67.

[57] Italic text altered: Murimuth, *Continuatio*, p. 67: 'Et hoc totum non sua virtute sed gratia divina ipsi Anglici factum esse *dixerunt*, et Deum propterea laudaverunt'; *London St Paul's*, p. 357: 'factum esse *crediderunt*'.

[58] *London St Paul's*, pp. 358–59 (here 359): 'multum gaudentes de victoria ab omnipotenti Deo facta'.

[59] Thomas Bradwardine, 'Victory Sermon in 1346', in Hilary S. Offler, *Church and Crown in the Fourteenth Century: Studies in European History and Political Thought*, ed. by A Ian Doyle (Aldershot: Variorum, 2000), XIII, 1–40 (here § 23, p. 26): 'nunquid illa fiebant per potestatem regis Anglie aut suorum? Non. Plene absit quod quisquam sic dixerit aut cogitauerit. Absit'. See also Bradwardine, *De causa Dei contra Pelagium et de virtute causarum*, ed. by Anna Lukács (Göttingen: V&R Unipress, 2013).

the beginning of his 1346 Normandy campaign with a particular focus on the achievements of his men, tersely narrates the English victory at the battle of Crécy: '[Edward] engaged in a grave battle, he overcame his adversary'.[60] The chronicle follows this with a casualty list, but provides no detail of action and concludes by declaring that the battle ended not because the English fought well or were right in their claims, as many texts do, but because it was 'as the Lord grants' and the battle 'was ended not by human, but by Divine power'.[61]

The *Lanercost Chronicle*'s account of victory and defeat stands in stark contrast to the highly detailed account in the *Anonimalle Chronicle*, which was probably altered because the account in its source, the *Minorite Chronicle*, also shared with *Lanercost* and the *Durham Latin Prose 'Brut'*, did not fit with the overall themes of the chronicler's intended narrative.[62] *Anonimalle* does not shy away from the means of victory by focusing exclusively on divine will, but instead celebrates military action and combat in a chivalric tone. However, the chronicle concludes by using a formulaic phrase that conflicts with the overall tone of the rest of his narrative: 'by divine grace and by the prayers of good people, and not by the force of man, the field and the victory, praise be to God, [were left to the English]'.[63] This is clearly a translation and slight elaboration of the passage found in the *Minorite Chronicle*, as both *Lanercost* and the *Durham 'Brut'* include similar passages, as cited above. This is a clear example of the sometimes haphazard composition of chronicles, but also shows that some writers could espouse seemingly contradictory ideas in the same episode to praise the English all the more.

Many chroniclers invoke ideas of divine will alongside human action, as does the *Anonimalle Chronicle*, in a rhetorical sense, but are comfortable praising elaborately and explicitly described military action. Geoffrey le Baker mentions at the battle of Poitiers that 'our men [the English], except the leaders, gave up hope of victory. To God they all entrusted themselves', while he states of Edward III at the battle of Crécy that 'to God and the blessed Virgin he entrusted everything'.[64] In a similar sense, the *Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* only once mentions divine will affecting the outcome of battle. As the writer describes the battle of Dupplin Moor in 1332,

---

60 *Lanercost*, p. 344: 'conserto gravi proelio, suum adversarium vicit'.

61 *Lanercost*, p. 344: 'Domino concedente', 'non humana sed divina potentia consummatum', also see pp. 274, 334. The second passage is also found in the *Durham LPB*, MS 2 fol. 34ᶜ: 'no[n] hu[ma]na s[ed] d[iv]ina potencia [con]su[m]matu[m]'.

62 *Anonimalle*, pp. 22–23.

63 *Anonimalle*, p. 22: 'par devyne grace et pay priers des bones gentz et nemy par force de homm le chaump et la victorie, loiez en soit Dieu'.

64 Le Baker, *Chronicle*, pp. 150, 82: 'nostri, ducibus exceptis, de victoria desperantes, Deo se totos comendarunt', 'omnia Deo et Virgini beate commendavit', also see pp. 9, 38, 39, 46, 50, 77.

Fulk Fitz Warren encourages his men: 'let us take into us strength and hardiness and let us by no means think about our wives and our children, but only about winning the battle, and by the aid of God we will vanquish our enemies'.[65] Chroniclers thought the idea important enough for them to interpolate letters that request prayer before or after campaigns directly into their own narratives.[66] But even then, they still focus on the personal achievements of the English in war without any sort of reliance on divine will. In many of these accounts battles are described in lengthy narratives that are driven solely by human action, not by any sort of divine intervention.

It is tempting to use divine will as a solution to the seemingly contradictory aspects of war in the later Middle Ages, especially those with unsavoury elements. While some medieval thinkers might appear to hold firm to divine will or human action to explain events, it is clear that chroniclers often switch between the two and use them in different settings to praise English actions as it best suits their narratives. Mentions of divine intervention are mostly formulaic and never elaborated upon or consistently applied in these texts. Every chronicle that covers these events cares about the people acting within them, English or otherwise, and suggests they matter on their own terms, even if their acts are only described in cursory detail. However, even the chronicles that are most interested in the acts of war, such as the *Anonimalle Chronicle*, invoke notions of God determining acts to show divine endorsement for the victory, and therefore, the people involved. Likewise, writers that appear overwhelmingly concerned with divine will can find more temporal explanations. Bouvet himself, immediately after his seemingly fatalistic explanation of war and suffering that is given at the beginning of this section, blames the people doing them rather than treat them as a *flagellum Dei* (scourge of God).[67] This is not to say that divine will or prophecy are carelessly employed as mere elements of style, but that they were 'treated with deadly seriousness' by writers who used them.[68] They allow writers to further increase the praise or criticism for such events, and in no way override the praise earned for actions that were done by men. Equally, writers do not ignore or praise English defeat

---

[65] *Long ANPB*, ch. 223 (p. 306): 'preignoms en nous fortres [et] Hardiness [et] pensoms nient sur noz femmes ne sur noz enfantz, mais tant soulement de conquere la bataille, [et] par le aide de Dieux noz enemys nous venquiroms'.

[66] *Long ANPB Continuation*, fols 192^{r}–193^{r} (to the archbishop of Canterbury after Sluys); Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus*, pp. 312–14 (to the archbishop of Canterbury after Sluys); *Bridlington*, 135–36 (to the archbishop of York, 1338); Tynemouth, *Historia*, MS 2.3 fols 240^{v}–241^{r} (to his bishops, 1342), edn pp. 357–59 (to the archbishop of Canterbury after Sluys, not in MSS).

[67] The rest of the chapter discusses other types of wars that are caused by the sin of those waging war, not by the sins of their victims, as he does at the beginning of the chapter. These include wars for glory, unjust wars, covetouseness, and disobedience: Bouvet, '*Arbre des batailles*', ch. 121, 4.54 (pp. 791–92). See also pp. 38 above and 89–90 below.

[68] Coote, *Prophecy*, p. 13 (quote). Ruddick suggests that in many cases religious allusions are simply conventional and do not carry much added meaning: Ruddick, *English Identity*, p. 276.

or immoral actions because they should also be endorsed by God, but instead frequently discuss, lament, and treat them carefully in their narratives.

2. NATIONAL IDENTITY AND 'THE OTHER'

Massacres, atrocities, and other acts deemed regrettable in war are difficult to explain. Studies of modern conflict argue that perceptions of identity, national or otherwise, have a large influence on such behaviour.[69] If people are viewed as distinctly different, as an 'Other', then it is easy to treat them harshly, and in war this is typically manifested in extreme violence.[70] There has been considerable debate on whether 'nationality' or concepts of 'national identity' existed in the pre-modern world, with many modernists dismissing the Middle Ages entirely.[71] However, it is clear that in late medieval England such ideas were common, as is evident from the many texts, in all genres, that employ them for various rhetorical ends.[72]

Concepts of national identity had a key role in the conduct and ethics of war in the Middle Ages, even if they were only imagined or represented as such. It is often argued that conflicts along frontiers encouraged massacres in the Middle Ages because of potential for friction.[73] Barnie argues that atrocities on both sides encouraged 'a hardening of attitudes towards the enemy' and xenophobia, which perpetuated these reciprocal attacks.[74] Matthews builds

---

[69] See for example Jacques Semelin, 'Toward a Vocabulary of Massacre and Genocide', *Journal of Genocide Research*, 5 (2003), 193–210; Hugo Slim, *Killing Civilians: Method, Madness and Morality in War* (London: Hurst, 2007), pp. 33–36, 40–70, 124–31, 217–18; John Docker, 'The Origins of Massacres', in *Theatres of Violence: Massacre, Mass Killing and Atrocity throughout History*, ed. by Philip G. Dwyer and Lyndall Ryan (New York: Berghahn Books, 2012), pp. 3–16.

[70] Dave Grossman, *On Killing: The Psychological Cost of Learning to Kill in War and Society*, 2nd edn (New York: Back Bay Books, 2009), pp. 156–64.

[71] For the principal arguments against nationalism or national identity in the Middle Ages see Armstrong, and for nuanced critiques of Armstrong's argument see Johnson and Smith: John A. Armstrong, *Nations before Nationalism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982); Lesley Johnson, 'Imagining Communities: Medieval and Modern', in *Concepts of National Identity in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Simon Forde, Lesley Johnson, and Alan V. Murray (Leeds: Leeds Studies in English, 1995), pp. 1–19; Anthony D. Smith, 'National Identities: Modern and Medieval?', in *Concepts of National Identity in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Simon Forde, Lesley Johnson, and Alan V. Murray (Leeds: Leeds Studies in English, 1995), pp. 21–46.

[72] See most importantly Thorlac Turville-Petre, *England the Nation: Language, Literature, and National Identity, 1290–1340* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995); Turville-Petre, 'Afterword: The Brutus Prologue to *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*', in *Imagining a Medieval English Nation*, ed. by Kathy Lavezzo (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003), pp. 340–46; Butterfield, *Familiar Enemy*; Ruddick, *English Identity*.

[73] See for example Laurence W. Marvin, 'Atrocity and Massacre in the High and Late Middle Ages', in *Theatres of Violence: Massacre, Mass Killing and Atrocity throughout History*, ed. by Philip G. Dwyer and Lyndall Ryan (New York: Berghahn Books, 2012), pp. 50–62 (esp. 58).

[74] Barnie, *War in Medieval Society*, pp. 48–51. See also Marilyn Livingstone and Morgan Witzel, *The Road to Crécy: The English Invasion of France, 1346* (Harlow: Longman, 2005), p. 115; Matthew Strickland, 'Rules of War or War without Rules? Some Reflections on Conduct and the Treatment of Non-Combatants in Medieval Transcultural Wars', in *Transcultural Wars from the Middle Ages to the 21st Century*, ed. by Hans-Henning Kortüm (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2006), pp. 107–40.

upon this and asserts that English 'nationalism is based [...] on fear: fear of the other', to make national identity and harsh treatment of the enemy into a seemingly justified defensive measure.[75] Pratt argues that English texts produced in this period reflect these attitudes because they were 'nurtured in a climate which breeds prejudice and bitter hatred'.[76] Morillo employs a different model, in which the harshness of conduct is dictated by the relationship between the two groups as intracultural, intercultural, or subcultural.[77] He argues that in conflicts between large cultures (intercultural) brutality was often encouraged as part of the competition between groups. Prestwich has difficulty placing the fourteenth-century Anglo-Scottish wars into Morillo's scheme, however, and argues that the intercultural relationship that encouraged massacres was actually that between civilians and the nobles, knights, and combatants who attacked them, regardless of the affiliation of attacker or victim.[78] These schemes seek to explain away these actions and the rhetoric around them, fail to treat them on their own terms, in their cultural, intellectual, and literary contexts, and therefore require a more nuanced approach.

The way the enemy is understood by writers affects how they might consider ethical problems. If they view them as 'the Other' then all acts against them in war, even the most extreme, should be inherently justified and even praiseworthy.[79] Prestwich recognises that English writers commonly portray the Anglo-Scottish conflict as intercultural, but does not ask why this is the case, or attempt to understand the rhetoric behind these depictions.[80] This is particularly important, however, as the people along the Anglo-Scottish border were in reality part of one border culture, even if they described themselves as English or Scottish in their writing.[81] Indeed, study of documentary evidence shows that actions between combatants on this particular frontier were no more brutal than the Anglo-French conflict.[82] I investigate here English

---

[75] David Matthews, *Writing to the King: Nation, Kingship and Literature in England, 1250–1350* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p. 27.

[76] John H. Pratt, 'The Middle English Historical Battle Poem' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1976), p. 100.

[77] Stephen Morillo, 'A General Typology of Transcultural Wars: The Early Middle Ages and Beyond', in *Transcultural Wars from the Middle Ages to the 21st Century*, ed. by Hans-Henning Kortüm (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2006), pp. 29–42.

[78] Michael Prestwich, 'Transcultural Warfare: The Later Middle Ages', in *Transcultural Wars from the Middle Ages to the 21st Century*, ed. by Hans-Henning Kortüm (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2006), pp. 43–56 (esp. 43, 44, 47, 52). See also Macdonald's criticisms of these models: Alastair J. Macdonald, 'Two Kinds of War? Brutality and Atrocity in Later Medieval Scotland', in *Killing and Being Killed: Bodies in Battle. Perspectives on Fighters in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Jörg Rogge (Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2017), pp. 199–230 (here 217–22).

[79] See also Ruddick, *English Identity*, pp. 16–18.

[80] Prestwich, 'Transcultural Warfare', pp. 47, 56.

[81] Andy King, 'Best of Enemies: Were the Fourteenth-Century Anglo-Scottish Marches a "Frontier Society"?', in *England and Scotland in the Fourteenth Century: New Perspectives*, ed. by Andy King and Michael Penman (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), pp. 116–35; Ruddick, *English Identity*, pp. 79–81, 247–48, also see 72–79.

[82] Andy King, '"According to the custom used in French and Scottish wars": Prisoners and Casualties on the Scottish

attitudes towards their enemies and bring together the varied research strands of patriotism, national identity, and abuse of 'the Other'. Throughout I examine the meaning and purpose of the sometimes-harsh rhetoric of English writings to determine writers' attitudes.

To properly appreciate the nuances of English notions of national identity, both relating to their own people and others, it is necessary to begin with the widely read encyclopaedic writings. These are Bartholomaeus Anglicus' *De proprietatibus rerum* (in its different versions) as well as portions of Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon* and the *Eulogium historiarum*, which draws heavily from Higden.[83] These texts served as authoritative guides for fourteenth-century English readers and writers for a number of subjects, but most importantly for ideas about other places and their peoples.

Bartholomaeus Anglicus (d. 1272), an English Franciscan scholastic who taught in Paris, finished his *De proprietatibus rerum* in the 1240s.[84] The Latin text was widely read and survives in two hundred complete manuscripts and another 73 extracted, fragmentary, or heavily modified copies.[85] It was translated into Middle English by John Trevisa in 1397 (ten MSS),[86] into Middle French by Jean Corbechon in 1372 (forty-five MSS),[87] into a previously-unknown Middle French verse text that I have identified by comparison with the Latin text (one fragment),[88] as well as other vernaculars.[89] The twenty-three full and fifteen extracted Latin manuscripts of known English provenance (of these all are from the fourteenth century except four full copies from the fifteenth century), many prominent English owners, as well as quotations and

---

Marches in the Fourteenth Century', *Journal of Medieval History*, 28 (2002), 263–90.

83 Tynemouth's geographic and ethnographic descriptions are largely derived from those in Higden's *Polychronicon*, but with considerable rearrangement and alteration throughout. Because it would require a significant amount of explanation to properly describe these alterations, with little impact on the present discussion, his text is omitted from discussion of national identity in this chapter. Tynemouth, *Historia aurea*, MS 2.1, fols 1r–22r (bk 1, exclusively on geography and ethnography of the world, but with a greater focus on Britain than Higden).

84 Bartholomaeus Anglicus, *De genuinis rerum coelestium, terrestrium et inferarum proprietatibus*, ed. by Georg Barthold Pontanus von Breitenberg (Frankfurt am Main: Richter, 1601); Richard Sharpe, *A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1997), p. 69; Michael C. Seymour, ed., *Bartholomaeus Anglicus and his Encyclopedia* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1992), 29–35 (argues for *c.* 1245 completion); Bartholomaeus, *De proprietatibus rerum*, ed. by Christel Meier and others, 8 vols (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007–), I, 4 (argues for 1240s composition).

85 Listed and described, sometimes tersely, by Heinz Meyer, *Die Enzyklopädie des Bartholomäus Anglicus. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferunts- und Rezeptionsgeschichte von 'De proprietatibus rerum'* (München: Fink, 2000), pp. 41–137; Bartholomaeus, *De proprietatibus rerum*, I, 18–21 (additions and a correction).

86 Bartholomaeus Anglicus, *On the Properties of Things*, trans. by John Trevisa, ed. by Michael C. Seymour, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975–88); H. Meyer, *Enzyklopädie*, pp. 379–81.

87 Galderisi, ed., *Translations*, no. 146 (II, 334–36); H. Meyer, *Enzyklopädie*, pp. 325–79.

88 Reading, University Library, Item JGL 1/18/2, 2 leaves (s. XIII/XIV).

89 Galderisi, ed., *Translations*, no. 146 (II, 336, Occitan trans., 1 MS); H. Meyer, *Enzyklopädie*, pp. 382–86 (Occitan trans.), 386–90 (Italian trans., 4 MSS), 390–93 (Spanish trans., 1 MS), also see 393–96 (reception in Germany and the Netherlands).

references in sermons, literature, and history writing in England, all serve to demonstrate the text's popularity in late medieval England.[90]

The world and its peoples, ranging from smaller countries to the three continents in roughly alphabetical order, are described in Book 15 of Bartholomaeus's text.[91] In these chapters, the text describes the origin of place names, landmarks, relations to other places, related peoples, the inhabitants, and other assorted details. Book 15 was exceptionally popular in its own right. It was drawn upon by later writers for their own descriptions of the world, it is heavily annotated in many surviving manuscripts, and *De proprietatibus rerum* is often bound with similar geographic texts.[92] This section of the text circulated independently and survives in several manuscripts, although it is uncertain how (or if) these copies relate to each other.[93] Of these I have examined one, the *Geographia universalis*, which was written in England and said to be particularly close to the version used by many fourteenth-century English chroniclers.[94] An early version of one of these was also translated into the Anglo-Norman *Livre des regions* (*c.* 1260–70) and survives in a single manuscript.[95]

Bartholomaeus portrays the English in entirely positive terms. They earn their rights to rule through conquest and inherit the rights (and heritage, it seems) of those they conquer. The text suggests English dominance over all of Britain, by equating the former with the latter, but does not elaborate on this, especially in relation to other inhabitants of Britain.[96] The Welsh are notably absent from all versions of the text, however. France, the major enemy of England from

---

[90] As identitified by Seymour, but because he worked from an incomplete list of MSS there are surely more extant English copies: Michael C. Seymour, 'Some Medieval English Owners of *De proprietatibus rerum*', *Bodleian Library Record*, 9 (1973–78), 156–65; Seymour, ed., *Bartholomaeus*, pp. 257–61 (lists 175 MSS). See also Susan M. Clinton, 'The Latin Manuscript Tradition in England of the *De proprietatibus rerum* of Bartholomaeus Anglicus: An Analysis Based on Book Ten' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1982).

[91] Bartholomaeus, *De genuinis rerum*, pp. 624–714. For Bartholomaeus' use of sources in Book 15 see Seymour, the most prominent of these sources are Seville and Solinus, both of whom also drew on earlier authorities: Seymour, ed., *Bartholomaeus*, pp. 17–28, 158–71 (unfortunately through study of Trevisa's translation); Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum sive originum*, ed. by Wallace M. Lindsay, OCT, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911), esp. bks 9 and 14 (edn not paginated); Gaius Julius Solinus, *Collectanea rerum memorabilium*, ed. by Theodor Mommsen, 2nd edn (Berlin: Weidmann, 1895).

[92] H. Meyer, *Enzyklopädie*, pp. 261, 272–74.

[93] H. Meyer, *Enzyklopädie*, pp. 132–33 (list and brief descriptions of 8 MSS).

[94] Unless otherwise stated this version's text is the same as that in the full Latin edition, barring minor scribal errors: London, British Library, MS Arundel 123, fols 1^{r}–22^{v} (s. XIV 1). *Eulogium*, II, xxv–l; Higden, *Polychronicon*, I, xxiii n. 1, xxvi–xxix, xxxi–xxxvi, xli; J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, pp. 82–83. The similarities between the *Geographia* and English chronicles might reflect different MS traditions in England at the time that have not yet been worked out by scholars, in no small part due to the large number of extant MSS. See also Mary Hamel, 'An Anthology for the Armchair Traveller: London, British Library, MS Arundel 123', *Manuscripta*, 41 (1997), 3–18.

[95] *Le Livre des regions*, ed. by Brent A. Pitts, Anglo-Norman Text Society, Plain Texts Series, 15 (London: Anglo-Norman Text Society, 2006); Galderisi, ed., *Translations*, no. 146 (II, 335).

[96] Bartholomaeus, *De genuinis rerum*, p. 631: 'Britannia scilicet, quae nunc dicitur Anglia'; *Livre des regions*, p. 12: 'Bretaigne [...] ke ore est apelee Engleterre'.

1337 onwards, is described in conventional terms, with some praise, perhaps because Bartholomaeus lived in Paris when he wrote his text.[97]

The common enemies of England are sometimes described in critical terms in *De proprietatibus rerum*. The Irish are described as 'inhumane, with rude rituals [...] an inhospitable and warlike people, who drink up the blood, of those they have killed previously, that they had washed their triumphant faces with', which is modified in the *Livre des regions* to 'a wicked people who love murder more than peace, and greatly hate strange people'.[98] However, shortly afterwards they are described in more positive terms, but still as a different people.[99]

The Scots, the other major people of the British Isles, are described as originating in Ireland. The two peoples share customs, languages, and living habits, but these are not given in much detail. Later, the Scots are described in a mixed, but fairly positive fashion:

> [They are] a people that are flighty, wild of spirit, fierce unto enemies, hateful, superstitious, reckoning that anyone was of no virtue, or even honesty, or audacity as well, besides themselves. Loving death nearly as much as slavery, thinking it slothful to die in bed, but reckoning it glory or a virtue to be killed in the field against the enemy, as they should be killed.[100]

The Scots are shown, in a somewhat sarcastic fashion, to desire death as little as slavery, but also to be strong and praise death in battle. Part of the manuscript tradition in England deliberately minimises the critical depictions of the Scots in favour of a more positive militaristic image, however. The *Geographia*, *Livre des regions*, and John Trevisa's translation all omit the element of this description that is most critical: 'hateful, superstitious, thinking not a thing of virtue or even honesty, or audacity beyond themself'.[101] These versions leave the rest of the text largely

---

[97] A minor passage from the text is omitted from both the *Geographia* and the *Livre des regions*: Bartholomaeus, *De genuinis rerum*, p. 653: 'vel a Franco carnifice, qui successit Regi Parisiis, de quo carnifices priuilegiati sunt erga regem, [et] ab illo Franco est Francia nominata, ab oriente habet'; London, British Library, MS Arundel 123, fol. 8^{r}; *Livre des regions*, p. 23.

[98] Bartholomaeus, *De genuinis rerum*, p. 667: 'inhumana, incolarum ritu aspera [...] Gens inhospita [et] bellicosa, sanguine interemptorum hausto prius victores vultus suos obliniunt'; *Livre des regions*, p. 30, 'felunesce gent ke plus aime murdre ke pees, e mult heet estrange gent'.

[99] Bartholomaeus, *De genuinis rerum*, p. 667: 'animo saeua, vultu ferox [et] torua, affatu aspera, erga suos tamen liberalis [et] affabilis ac benigna, [et] maxime illa gens quae nemorosa [et] paludes inhabitant ac montana'; *Livre des regions*, p. 30: 'de poit poent vivre, e sunt cruels e de felun reguarde e aspre en parole, envers lé soens deboneire, e nomément ceus ke habitent en guastines'.

[100] Bartholomaeus, *De genuinis rerum*, p. 703: 'gens est leuis, animo ferox, saeuiens in hostes, inuida, superstitiosa, nullius virtutis vel probitatis aliquem reputans siue audaciae, praeter semetipsos. Tantum fere mortem diligens, quantum seruitutem, in lecto mori reputans segniciem. In campo autem contra hostem interfici, vt interficiantur, gloriam arbitrans [et] virtutem'.

[101] London, British Library, MS Arundel 123, fol. 20^{r}; *Livre des regions*, p. 43: 'les Escoz sunt legers e crueus e enragez encontre lur enemis, e autretant aiment la mort cum servage. Si tenant a mult grant laschesce e peresce a murrir en lur lit, e tenent a mult grant preuesce a murrir en champ combatanz encontre lur enemis'; *Properties of Things*, p. 812: 'þe

unchanged, especially sections concerned with France and other countries England engaged with in the fourteenth century.[102] This is probably because the purpose of the text was not to condemn other peoples for their differences, but rather to focus on their exotic nature. Bartholomaeus focuses on the positive aspects of these sorts of 'barbaric' traits elsewhere in his text, such as when he praises the inhabitants of Europe for living in harsh climates because it makes them bolder.[103]

Fourteenth-century encyclopaedic chronicles written in England were often inspired, in both style and content, by Bartholomaeus. Ranulf Higden drew on a vast number of biblical, classical, and medieval sources, including *De proprietatibus rerum*, for his *Polychronicon*.[104] Sometimes these were taken at second- or third-hand through florilegia or other compilations, which likewise sought to collect the most authoritative information on the world.[105] Higden's description of Wales is entirely in the form of a long poem, likely drawn the *Cambriae epitome* of Walter Map (1140–*c*. 1210).[106] The Welsh are here portrayed as good people with many admirable traits and only a few negative aspects. Higden draws on Bartholomaeus almost exclusively for his portrayal of the French and kindred peoples to present them in a positive light.[107] After describing the other peoples of Europe he provides a more detailed and lengthy account of the various aspects of England (equated with Britain), such as its size, parts, famous rivers, cities, provinces, laws, reigns of pre-Norman kings, the church in England, inhabitants, and language.[108]

---

men ben li3te of herte, fers and corageous on enemyes. Þey louen ny3e as wele deþ as þraldame, and þey acounten slouþe to dye on bedde, and grete worshepe and vertue to dye in þe felde fi3tynge a3eins enemys'.

[102] Two other passages are omitted from the description of the Scots in the *Geographia* and the *Livre des regions*: Bartholomaeus, *De genuinis rerum*, p. 703: 'arque Anglorum idiomate informantur: vnde quiequid decens [et] honestius in illis inuenitur, hoc ab Anglicis est contractum', 'vnde quilibet superesse laborat, etiam omnes detrahunt [et] viciis semper inuident. Cunctos derident, [et] mores alienos reprehendunt. Mentiri non verentur, nec quemquam ex quaeunque natione exortum, siue progenie alicuius virtutis reputant vel audacie, praeter seipsos. In propriis gaudent, pacem non diligunt'.

[103] Bartholomaeus, *De genuinis rerum*, p. 648: 'Nam ex frigiditate poros extrinsecus opilante generantur humores in corpore, [et] efficiuntur homines corpulentiores', 'vaporum [et] spirituum ad interiora efficiuntur calidiores interius, [et] per consequens plus audaces'; rephrased and abridged in *Livre des regions*, p. 21: 'tut fet la grant chaline suer hors e deguaste les bons humurs e les fet plus neires en façun e plus crespes en chevelure e plus couarz'.

[104] J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, pp. 72–88; Higden cites most of his authorities directlly in his prose, but for corrections see the introductions to Higden, *Polychronicon*.

[105] J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, p. 72; Gransden, *Historical Writing*, II, 48.

[106] Higden, *Polychronicon*, I, xxxix, 1.38 (I, 394–430); Walter Map, 'Cambriae epitome', in *Latin Poems*, ed. by Thomas Wright, Camden Old Series, 16 (London: Nichols, 1841), pp. 131–46. Borrowed in *Eulogium*, 4.163–4.164 (II, 132–39). Taylor, however, believes this section to be a verse adaptation of parts of Gerald's text: J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, p. 58.

[107] Higden, *Polychronicon*, 1.25–1.28 (I, 266–98), also see I, 268 (Frenchmen are weak like women, but not in a military sense), 296 (Aquitanians are strong, but engage in pillage); J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, p. 57.

[108] Higden, *Polychronicon*, 1.39–1.60 (II, 2–174), these are drawn from a number of sources, not properly identified by Babington; J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, pp. 58–63. Borrowed and sometimes modified in *Eulogium*, 4.165–4.176

Higden does not merely compile his geographic and ethnographic descriptions as a series of passages from authorities, despite the common assertion that his text here is an uncritical compilation.[109] He intentionally alters his sources through varied paraphrases, quotes, omissions, and additions to present his particular view of the world. Higden clearly attempts to show the Irish as barbarous and cruel, without any of the positive attributes that Bartholomaeus includes. In his first chapter on Ireland he describes its geography and environment, but only briefly mentions the Irish people and states they are healthy.[110] Higden begins his later chapter on the customs of the Irish by quoting, with only minor changes, Bartholomaeus' seemingly critical description.[111] He then deliberately omits nearly all of Bartholomaeus' positive descriptions and even misidentifies his authority here as Solinus.[112]

After using Bartholomaeus, Higden turns to an even more disparaging source, Gerald of Wales' *Topographia hibernica* (1186–87).[113] As with most of the geographic section of his text, some scholars assume that this section of the *Polychronicon* is merely a series of extracts or a summary of Gerald.[114] However, a comparison of the *Polychronicon* with the *Topographia* reveals that Higden was particular in how he employed his source here.[115] He borrows many passages whole and unaltered that disparage the Irish, such as his description of the peculiar fashion in which their men and women urinate.[116] He also describes how the clergy are chaste and otherwise good during the day, but drink throughout the night, but here omits much of Gerald's positive commentary on Irish devotion.[117]

(II, 139–71). See also Ruddick, *English Identity*, p. 68.

[109] See for example Gransden, *Historical Writing*, II, 48.

[110] Higden, *Polychronicon*, 1.32 (I, 332); from Gerald of Wales, 'Topographia hibernica', in *Opera*, ed. by John S. Brewer, James F. Dimmick, and George F. Warner, RS, 21, 8 vols (London: Longman, 1867), V, 3–204 (here 1.33, p. 67). Babington does not cite Higden's use of this passage. See also J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, p. 58. Borrowed in *Eulogium*, 4.161 (II, 131).

[111] Higden, *Polychronicon*, 1.34 (I, 350–52): 'gens hujus terrae sit barbara, inhospita, bellicosa, fasque nefasque pro eodem ducens. Gens habitu singularis et inculta, victu parca, animo saeva, affatu aspera, sanguine interemptorum prius hausto vultus suos oblinivit'.

[112] David points out this misidentification, but mistakenly asserts that Higden 'uses verbatim the final paragraph of Bartholomew' for this part of his description of the Irish: Sumithra J. David, 'Looking East and West: The Reception and Dissemination of the *Topographia Hibernica* and the *Itinerarium ad partes orientales* in England, 1185–*c*. 1500' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of St Andrews, 2009), p. 120. See also Solinus, *Collectanea*, pp. 100–01 (on Ireland and the Irish).

[113] Although Higden claims he uses other writings by Gerald, here he only draws on the *Topographia*: David, 'Looking East and West', p. 119.

[114] Higden, *Polychronicon*, I, xxxvii n. 2: 'The reader may pick out the pieces of Giraldus, by comparing Higden's sentences in order, thus'; J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, p. 58: 'little more than a summary of the remarks of Gerald of Wales'.

[115] Babington provides a list of chapters from Gerald used by Higden (in a rather inaccessible format), but makes many errors throughout, and was clearly comparing Trevisa's translation and not Higden's Latin. One of these errors has been identified by David, 'Looking East and West', p. 118 n. 109.

[116] Higden, *Polychronicon*, 1.34 (I, 358); Gerald, 'Topographia', 3.26 (p. 172). Borrowed in *Eulogium*, 4.160 (II, 127).

[117] Higden, *Polychronicon*, 1.36 (I, 376); Gerald, 'Topographia', 3.27 (p. 172). Borrowed in *Eulogium*, 4.161 (II, 129).

Higden also discusses the more serious aspects of Irish behaviour and its effects on other countries, but especially England. He concludes his chapter on the many invasions of Ireland by suggesting that their rulers were not legitimate kings:

> And thus in all, from the first Herimon up to the final Roderic (whom the king of the English Henry II subjugated in the fortieth year of his life, and the seventeenth year of his reign, in the year of our Lord 1172), ruled Ireland 181 kings who were not crowned, not anointed, not hereditary [did not rule by hereditary rights], but who succeeded by strength and arms.[118]

Here he leaves out Gerald's justification for omitting the story of Roderic's rule and replaces it with a passage on Henry II conquering Ireland, taken from the chapter of the *Topographia* that follows. This serves to anchor these events around English rather than Irish rule, and when combined with the detail of how the Irish kings ruled through conquest only, suggests that Henry II likewise ruled Ireland justly through his military victories.

This strategy of portraying the Irish as entirely different from the English, especially in customs and morals, is amplified in Higden's next chapter. He condenses from his source a longer passage on how the Irish are deceitful and do not respect treaties so that it focuses directly on the immorality of such transgressions:

> Those deceitful and inconstant people, variable and wily, who fear skill more than war, peace than fire, honey than bile, malice than martial spirit. And these are their morals: that they are not found to be strong in war, nor faithful in peace. Anyone they want to oppress through crafty means, they first make a compact of co-paternity and consecrated brotherhood with him, in which each drinks the other's willingly shed blood.[119]

---

[118] Italic text shared: Higden, *Polychronicon*, 1.33 (I, 350): '*et sic in universo a primo Hermone usque ad ultimum Rothericum*, quem subjugavit rex Angliae Henricus secundus anno aetatis suae quadragesimo, regni sui septimo decimo, ab incarnatione Domini millesimo centesimo septuagesimo secundo, *rexerunt Hiberniam centum octoginta unus reges non coronati, non inuncti, non haereditarii, sed vi et armis succedentes*'; Gerald, 'Topographia', 3.45, 3.45 (pp. 188, 189): 'est itaque numerus omnium regum, qui *a primo gentis hujus rege Herimone usque ad hunc ultimum Rothericum Hiberniam rexerunt, .clxxxi.* Quorum nomina, gesta, et tempora hic praetereo, tum quia pauca in his insignia et memoratu digna reperio, tum etiam ne compendium nostrum inutilis prolixitas impediret. *Praedicti vero reges non aliqujus coronationis solemnitate, non inunctionis sacramento, non etiam jure hereditario, vel aliqua successionis proprietate, sed vi tantum et armis*, totius insulae monarchiam obtinuerunt, et suo more regni gubernacula susceperunt', 'anno videlicet aetatis vestrae *quadragesimo* primo, *regni vestri septimo decimo, ab incarnatione* vero *Domino .mclxxii.*' Borrowed in *Eulogium*, 4.159 (II, 125).

[119] Italic text shared: Higden, Polychronicon, 1.34 (I, 356): '*gens* ista *versipellis et inconstans, varia et versuta, cujus magis timenda ars quam Mars, pax quam fax, mel quam fel, malitia quam militia. cujus mores* sunt, quod *nec in bello fortes, nec in pace fideles* inveniuntur. *Cum illo quem* dolose opprimere *volunt, primo compaternitatis* et consecratae fraternitatis foedera jungunt, in qua *alter alterius sanguinem sponte fusum bibunt*'; Gerald, 'Topographia', 3.21, 3.22 (pp. 166, 167): '*gens inconstans*, gens *varia*, gens *versipellis* et *versuta* [...] *fortius timenda eorum ars, quam Mars*, eorum

In his string of compared fears Higden includes *malitia* and *militia*, commonly used by writers to condemn military action for failing to live up to the ideals of chivalry, and thereby connects the Irish to unchivalrous and immoral military conduct.[120] He also shows that the Irish have bizarre and paganesque rituals for their treaties, and if these agreements are made they should not be relied upon. While it was acceptable to not be forthright with information, or to even act deceitfully, in a declared war, it was universally condemned to break an agreement or lie after swearing an oath.[121]

Higden concludes his portrayal of the Irish with a description of their barbaric methods of war and slothful lifestyle. Immediately after his first critical passage, altered from Bartholomaeus as given above, he describes Irish conduct as:

> With unarmoured bodies they fight with two javelins, lances, and broad axes. They do combat with one hand only and when other weapons fail they hold stones at the ready. And so the people spurn agriculture, using the land only for pasture, with beards and hair from the back part of the head excessively long [...] they have surrendered to leisure, thinking that to be without labour is their favourite thing, [and] regard their riches to be enjoying liberty.[122]

Here he condenses a large amount of material from Gerald and intentionally omits any details that originally explained these peculiarities as foreign curiosities instead of barbarous habits. Higden omits here the many details from his source on the purpose and effectiveness of Irish weaponry. He modifies Gerald's claim that the Irish fight naked, praiseworthy for the bravery and ferocity it suggests, into a statement that they fight unarmoured, critical for the stupidity it suggests, and also omits his source's praise of their courage in war. Higden heavily abridges the more thorough and reasoned explanation of Irish life to highlight their wasteful use of land and

---

pax, quam fax, eorum *mel, quam fel, malitia quam milita*, proditio quam expeditio, amicita defucata, quam inimicitia despicata [...] hi *mores: "Nec in bello fortes, nec in pace fideles."', 'cum eo quem* oppetere *cupiunt. Primo compaternitatis* [... steps detailed ...] *sanguinem sponte* ad hoc *fusum uterque alterius bibit*'. Borrowed in *Eulogium*, 4.160 (II, 126–27).

120 See Strickland, *War and Chivalry*, pp. 75–77; Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence*, pp. 63–81.

121 See p. 190 below.

122 Italic text shared: Higden, Polychronicon, 1.34 (I, 352–54): '*inermes corpore, pugnant attamen jaculis binis, lanceis, et securibus amplis. Una tantum manu* confligunt, *lapides pugillares, cum alia defecerint*, in promptu *habent. Gens* itaque *agriculturam spernens*, pascuis tantum utens, *barbis et comis* a posteriori parte capitis *luxurians*, [...] *otio dediti, delicias reputant labore carere, divitias* deputant *libertate gaudere*'; Gerald, 'Topographia', 3.10 (pp. 150–51, 152, 153): 'nudi et *inermes ad bella procedunt*. Habent enim arma pro onere, inermes vero dimicare pro audacia reputant et honore. Tribus tantum utuntur armorum generibus, *lanceis* non longis, et *jaculis binis*, in quibus et Basclensium morem sunt imitati, *securibus quoque amplis*, fabrili diligentia optime chalibatis [... origin of their axe ...] *una tantum manu* [...uses of their axe, esp. against cavalry, detailed ...] *lapides* quoque *pugillares, cum alia defecerint*, hostibus in conflictu damnosissimos, prae alia gente promptius et expeditius ad manum *habent*', '*gens* haec, *agriculturae* labores *aspernans*', '*solum enim otio dediti*, solum desidiae dati, summas *reputant delicias labore carere*, summas *divitias libertate gaudere*', '*comis et barbis luxuriantibus*, juxta modernas novitates, incultissima'. Borrowed in *Eulogium*, 4.160 (II, 126).

perhaps to suggest it would be better off under English control. He portrays the Irish as different from the English in nearly every way, and not in the positive sense that Bartholomaeus does, but so much that they are instead barbarians.

Given his hostility to the Irish, who were only an occasional enemy to the English when Higden wrote, it is curious that he does not portray the Scots in such an obviously critical fashion in his geographic and ethnographic section. Indeed, it is assumed that he finished the first recension (Short Version) of his text around 1327, the final date in this version, when the Scots were at war with the English and had even invaded in the Weardale campaign.[123] His careful treatment of the Scots might be better explained if his text was finished after the treaty of Northampton (3 May 1328), the so-called 'Shameful Peace', that recognised Scottish independence and disinherited many English noblemen, but before hostilities resumed in 1332.[124] He draws on a number of sources for his description of the Scots and often mixes them together in a complicated fashion that Babington, the text's editor, was unwilling to appreciate.[125] Higden begins by geographically placing Scotland in relation to England and Ireland and then discusses its various names and their etymological origins.[126] He does not level the same sorts of criticisms against the Scots here that he does against the Irish, although he states that both peoples intermarried and have similar customs.[127] After giving other incidental details Higden gives a slightly abridged version of the *Geographia*'s description of the Scots in which he states that their manners have been softened from mixing with the English and that they desire to be killed in battle rather than die in bed.[128] Throughout he sometimes misidentifies his sources and here cites Herodotus, which lends his text more authority than the anonymous *Geographia* or even its original writer, Bartholomaeus, might have.[129] Although Higden hints at their origins in the beginning of his description, it is not until he describes England and Britain that he openly

---

123 See for example J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, pp. 96–98.

124 Edward L. G. Stones, 'The Treaty of Northampton, 1328', *History*, 37 (1953), 54–61.

125 Higden, *Polychronicon*, 1.37 (I, 382–94), I, xxxviii: 'Higden has misunderstood his authorities to some extent, and upon the whole his account is of very little value, and for the most part legendary'; J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, p. 58.

126 Higden, *Polychronicon*, 1.37 (I, 382).

127 Higden, *Polychronicon*, 1.37 (I, 384).

128 Higden, *Polychronicon*, 1.37 (I, 386–88): 'scoti sunt animo leves, barbari satis et silvestres, sed admixtione cum Anglis in parte emendantur. In hostes saevi, servitutem summe detestantur. In lecto mori reputant segnitiem, in campo interfici arbitrantur gloriam'; see Bartholomaeus' passages above.

129 On the use of a 'Pseudo Herodotus' in English writing see Taylor and on the citation of Herodotus as an authority, even though his text was not accessible in the Latin west, see Racine: J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, pp. 73–74; Félix Racine, 'Herodotus' Reputation in Latin Literature, from Cicero to the 12th Century', in *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Herodotus in Antiquity and Beyond*, ed. by Jessica Priestley and Vasiliki Zali (Leiden: Brill, 2016), pp. 193–121.

criticises the Scots, and then this is limited to a discussion of how they came to inhabit Scotland and their subsequent illegitimate rule.[130]

The other English chronicles that describe the peoples of Britain and France draw heavily on Higden's *Polychronicon*. The *Eulogium historiarum* reproduces his source's text largely unaltered, but rearranges many of its sections to give them all a different emphasis.[131] The *Eulogium* presents a long series of geographic and ethnographic descriptions of places in the world but in a different order than Higden's text. In this section the *Eulogium* does not draw on Higden, but instead his source, the *Geographia*, as well as its authority, Isidore of Seville (*c*. 560–636).[132] The *Eulogium* begins a new section entirely to describe the countries of Britain and Ireland.[133] Here the text defers to Higden and includes most of his criticisms, with only minor alterations. The *Eulogium* rearranges its source's description of the early relations between the Scots, the English, and other inhabitants of Britain, but supports Higden's position on English hegemony.[134]

The general trend of writings to show the Scots, French, and others as different from the English is illustrated in some chronicles that are more narrative in form than the encyclopaedic passages described above. Jean le Bel presents the Scottish practice of war, and perhaps their way of life, as totally alien, in his narrative of the 1327 Weardale campaign, in which he claims to have participated:

> They no longer have wagons [for supplies] because of the various mountains that they have to pass through these lands, and so they have no purveyance of either bread or wine, for their custom is such in war and their sobriety so great that they can survive well enough for a long time on half-raw meat, without bread, and on clean water from the river, without wine, and so have no need of either cooking pots or pans, for they can cook their meat satisfactorily in the hide of a beast, as soon as they have flayed it.[135]

---

[130] See pp. 68–73 below.

[131] These borrowings are cited above after each passage. Some scholars are overly dismissive of how derivative the *Eulogium* is: J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, pp. 20, 143; Gransden, *Historical Writing*, II, 104.

[132] The *Eulogium* alternates between using the *Geographia* and Seville's *Etymologiae*, and sometimes even a mix of the two, in order, it seems, to provide the best possible text, although this is more evident in chapters describing other parts of the world: *Eulogium*, II, xli–xlvi, 4.94 (II, 81–82, Britain from *Geographia*), 4.99 (II, 84–85, England from *Geographia*), 4.132 (II, 100, France from *Geographia*), 4.156 (II, 113–15, Islands, including Britain, from Seville, *Etymologiarum*).

[133] *Eulogium*, II, xlvii–lxi, 4.159–4.161 (II, 123–31, Ireland, occasionally defers to Higden's source, Gerald, 'Topographia'), 4.162 (II, 131–32, Scotland), 4.163–4.164 (II, 132–39, Wales, only a few omissions).

[134] See pp. 71–73 below.

[135] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 10 (I, 51): 'ne mainnent point de charroy pour les diverses montaignes qu'il y a à passer parmy ce

He then goes on to describe the Scots' primitive methods of preparing pancakes on large stones. These are said to ease their bloated stomachs that result from the ill-prepared meat consumed in the field. Chareyron argues that these descriptions reveal Le Bel's belief that the Scots are savages and entirely different from the more 'civilised' peoples that he had before encountered.[136] However, scholars have not noticed that the chronicler here draws from late-Roman imagery of barbarians.[137] It would seem, then, that Le Bel might intend to uncritically describe the Scots as less sophisticated by alluding to authorities on the subject, so that he can praise English military organisation and discipline by contrast. On the other hand, he implicitly praises the Scots for being hardy and living a rugged lifestyle, which Charny himself praises in his manual on chivalry.[138]

National identity and conceptions of enemy people as 'the Other' is asserted to be most strongly manifested in the invective of so-called 'political poems'.[139] These texts are distinguished from others because of the strong opinions they hold on contemporary events, rather than for any explicit political stance. In fourteenth-century England these are said to be 'most properly expressed in English' because of the vernacular's supposed primary concern with ideas of England and its people as a nation.[140] However, these texts' seemingly extreme 'nationalism' and consequent abuse of other people are less serious in their outlooks than commonly assumed, especially in contrast to other historical literature. 'Durham Feilde' (*c.* 1346, revised 1356) celebrates the victory over the Scots at the battle of Neville's Cross, in part by describing how

---

pays, et si ne mainnent nulle pourveance ne de pain ne de vin, car leur usage e(s)t tel en guerre et leur sobrieté si grande qu'ilz se passent bien assez longuement de chair cuite à la moityé, sans pain, et de bonne eaue de riviere, sans vin, et si n'ont que faire de chaudieres ne de chauderons, car ilz cuisent bien leur chair dedens le cuir de la beste, mesmes quant ilz l'ont eschorchée'.

136 Nicole Chareyron, 'La Sauvage Ecosse dans la *Chronique* de Jean le Bel', in *Nouveaux Mondes et mondes nouveaux au Moyen Âge*, ed. by Danielle Buschinger and Wolfgang Spiewok (Greifswald: Reineke-Verlag, 1994), pp. 19–27; Chareyron, *Jean le Bel*, pp. 173–76.

137 See for example the portrayal of the Huns by Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt*, ed. by Wolfgang Seyfarth, BT, 2 vols (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1978), 31.2 (II, 161–66). For reception see Reynolds, *Texts and Transmission*, pp. 6–8. See also Roger C. Blockley, *Ammianus Marcellinus: A Study of his Historiography and Political Thought* (Bruxelles: Latomus, 1975), pp. 177–82; Timothy D. Barnes, *Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), pp. 107–19; and more generally Peter Heather, 'The Barbarian in Late Antiquity: Image, Reality and Transformation', in *Constructing Identities in Late Antiquity*, ed. by Richard Miles (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 234–58. Baraz claims that 'Ammianus linked cruelty and savagery to irrationality and consequently related it to madness and beastly behaviour', but Le Bel does not carry his portrayal of the Scots to this length: Baraz, *Medieval Cruelty*, pp. 31–32 (here 31).

138 See p. 164 below.

139 Chareyron, *Jean le Bel*, p. 176; Butterfield, *Familiar Enemy*, p. 111; D. Matthews, *Writing to the King*, p. 22. See also J. Taylor, *English Historical Literature*, pp. 236–56.

140 Turville-Petre, *England the Nation*, p. 22; D. Matthews, *Writing to the King*, pp. 91–97 (here while discussing political writings and Edward I).

Thomas Hatfield (d. 1381), bishop of Durham, encourages the English archers to attack the enemy:

> 'Be of good cheere, my merrymen all,
> the Scotts flyen, [and] changen there cheere!'
> But as thé saidden, soe thé didden,
> they fell on heapes hye.
> Our Englishmen laid on with their bowes
> as fast as they might dree.[141]

Here the violence is described only allusively and the narrative focuses more on the English than their victims.[142] Pratt argues that such poems are meant to celebrate, not narrate in depth, and thus such details as violence and action should not be expected.[143] However, there is plenty of room within these texts to accommodate such detail, should the writer desire, as can be seen in other medieval texts on war, and these poems should be read both for what they include and what they omit. Although these poems acknowledge that the French and Scots are different from the English, they offer no focused discussions on the subject, nor do they imply how identity might relate to the conduct of war and its ethics. Instead, they deride the actions of the enemy and praise themselves in revelling passages.

English political poems celebrate English victory, but only in the standard style of all such writing in the later Middle Ages.[144] They describe events in colourful language that does not revel in the pain inflicted on the enemy. These sorts of descriptions vary greatly, but none approach the sort of violent abuse that scholars claim them to promote. 'Halidon Hill' (*c.* 1333) begins with a summary of the victory:

> Many a Skotte lightely fflee,
> And þe Englische after priking
> With scharp swerdes þem stiking.
> And þere her baners weren ffounde
> Alle displayedde on the grounde,

---

[141] 'Durham Feilde', in *Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript: Ballads and Romances*, ed. by John W. Hales and others, 3 vols (London: Trübner, 1867–68), II, 191–99 (here lines 193–96). See also Minot, *Poems*, 1.54–1.56, 10.3–10.6, 10.24.

[142] See also pp. 149–58 below.

[143] Pratt, 'Middle English Battle Poem', p. 114.

[144] Pratt argues that poems describing contemporary military events had several purposes, especially to ridicule the enemy and praise the English: Pratt, 'Middle English Battle Poem', esp. pp. 1–13, 101–03, 95–100, 208–14. See also Tyson's provisional reading of several such texts written in Anglo-Norman and continental French: Tyson, 'Aspects of War'.

And layne starkly on blode,

As þei hadde ffought on þe fflode.[145]

The text moves through vague and stereotypical imagery to illustrate the battle, but does not celebrate the killing of Scottish enemies as such. Instead the victims are absent entirely, and symbolised by the English thrusts, fallen banners, and blood on the ground. This type of rhetoric is not used by the poets to justify any sort of action, nor is it meant to encourage brutality, as it is rarely linked to any sort of violence, and even then, only tangentially.

Laurence Minot is considered to be the most abusive and nationalistic of the fourteenth-century English poets.[146] Pratt describes him as 'full of passionate hatred for the enemy', Albano as 'a super-patriot', and Turville-Petre as 'the laureate of masculine arrested development'.[147] Accordingly, his poems have been dismissed by Barnie as 'patriotic outbursts', by Robbins as 'fervid nationalism', by Matthews as 'characterized throughout by a strident tone of pro-English sentiment and wild invective against Scots and French' and 'nationalism in full-throated cry', by Bellis as 'swaggering, nationalistic panegyrics', and, perhaps most succinctly, by Mossé as a 'hack writer'.[148] Hall summarises the important role scholars believe Minot to play in fourteenth-century writing when he asserts that the 'greatest merit of his poems lies in their warm and spontaneous expression of national feeling' and claims Minot to be 'the first to speak in the name of the English nation just awakened to a consciousness of its unity and strength'.[149]

Minot's description of the siege of Calais has been criticised as being unjustifiably harsh for revelling in the suffering inflicted on the city's inhabitants.[150] The poet gives a clear

---

[145] 'Halidon Hill', in Laurence Minot, *Poems*, ed. by Joseph Hall, 3rd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914), pp. 101–03, 123 (here lines 2–8, also see 49–58). See also Pratt, 'Middle English Battle Poem', pp. 104–10.

[146] Butterfield suggests little invective poetry was composed during Edward III's reign except by Minot: Butterfield, *Familiar Enemy*, p. 111. Edwards' argument that the 11 poems attributed to Minot had different authors has little merit: Edwards, 'Authorship of the Poems of Minot'.

[147] Pratt, 'Middle English Battle Poem', p. 111; Robert A. Albano, *Middle English Historiography* (New York: Lang, 1993), p. 223; Thorlac Turville-Petre, 'Political Lyrics', in *A Companion to the Middle English Lyric*, ed. by Thomas G. Duncan (Woodbridge: Brewer, 2005), pp. 171–88 (here 182).

[148] Barnie, *War in Medieval Society*, p. 101; Rossell Hope Robbins, 'Poems Dealing with Contemporary Conditions', in *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050–1500*, ed. by Burke J. Severs, Albert E. Hartung, and Peter G. Beidler, 11 vols so far (New Haven: Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1967–), V, 1385–1556, 1631–1726 (here 1413); D. Matthews, 'Laurence Minot', p. 271; D. Matthews, *Writing to the King*, p. 152; Bellis, *Hundred Years War*, p. 104; Fernand Mossé, *A Handbook of Middle English*, trans. by James A. Walker (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1952), p. 234. For additional criticisms see references by Pratt, 'Middle English Battle Poem', pp. 1–13 (especially for his survey of scholarly attitudes towards 'battle poems', including Minot's); D. Matthews, *Writing to the King*, pp. 159–60; Bellis, *Hundred Years War*, p. 103.

[149] Minot, *Poems*, p. xiv.

[150] See for example Bellis, 'Reader myghte lamente', p. 93: describes Minot's narrative style as 'crowing pride' and 'jingoistic'.

justification for these actions, however, as he claims that the city harboured pirates who conducted destructive and violent raids on the English coast:

> Kend it es how ȝe war kene
> al Inglis men with dole to dere.
> Þaire gudes toke ȝe al bidene,
> no man born wald ȝe forbere.
> Ȝe spared noght with swerd ne spere
> to stik þam and þaire gudes to stele.
> With wapin and with ded of were
> þus haue ȝe wonnen werldes wele.[151]

In reality Calais did serve as a base for such attacks, one of which is the subject of one of Minot's earlier poems.[152] Many other English writers mention Calais' role in attacks on England, but do not elaborate on it in any sort of revelling fashion.[153] Overall, Minot had a subtle narrative style that appealed to different aspects of England's several conflicts and was not inherently nationalistic or jingoistic.[154] His celebratory passages on Calais do not revel in the pain and suffering inflicted, but rather on justice being done, as is the case elsewhere in his poetry. Overall, however, these poems celebrate the non-violent effects of war, such as emotional suffering, and these are shown in most cases to be side effects, not the primary objectives, of English actions.[155]

Writings in English appear to carry a different sort of inherent value than those in Anglo-Norman or Latin.[156] It has often been claimed that these texts are manifestations of the popular attitudes of the lesser elements of society, and thus these texts can be used to measure the opinion of England as a whole.[157] If this were the case scholars could better understand why excessive military actions were done and their moral value to the people doing them. However, the appearance of these texts as coming from the uneducated people is almost certainly an

---

[151] Minot, *Poems*, 8.9–8.16.

[152] Kelly DeVries, 'Hunger, Flemish Participation and the Flight of Philip VI: Contemporary Accounts of the Siege of Calais, 1346–47', *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, n.s., 12 (1991), 129–81 (here 133); Minot, *Poems*, 3.

[153] See also pp. 168–69 below.

[154] See also Coleman, *English Literature*, pp. 73–76; Bellis, *Hundred Years War*, pp. 104, 108.

[155] 'Durham Feilde', lines 237–52; Minot, *Poems*, 1.79–1.80, 2.25–2.28, 6.7–6.18, 9.39–40, 9.55–9.60, 11.25–11.30, see more general revelling at 2.7–2.12, 5.34–5.36, 7.117–7.138. See also Slim, *Killing Civilians*, pp. 106–15.

[156] Writers often explain or apologise for not writing in Anglo-Norman or Latin and claim that they want their text exposed to as wide an audience as possible. See for example Mannyng, *Chronicle*, lines 1–8 (p. 91); Turville-Petre, *England the Nation*, pp. 27–40; Bellis, *Hundred Years War*, pp. 29–45.

[157] Pratt, 'Middle English Battle Poem', pp. 65–100 (repeatedly labels such 13th–early 14th-century poems as 'folk verse'); Coleman, *English Literature*, p. 76; J. Taylor, *English Historical Literature*, p. 243; D. Matthews, *Writing to the King*, p. 142; Tyson, 'Aspects of War', p. 51 (as spontaneous and emotional responses to events).

intentional façade with rhetorical ends, as these texts were clearly written by either churchmen or members of the government to serve as propaganda, and were not just transcripts of oral poems.[158] Writings in the other two languages of England, Anglo-Norman and Latin, employ the same sorts of rhetoric and often present similar ideas of England and its enemies, with no less vigour or national feeling.[159]

As with Minot, the *Lanercost Chronicle*'s writer is condemned by scholars. He is described by Little as 'a patriotic hater of the Scots' and by Gransden as 'patriotic and royalist' and 'ultra-patriotic'.[160] The chronicle is generally ignored for these reasons, and is denounced by Maxwell for exhibiting 'bitter partisanship', by Wilson as 'acrimonious hostility to Scottish interests', by Offler as 'hatred and despite [of the Scots]', and Ruddick as a 'virulently anti-Scottish tone'.[161] However, besides its critical descriptions of Scottish actions in war, mostly depicted as atrocities, the text provides no real notion of Scottish or French identity in its narrative of Edward III's reign. *Lanercost*'s only concern in portraying national identity is to depict the English in a positive light, but especially as the New Israelites who suffer repeated attacks. The writer compares David II's refusal of the request of the English knight Walter Selby (*c.* 1290–1346) to surrender at Liddel Peel, north of Carslile, to Pharaoh's hard-heartedness and the fury of Herod, both of whom tormented the Israelites, notably by attacking innocent children.[162] He compares the Scottish king to the many biblical enemies of the Israelites, such as Antiochus, Nebuchadnezzar, Haman, and Jabin.[163] The protection of Durham by William Zouche (d. 1352), archbishop of York, against the 1346 invasion is described in a fashion similar to Mattathias' defence of the Jews.[164] *Lanercost*'s type of colourful narrative is uncommon and might be

---

[158] Laurence Minot, *Poems, 1333–1352*, ed. by Thomas Beaumont James and John Simons (Exeter: University of Exeter, 1989), p. 85. Complaint literature, a related genre, more accurately reflects the popular voice: Ilana Krug, 'Complaint Literature: The Voice of the People, or Literary Formulae?', *Medieval Perspectives*, 27 (2012), 125–35.

[159] See Galbraith for the overstated importance of writings in English and Short for the continued importance of Anglo-Norman through the later Middle Ages: Vivian H. Galbraith, 'Nationality and Language in Medieval England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 4th ser., 23 (1941), 113–28; Ian Short, *Manual of Anglo-Norman*, Anglo-Norman Text Society, Occasional Publications Series, 8, 2nd edn (Oxford: Anglo-Norman Text Society, 2013), p. 37.

[160] Andrew G. Little, 'Chronicles of the Mendicant Friars', in *Franciscan Essays II*, ed. by Francis C. Burkitt, Harold E. Goad, and Andrew G. Little, British Society of Franciscan Studies, Extra Series, 3 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1932), pp. 85–103 (here 97); Gransden, *Historical Writing*, II, 115, 116.

[161] *Chronicle of Lanercost, 1272–1346*, trans. by Herbert Maxwell (Glasgow: Maclehose, 1913), p. vi; James Wilson, 'Authorship of the *Chronicle of Lanercost*', in *Chronicle of Lanercost, 1272–1346*, trans. by Herbert Maxwell (Glasgow: Maclehose, 1913), pp. ix–xxxi (here xix); Hilary S. Offler, 'A Note on the Northern Franciscan Chronicle', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 28 (1984), 45–59 (here 52); Ruddick, *English Identity*, p. 240.

[162] *Lanercost*, p. 345; *Bible*, Exodus 1.9, 1.22, 5–15, Matthew 2.16–2.18. See also parallels drawn between England and Israel in a number of English writings: Barnie, *War in Medieval Society*, pp. 102–03; Coote, *Prophecy*, p. 124; Ruddick, *English Identity*, pp. 272–85.

[163] *Lanercost*, pp. 347 (Antiochus), 349 (the others); *Bible*, I–II Maccabees, Daniel 3–4, Esther 3–7, Joshua 11.

[164] *Lanercost*, p. 347; *Bible*, I Maccabees 2.

inspired by the writer having been personally affected by Scottish attacks, as well as the large amount of northern English poetry that touches on these issues.[165]

Given their critical portrayal of their enemies, it might be presumed that these texts represent manifestations of common hatred of other peoples, or were intended to reinforce such attitudes.[166] If this were the case then it would be expected to find passages explicitly revelling in such attacks, but, as this thesis demonstrates throughout, English writers are careful in their representations of attacks on French and Scottish civilians and sensitive to the moral problems therein. The purpose of seemingly nationalistic or jingoistic passages is more nuanced. They are meant to support England in its opposition to other countries in a time of war by providing elaborate celebratory passages that also criticise the enemy. This is exemplified in the Latin poem 'Dispute between the Englishman and the Frenchman' (*c.* 1350). The text begins with the Frenchman addressing the Englishman as 'dregs of humanity, shame of the world, and most of all / guilty more than others' and 'you subvert, you teach, you turn, all things into crime / you drag the banner of virtue into vice'.[167] He then complains, in detail, of the English people's harsh language, gluttony, and poor drinking habits.[168] The Englishman asks why the Frenchman is complaining at all and replies only partially to his accusations. Instead he focuses his own insults on French effeminacy, such as describing their language as akin to 'a woman speaking in the mouth of a man'.[169] Here, as elsewhere in English writings, these are only general stereotypes expanded into more explicitly critical language. However, they do not represent a wider hatred of the French or Scots amongst English writers, at least to the degree that attacks on them might be wholly justified and laudable, no matter how severe, nor the types of victims. These English writings and their 'nationalist' passages are used instead to better define the English by contrast with their enemies, and also to praise their own defensive behaviour.[170]

---

[165] For poems drawn upon by *Lanercost* see 'Tractatus belli apud Crucem', in Laurence Minot, *Poems*, ed. by Joseph Hall, 3rd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914), pp. 114–22, 127–29; Calais Anonymous, 'Durham'. See also Pratt, 'Middle English Battle Poem', p. 102; Rigg, *History*, pp. 261–63, 381–82; Iain A. MacInnes, *Scotland's Second War of Independence, 1332–57* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2016), pp. 208–09.

[166] See for example Pratt, 'Middle English Battle Poem', p. 149: these texts 'were composed during a period of strong nationalism when the hostile passions of a nation were the hatreds of its monarch and any minstrel poet would logically bare these passions'.

[167] 'Dispute between the Englishman and the Frenchman', in *Political Poems and Songs Relating to English History, Composed during the Period from the Accession of Edw. III to that of Ric. III*, ed. by Thomas Wright, RS, 14, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1859–61), I, 91–93 (here lines 1–2, 9–10): 'faex hominum, pudor orbis, et ultima rerum, / res rea plus aliis', 'omnia pervertis, doces, in crimina flectis, / signum virtutis in vitiosa trahis'. See also Coleman, *English Literature*, pp. 75–76.

[168] 'Dispute', lines 3–6 and 17–18 (language), 25–30 (gluttony), 31–37 (drinking).

[169] 'Dispute', line 56: 'mulier fatur in ore viri', also see line 61: 'foemineos castravit Gallica Gallos'.

[170] On the idea of national identity through contrast with others see D. Matthews, 'Laurence Minot', p. 285; D. Matthews, *Writing to the King*, p. 151; David Green, 'National Identities and the Hundred Years War', in *Fourteenth-*

3. JUST WAR AND REBELLION

It is often assumed that English writers were entirely unconcerned with the ethical problems of war because they accepted ideas of just war (*ius ad bellum*). Thomas Aquinas, in his widely read *Summa theologica* (1265–74), clarifies and elaborates upon Augustine's ideas to argue that three conditions are required for a war to be just: authority, cause, and intention.[171] So long as these were met then there would be no reason to worry about the conduct of war, as it would, by necessity, be just. *Ius ad bellum* often takes prime place in scholarly investigations of medieval just war, which often suggest that medieval writers did not care about the often brutal and ruthless conduct of war.[172] It was easy enough to argue that any war was just through careful selection and manipulation of facts to fit the required conditions, and even then, wars were no more restrained and less violent if they met these criteria.[173]

These ideas circulated amongst medieval English writers and were appropriated to argue that rebels and traitors deserved to be treated without restraint. Scholars who argue that these ideas were widely accepted by writers and military leaders cite the 1435 letter by the English knight John Fastolf (1380–1459).[174] In his letter Fastolf alludes to the then mostly abandoned strategy of large-scale devastation when he advocates 'werre cruelle and sharpe, without sparing of any parsone' and argues its necessity because 'traitours and rebellis must nedis have anothere manere of werre, and more sharpe and more cruelle werre than a naturelle and anoien ennemye'.[175] It is easy enough to make the connection that the 'enemy' should obey their rightful

---

Century England VI, ed. by Chris Given-Wilson (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2010), pp. 115–30 (here 124); and more generally A. D. Smith, 'National Identities'.

171 Thomas Aquinas, 'Summa theologiae cum commentariis Thomae de Vio Caietani ordinis praedicatorum', in *Opera omnia iussu impensaque Leonis XIII*, ed. by Tommaso Maria Zigliara and others, 39 vols so far (Roma: Typographia poliglotta S. C. de Propaganda Fide, 1882–), IV–XII, esp. 2-2 qq. 40 (VIII, 312–17, *de bello*), 41 (VIII, 318–19, *de rixa*), 42 (VIII, 320–21, *de seditione*), 64 (IX, 67–75, *de homicidio*), 65 (IX, 76–78, *de aliis injuriis in personam*), 66 (IX, 79–83, *de furto et rapina*). On Aquinas' attitudes to war see also Frederick H. Russell, *The Just War in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), pp. 258–91; Gregory M. Reichberg, *Thomas Aquinas on War and Peace* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), pp. 42–53, 114–222.

172 See for example articles that summarise just war as if it were solely *ius ad bellum*: Jonathan Barnes, 'The Just War', in *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy*, ed. by Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny, and Jan Pinborg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 771–84; Frederick H. Russell, 'Just War', in *The Cambridge History of Medieval Philosophy*, ed. by Robert Pasnau, 2 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 997–1193.

173 Keen, *Laws of War*, pp. 70, 190–217; Russell, *Just War*, pp. 292–308.

174 Note that Rogers borrows a quote from Fastolf for the title of his monograph: C. J. Rogers, 'Edward III'; C. J. Rogers, *War, Cruel and Sharp*; Rory Cox, 'Asymmetric Warfare and Military Conduct in the Middle Ages', *Journal of Medieval History*, 38 (2012), 100–25 (here 112–13).

175 John Fastolf, 'Report upon the Management of the War in France upon the Conclusion of the Treaty of Arras', in *Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Wars of the English in France during the Reign of Henry the Sixth, King of England*, ed. by Joseph Stevenson, RS, 22, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1861–64), II, 575–85 (here 581, 580). See also Malcolm Vale, 'Sir John Fastolf's "Report" of 1435: A New Interpretation Reconsidered', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 17 (1973), 78–84; N. A. R. Wright, *Knights and Peasants*, pp. 31–33.

lords, the English (as argued by the English), and therefore needed to be punished by the harshest of measures to ensure compliance and prevent society from unravelling. If the victims of English attacks were said to be rebels it follows that attacks on them would be entirely justified, as rebellion was universally condemned.[176] Punishment as justice was, after all, widely accepted, despite its necessarily often violent nature.[177] Late medieval writers sometimes praised such violent punishment in great detail in their chronicles and even in occasional poems.[178] I examine here the dissemination of these arguments for war, how deeply writers accepted them, and whether they are used to excuse actions in war that might be seen as immoral.

The English were keen to promote their wars with France and Scotland as legitimate and focused almost entirely on just cause over any other element.[179] They circulated their arguments widely in a number of forms, such as newsletters and calls for prayer, which were widely disseminated and read aloud to the public. These documents were occasionally modified, but the many surviving copies in major repositories and monastic collections suggest that the main content and rhetoric of these texts remained unchanged.[180] Edward III also asserted his claims more directly by suggesting he was the new Arthur, ruler of Britain, through chivalric orders, stylised tournaments, and other symbolic displays.[181]

Writers who were not affiliated with the government thought it important to record the justifications for Edward III's wars in their chronicles, histories, poems, and other literature. As Writers sometimes interpolated copies of official documents that explained England's claim to the thrones of France or Scotland, discussed them in detail, brought them up repeatedly in their narratives, or sometimes merely alluded to them. These ideas circulated amongst all ranks of English society, even among illiterate workers who had nothing to do with war. Writers took it upon themselves to ensure that they recorded these nuanced positions accurately, so that the English would appear justified in their wars.

---

[176] See for example Prestwich, *Armies and Warfare*, pp. 231, 239; Allmand, *Hundred Years War*, pp. 37–38; C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, p. 194.

[177] Mitchell B. Merback, *The Thief, the Cross and the Wheel: Pain and the Spectacle of Punishment in Medieval and Renaissance Europe* (London: Reaktion, 1999). See also Skoda for problems of judicial violence and McGlynn's profound misunderstanding of punishment's ethical value: Skoda, *Medieval Violence*, pp. 169–71; McGlynn, *By Sword and Fire*, pp. 5–35.

[178] See for example 'The Execution of Sir Simon Fraser', in *Historical Poems of the XIVth and XVth Centuries*, ed. by Rossell Hope Robbins (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), pp. 14–21, 252–56.

[179] On just cause see Anthony J. Coates, *The Ethics of War*, 2nd edn (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016), pp. 162–82.

[180] Alison K. McHardy, 'Some Reflections on Edward III's Use of Propaganda', in *The Age of Edward III*, ed. by James S. Bothwell (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2001), pp. 171–92; Ruddick, *English Identity*, pp. 268–88.

[181] J. Vale, *Edward III*.

The recurring wars with Scotland were supported by an elaborate argument that the Scots owed fealty to the kings of England. The main legal point was that Edward I received overlordship of Scotland for his arbitration in the Scottish inheritance crisis (1286–92).[182] Because of his repeated demands and humiliation of their elected king, John Balliol (*r.* 1292–96), the Scots were encouraged to ally with France, in what became known as the Auld Alliance. Edward was then able to claim that the Scots had broken their feudal obligation and invaded Scotland in 1296. Scotland's First War of Independence lasted until the treaty of Northampton in 1328, but war broke out again in 1333.[183] Edward Balliol, with Edward III's support, claimed to be the rightful king of Scotland and, accordingly, declared Scotland's fealty to England. This allowed the kings of England to once again claim Scotland.

English texts repeat these arguments for English overlordship, sometimes explicitly, but not through interpolations of official documents. The short chronicle *Gesta Scotorum contra Anglicos* is wholly concerned with demonstrating that the Scots owe fealty to the English. In one of the two manuscripts, the writer interpolates a literary piece entitled 'Passio Scotorum perjuratorum', which criticises the Scottish claimants (*c.* 1306–07) through heavy use of biblical quotation and allegory, and covers all the essential characteristics of the dispute.[184] Although the manuscript was written around 1370, the scribe still found the much earlier events important enough to take up a significant portion of the text.

Chroniclers typically promote the English claim to Scotland by integrating its core ideas into legendary narratives. They show that the kings of England inherited the right to rule all of Britain, as the supreme monarchy. Such chroniclers begin their narratives with Brutus' legendary foundation of Britain that traces the English lineage back to Troy and offered the preeminent foundational legitimacy.[185] Many of writers employ a visual medium to better demonstrate the genealogical descent, but these texts were almost always written before or after Edward III's reign.[186] Geoffrey of Monmouth's *De gestis Britonum* (alternatively titled *Historia regum*

---

[182] Andy King and Claire Etty, *England and Scotland, 1286–1603* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), pp. 13–28, 204–05.

[183] King and Etty, *England and Scotland*, pp. 29–46, 205–06.

[184] 'Notice of a Manuscript of the Latter Part of the Fourteenth Century, Entitled *Passio Scotorum perjuratorum*', ed. by John Patrick Crichton-Stuart, *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, n.s., 7 (1885), 166–92 (*Gesta Scotorum*, MS 2 fols 275^{v}–278^{v}). See also Alexander Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn: What Was Going On?', *Scottish Historical Review*, 86 (2007), 176–224 (here 187–88).

[185] J. Taylor, *English Historical Literature*, pp. 97–98; Ruddick, *English Identity*, pp. 171–73. See also Colette Beaune, *The Birth of an Ideology: Myths and Symbols of Nation in Late Medieval France*, trans. by Susan Ross Huston, ed. by Fredric L. Cheyette (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), pp. 226–44.

[186] On the use of genealogical history in a visual form, often by the government, see Joan A. Holladay, 'Charting the Past: Visual Configurations of Myth and History and the English Claim to Scotland', in *Representing History, 900–1300:*

Britanniae, *c*. 1136) was the authoritative version of Britain's origin. It circulated widely in its vulgate text and a few variant versions in well over 200 manuscripts in the course of the later Middle Ages.[187] Edward I himself, during his war with Scotland, turned to these types of texts to argue that he was the heir to the overlordship of Scotland and the rest of Britain.[188]

Monmouth's text was the basis of several later adaptations, but it was not until the *Oldest Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* that the authority of legendary rulers was forcefully and explicitly connected to late medieval English kings.[189] In this later text the three sons of Brutus are assigned the countries of Britain: England, Scotland, and Wales. Locrin, as the oldest son, is given the overlordship of all of Britain, and the rest of the text traces his rights down to Edward I, despite the many invasions Britain endured. The *Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* became more explicitly political in the fourteenth century when it was adapted, expanded, and continued to 1333 in the *Long* and *Short* versions, both of which were probably written by clerks attached to the government while in York.[190] The several later continuations and translations of these texts demonstrate the *Brut*'s continuing authority and relevance to late fourteenth-century England. Other fourteenth-century chronicles, though largely compiled from other sources or rewritten entirely, adopted this structure to demonstrate English dominance throughout.[191] Chronicles written during Edward III's reign were sometimes modified to appear to be *Brut*s, such as the two manuscripts of the *Eulogium historiarum* that omit the bulk of the text's earlier narrative so that they begin with Brutus' story.[192]

Art, Music, History, ed. by Robert A. Maxwell (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2010), pp. 115–32, 232–35; Olivier de Laborderie, *Histoire, mémoire et pouvoir: Les Généalogies en rouleau des rois d'Angleterre, 1250–1422* (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2013), esp. pp. 353–426.

187 For the vulgate text see Reeve's edition, for variant texts see Wright's editions (Wright and Crick, I, II, V), for MSS see Crick (article and Wright and Crick, III), Reeve (introduction), and Tahkokallio, and for reception see Keeler and Crick (Wright and Crick, IV): Monmouth, *De gestis Britonum*, ed. by Reeve, xi–li (MSS); Neil Wright and Julia Crick, eds, *The 'Historia regum Britannie' of Geoffrey of Monmouth*, 5 vols (Cambridge: Brewer, 1985–91); Julia Crick, 'Two Newly Located Manuscripts of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia regum Britanniae*', *Arthurian Literature*, 13 (1995), 151–56; Jaakko Tahkokallio, 'Update to the List of Manuscripts of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia regum Britanniae*', *Arthurian Literature*, 32 (2015), 187–203; Laura Keeler, *Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Late Latin Chroniclers, 1300–1500* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1946).

188 Edward L. G. Stones, 'The Appeal to History in Anglo-Scottish Relations between 1291 and 1401', *Archives*, 9 (1969), 10–21, 80–83; Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, pp. 65–69; Ruddick, *English Identity*, pp. 171–74.

189 See Julia Marvin, 'Narrative, Lineage, and Succession in the Anglo-Norman Prose *Brut* Chronicle', in *Broken Lines: Genealogical Literature in Late Medieval Britain and France*, ed. by Raluca L. Radulescu and Edward Donald Kennedy (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), pp. 205–20; John Spence, *Reimagining History in Anglo-Norman Prose Chronicles* (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2013), pp. 40–73; J. Marvin, *Construction of Vernacular History*, pp. 21–56, 121–28.

190 See also Mannyng, *Chronicle*.

191 *Durham LPB*; *Prophetic LPB*; *Historia de Bruto* (see p. 205 n. 4 below).

192 *Eulogium*, MS 3, MS 8.

Ranulf Higden takes a similar position on English dominance, although his *Polychronicon* has a different, non-linear structure and does not always focus on Britain or England. However, he treats his text seriously and aims for a truthful account, so much that he casts doubt on some parts of Geoffrey of Monmouth's story because he found no supporting evidence in other authorities.[193] Despite his attitude towards such legendary stories Higden presents a version of Britain's foundation that clearly draws on Monmouth's story.[194] This origin story was clearly meant to affect the meaning of the more contemporary portions of the narrative, despite assertions that Higden only cared about the distant past.[195]

Through a careful manipulation of sources Higden is able to show that the English are the rightful rulers of Scotland. In the beginning of his short geographical section on Scotland he claims that Albanactus, one of Brutus' sons, was the first to inhabit, and lent his name to, what would later be Scotland.[196] Higden shows how the English later inherit this supreme position as the heirs to Brutus. He acknowledges that these stories were not the only explanations available when he posits that Albania might have instead been named after a province of Scythia with the same name, from which the Scots were said to originate.[197] There is no suggestion here that Higden meant this mention of Scythia to condemn the Scots as a people, or understood any reference to Scythia to make the Scots 'ferocious and friendless brute[s]', as was common through Late Antiquity.[198] Instead, he only traces the origin of each people through the many sources he had available to him. Although he offers an alternative etymology he is careful to show that the Scots did not inhabit Scotland before Brutus' descendants, and thereby implies that they did not have any right to rule their land that might supercede that of the English.[199] He then tersely states that the Picts afterwards inhabited Albania, then renamed Pictavia, and

---

[193] Higden, *Polychronicon*, 5.6 (V, 334–36), which compels Trevisa to add a long digression about truth and evidence in his translation. See also J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, pp. 44–45.

[194] Brown claims that Higden mostly ignores the Brutus story, but it is clear that his assertion is based on having read only a small portion of the text: Peter Brown, 'Higden's Britain', in *Medieval Europeans: Studies in Ethnic Identity and National Perspectives in Medieval Europe*, ed. by Alfred P. Smyth (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002), pp. 103–18 (here 107).

[195] See for example Gransden, *Historical Writing*, II, 44, 50.

[196] Higden, *Polychronicon*, 1.37 (I, 382): 'vocabatur Albania ab Albanacto, regis Bruti filio, eam primum inhabitante'.

[197] Higden, *Polychronicon*, 1.37 (I, 382–84): 'sive ab Albania provincia, quae est pars Scythiae, vicina Amazonibus, unde et Scoti quasi Sciti a Scythia, originem duxerunt'.

[198] Baraz, *Medieval Cruelty*, pp. 5, 14, 30–32, for examples of later uses see 69, 72, 74, 97, 121, 151–52, 165; Jason Berg, 'How Monstrosity and Geography Were Used to Define the Other in Early Medieval Europe' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Leeds, 2015), pp. 121–53, 152 (quote), 178–81, 185–87.

[199] Lavezzo claims that Higden's lists of different names for places are meant to suggest the unstable and fractured nature of England and Britain. However, Higden's etymological digressions are clearly meant to show England's inherited past while also fulfilling his text's encyclopaedic purpose: Kathy Lavezzo, *Angels on the Edge of the World: Geography, Literature, and English Community, 1000–1534* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006), p. 84. See also J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, p. 60.

the Scots came and ruled only later, then renamed the land Scotland.[200] Higden offers no explanation here, and later in his text describes how the Picts had originally invited the Scots, then in Ireland, to stay with them, only for them to be betrayed and murdered by their guests at a feast.[201]

The Scots promoted a related version of their foundation to argue for their independence. In the Scottish lords' *Declaration of Arbroath*, sent to Pope John XXII (*r.* 1316–34) in 1320, Scottish identity and independence are joined together in an origin story based on their supposed Scythian heritage, without mention of Scota as their founder.[202] This reference to Scythia implies that the Scots were converted to Christianity by their patron, St Andrew, who was commonly believed to have preached to the Scythians, far earlier than the English had been in the early Middle Ages.[203] The text's reference to Scythia has a deliberately positive meaning, unlike those espoused through Late Antiquity or by Higden. In the declaration the Scots trace their many journeys until they settle finally in Scotland, perhaps in an allusion to the Israelites' journey through the wilderness to the promised land.[204] *Arbroath* then describes how they came to inhabit and rule their country:

> The Britons were first expelled and the Picts entirely destroyed [by the Scots], and although by the Norwegians, Danes, and English they [the Scots] were very often attacked, with many victories and very many labours they took possession [of their home], and held it free from servitude [...] [and in this manner] they held it for all time.[205]

Here the Scots proudly claim that they earned the right to rule Scotland by conquest. Higden was surely aware of this claim, as he finished the first recension of his *Polychronicon* many years later. He responds to this story by altering the particulars to allow the English to trace their rule to the first legitimate inhabitants, and thus makes them dominant. He is inspired by Monmouth

---

200 Higden, *Polychronicon*, 1.37 (I, 384).

201 Higden, *Polychronicon*, 1.58 (II, 154–56).

202 *The Declaration of Arbroath*, ed. by James Fergusson (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1970), pp. 6, 50; Benjamin Hazard, 'A Manuscript Copy of the *Declaration of Arbroath* from the Roman Archives of Fr. Luke Wadding (1588–1657)', *Scottish Historical Review*, 90 (2011), 296–315 (here 308–09). See also R. James Goldstein, *The Matter of Scotland: Historical Narrative in Medieval Scotland* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993), esp. pp. 18, 74–75, 77, 90–92, 104–32.

203 Geoffrey W. S. Barrow, *Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm of Scotland*, 4th edn (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005), pp. 394–400; Edward J. Cowan, *'For freedom alone': The Declaration of Arbroath, 1320* (East Linton: Tuckwell, 2003), pp. 41–47.

204 *Bible*, Exodus 16–18. See also Goldstein, *Matter of Scotland*, pp. 90–91, 108, 114, 116–18, 316 n. 31; Edward J. Cowan, 'Myth and Identity in Early Medieval Scotland', *Scottish Historical Review*, 63 (1984), 111–35.

205 *Declaration of Arbroath*, pp. 6 (quote), 50: 'expulsis primo Britonibus et Pictis omnino deletis, licet per Norwagienses, Dacos et Anglicos sepius inpugnata fuerit, multis cum victorijs et Laboribus quamplurimis adquisiuit, ipsasque ab omni seruitute liberas [...] semper tenuit'; Hazard, 'Manuscript Copy', p. 309.

but draws directly on two authorities, Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* (*c.* 731) and Isidore of Seville, rather than *Arbroath*'s vague citation of 'we know it [...] from deeds and books of the ancients'.[206] Higden concludes his description of Britain and the relationship between the various countries by condemning the Scots for their attacks on England, in a reversal of the Scots' assertion of innocence.[207]

English writers are just as concerned with just cause in their war with France, but are obviously more partisan when they describe contemporary events. They repeatedly cite and describe Edward III's claim to the throne of France as the most important justification. King Charles IV of France died in 1328 without an heir and Edward was the closest male descendant through his mother, Isabella of France (1295–1358), who was the late king's sister.[208] French authorities would not accept an English king on their throne, however, and invoked the Salic Law to offer it to Charles' first cousin, Philippe, count of Valois.[209] Despite his superior claim, Edward relinquished it in 1329 when he acknowledged Philippe VI's rule by paying liege homage for the duchy of Aquitaine. These issues, and many others, contributed to the outbreak of war between England and France in 1337.[210] However, Edward was encouraged to formally claim the French throne in 1340, and throughout the rest of the Hundred Years War the English consistently cited this claim as leverage during negotiation.[211]

Despite the many pragmatic justifications for the Anglo-French war, writers who portray the English invasions of France as just consistently repeat Edward III's claim to France.[212] They disqualify the young English king's acknowledgment of Philippe VI and attribute it to the influence of Isabella and Roger Mortimer so that Edward can legitimately claim his rights. Both Edward's 1339 letter to Pope Benedict XII on his claims, as well as his 1340 proclamation that he

---

[206] Bede, *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, ed. by Bertram Colgrave, Roger A. B. Mynors, and John M. Wallace-Hadrill, OMT, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969–88), I.1 (I, 16–18), also see II, 8–9; Seville, *Etymologiarum*, 9.2.62 (for comment on Amazons); *Declaration of Arbroath*, p. 6: 'scimus [...] ex antiquorum gestis et libris'.

[207] Higden, *Polychronicon*, I.60 (II, 172–74).

[208] Craig Taylor, 'Edward III and the Plantagenet Claim to the French Throne', in *The Age of Edward III*, ed. by James S. Bothwell (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2001), pp. 155–69. See also Ruddick, *English Identity*, pp. 210–11.

[209] Craig Taylor, 'The Salic Law and the Valois Succession to the French Crown', *French History*, 15 (2001), 358–77 (esp. 165–67).

[210] See John Le Patourel, 'The Origins of the War', in *The Hundred Years War*, ed. by Kenneth Fowler (London: Macmillan, 1971), pp. 28–50; Malcolm Vale, 'England, France, and the Origins of the Hundred Years War', in *England and her Neighbours, 1066–1453: Essays in Honour of Pierre Chaplais*, ed. by Michael C. E. Jones and Malcolm Vale (London: Hambledon, 1989), pp. 199–215.

[211] John J. N. Palmer, 'The War Aims of the Protagonists and the Negotiations for Peace', in *The Hundred Years War*, ed. by Kenneth Fowler (London: Macmillan, 1971), pp. 51–74; Anne Curry, *The Hundred Years War*, 2nd edn (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), esp. pp. 38–50.

[212] See also Bellis' unfair assertion that 'Edward III's war could claim none of the justifications, nor abide by many of the moral mandates, laid out by the military theorists: it was not a defensive war; it did not respect the innocent parties caught up in it; under French law it was illegal': Bellis, 'Reader myghte lamente', p. 88.

was king of France, are interpolated in English chronicles, many of which were widely read.[213] The claim is expressed through genealogical diagrams in a variety of forms and manuscript contexts. These range from crudely written names with lines connecting them, to more formal scripts in precise roundels, with much variation of detail and structure amongst them.[214] These diagrams circulated in some manuscripts with accompanying treatises that explain the English claim, some in Anglo-Norman and others in Latin.[215] Although unnoted by scholars, the major differences between all these genealogical diagrams implies that several versions were composed independently, from information in documents or elsewhere, rather than from a single archetype, and therefore demonstrates widespread interest amongst writers in Edward III's claims.

English writers did not simply copy these documents, but accepted and used them in their narratives. In some cases chroniclers interpolate their genealogical diagrams directly into their narratives, which gives the impression that they are spontaneous visualisations of Edward III's claims.[216] Most political poems repeatedly cite Edward's rights to support and justify his actions against France in their celebratory narratives.[217] There also survives a short Latin poem that focuses solely on this subject and states Edward's claim succinctly.[218]

Some chroniclers suggest a widespread familiarity with the English claim by their passing references. Geoffrey le Baker consistently labels Philippe VI as 'the tyrant' (*tirannus*) and his successor Jean II (*r*. 1350–64) as 'the crowned one' (*coronatus*).[219] He gives this label to Philippe

---

[213] *Long ANPB Continuation*, fols 185^{r}–188^{v} (1339), 191^{r}–192^{r} (1340); Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus*, pp. 303 (1339 opening), 309–10 (1340); *Bridlington*, pp. 140–47 (1339); *Lanercost*, pp. 319–26 (1339); Murimuth, *Continuatio*, pp. 91–100 (1339), Tynemouth, *Historia*, not in MSS, edn pp. 316–26 (1339), 337–40 (1340).

[214] Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus*, MS 1 fol. 105^{r}, MS 2 fol. 146^{v}, MS 3 fol. 257^{v} (all of which have the same form and content); *Eulogium*, MS 5 fol. 204^{r}; Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 175, MS 2 fol. 157^{v}, not in MS 1; Murimuth, *Continuatio*, between pp. 100 and 101, MS 1 fol. 11^{v} and MS 6 fol. 23^{v} (both of which have the same form and content), not in MSS 2–5, 7–18.

[215] The Anglo-Norman text is in a collection of miscellaneous texts in the beginning of the *Anonimalle* MS, interpolated in *Lanercost*, in a later miscellany, and possibly other witnesses identified by Pagan: Diana B. Tyson, 'Three Short Anglo-Norman Texts in Leeds University Library, Brotherton Collection MS 29', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 52 (2008), 81–112 (here 93–98, 103–05, fols 2^{v}–3^{v}); *Lanercost*, pp. 330–32, fols 240^{v}–241^{r}; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 637 (SC 1592), fols 74^{r}–74^{v}; Heather Pagan, 'Trevet's *Les Cronicles*: Manuscripts, Owners and Readers', in *The Prose 'Brut' and Other Late Medieval Chronicles: Books Have their Histories. Essays in Honour of Lister M. Matheson*, ed. by Jaclyn Rajsic, Erik Kooper, and Dominique Hoche (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2016), pp. 149–64 (here 163 n. 53). The Latin texts are interpolated in Murimuth, *Continuatio*, MS 1 fols 10^{v}–11^{v}, MS 6 fols 22^{v}–23^{r}, and another independent one in MS 10, fols 186^{v}–187^{r}.

[216] *Lanercost*, p. 330, fol. 240^{v}; Murimuth, *Continuatio*, between pp. 100 and 101, MS 1 fol. 11^{v}, MS 6 fol. 23^{v}.

[217] Minot, *Poems*, 1.31, 4.28–4.30, 6.77–6.79, 7.32; *Les Voeux du héron: A Middle French Vowing Poem*, ed. by John Grigsby and Norris Lacy (New York: Garland, 1992), lines 107–09 (p. 38).

[218] 'Epigram on the Assumption of the Arms of France', in *Political Poems and Songs Relating to English History, Composed during the Period from the Accession of Edw. III to That of Ric. III*, ed. by Thomas Wright, RS, 14, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1859–61), I, 26.

[219] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, tyrant: pp. 55 (six times), 58 (two times), 59, 61 (two times), 62, 63, 64 (three times), 65 (two times), 66 (three times), 71 (two times), 82 (five times), 90 (two times), 91 (two times), crowned one: 103, 111, 125 (two times), 133 (two times), 140, 141 (two times), 142 (four times), 143 (two times), 149, 152, 153, 154 (three times),

because 'he was the enemy of common justice and the usurper of the above-said sacred kingdom [of France]' and the other to Jean because he was crowned unjustly.[220] Le Baker also claims that the English nobles and other combatants fighting in France were eager to go to war so that they could defend their king's rights, as do other writers, although these have been casually dismissed by some as empty rhetoric.[221]

These many references to Edward III's rights to act against the Scots and French do not signal acceptance of massacres on legal grounds, but serve to demonstrate the English as legitimate and just in their pursuits and their enemies, in constrast, as illegitmate and unjust, as part of a more general praise of England. The connection between English just cause with the enemy as rebels who deserve harsh treatment is never explicitly stated in English texts during Edward's reign. It should not be assumed that these ideas were silently accepted and simply not discussed when they applied to the enemy as a whole. English sources never describe the victims of devastation or even enemy armies as illegitimate, and never use them to revel in massacres of the enemy or their people.[222] Equally, there is no concept of collective guilt that might be assigned to people because they passively accept the status quo and support their assumed king, even if he might be depicted as a usurper. On only a few occasions do texts revel in the execution or harsh treatment of supposed rebels or traitors, but these are explained as such, and in nearly every instance limited to individuals.[223] The nearest writers approach this concept is when they accuse people in fortified places of resisting the will of English military leaders, but even then, they do not suggest these victims ought to be treated harshly, but merely that they are not entitled to leniency.[224] English writers use ideas of just war, rebellion, and treason in a fashion similar to ideas of divine will and prophecy, to praise and criticise military action.

---

also see 87 (David II labelled 'tirani').

220 Le Baker, *Chronicle*, pp. 55, 111: 'inimicum iusticie communis et predicti sancti regni instrusorem', 'Iohannes in regem Francie fuit coronatus, set iniuste'.

221 Cox, *John Wyclif*, p. 167: 'not even the most jingoistic fourteenth-century English commentators attempted to claim that the soldiers who fought in France were motivated by a zeal for justice or a charitable disposition'.

222 See pp. 102–06 below.

223 See the execution of the Scottish military leader Menteith at pp. 199–200 below.

224 See also pp. 141–48, 185–87, 196–99 below.

* * *

English writers were familiar with the theoretical frameworks of divine will, national identity, and just war, as well as their importance to interpreting war. Despite their many seemingly abusive passages, a properly contextualised reading shows that they do not take these attitudes to their logical extremes. Instead, they recognise the rhetorical uses of these ideas and employ them throughout their texts, even if they might contradict other stances that they advocate elsewhere, and use criticisms of the French and Scots to better define themselves by contrast. In this period of conflict it was especially important to reinforce collective identity. Writers commonly employ all three of these notions together to more comprehensively support Edward III and criticise his opponents. The Calais Anonymous' 'Invective against France' (alternatively titled 'Crécy', 1346–47) draws on an extensive array of allusions and quotations, while engaging with many thematic issues, to portray Edward's war with France as entirely just.[225]

It remains difficult to grasp why these abusive passages were written in support of England. Bellis questions the seriousness of such political poems because of their overly abusive comments, many allusions, colourful language, and their medium of Latin rather than the vernacular.[226] Her suggestion that these texts might have been intended as parody or satire is compelling, especially when the manuscript contexts of some of these texts are considered. However, these ideas are treated with the utmost seriousness in the *Lanercost Chronicle* and other poems on David II's 1346 invasion of England, which caused great harm to the writers of these texts.[227] These texts do not conform to our modern idea of a proper, sober complaint, but are instead presented in much the same style as the 'Invective against France' and 'Dispute between the Englishman and the Frenchman', with abusive criticisms and a vast array of biblical allusions, all often in a taunt-reply structure.[228] This style of presentation is also found in sermons, which are themselves colourful but entirely serious, with many references and quotations

---

[225] Calais Anonymous, 'Crécy', in 'Propaganda of the Hundred Years War: Poems on the Battles of Crécy and Durham (1346), a Critical Edition', ed. by Arthur G. Rigg, *Traditio*, 54 (1999), 177–88, 197–205.

[226] Joanna Bellis, 'Propaganda or Parody? Latin Abuse Poetry from the Hundred Years War', in *Crossing Borders in the Insular Middle Ages*, ed. by Victoria Flood and Aisling Byrne (Turnhout: Brepols, 2018 forthcoming).

[227] 'On the Battle of Nevile's Cross', in *Political Poems and Songs Relating to English History, Composed during the Period from the Accession of Edw. III to that of Ric. III*, ed. by Thomas Wright, RS, 14, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1859–61), I, 40–41 (*si valeas paleas*); Calais Anonymous, 'Durham'; 'Durham Feilde'; 'Letre Dauyd de Bruys', in Laurence Minot, *Poems*, ed. by Joseph Hall, 3rd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914), pp. 112–14, 127; Minot, *Poems*, 9; 'Tractatus belli apud Crucem'. See also Pratt, 'Middle English Battle Poem', p. 102; Rigg, *History*, pp. 261–64, 381–82; MacInnes, *Scotland's Second War*, pp. 207–08.

[228] See also Pratt, 'Middle English Battle Poem', p. 212.

from other sources throughout.[229] Sermons and abuse literature employ this style and rhetoric to better provide moral commentary and instruction, and should not be disregarded simply because they are layered and allusive.

These frameworks are part of a common rhetorical strategy that stresses the justness of English actions against the repeated transgressions of their enemies. They often recite the endorsed position of the government and indirectly serve propagandist purposes. Although these writers treat the issue of war and the enemy's perceived injustices with seriousness, their outlooks do not reflect those that scholars often assume them to be. While Laurence Minot's aims might be to praise the English and 'heap abuse upon the defeated enemy', it should not be assumed that he endorsed all manner of attack on French and Scottish civilians.[230] Close examination of the rhetoric of Minot's poems and other texts shows that they do not think of their enemies with only amoral callousness. Indeed, writers of all varieties of historical literature engage with moral issues of war through careful reference to ideas of divine will, national identity, and just war, and their texts should be closely considered for their rhetorical purposes, rather than dismissed for not being entirely 'historical' or for espousing unpalatable views that were popular at the time.

[229] On sermon composition and structure see *Middle English Sermons, from British Museum, MS Royal 18 B XXIII*, ed. by Woodburn O. Ross, EETSos, 209 (London: Oxford University Press, 1940), pp. xliii–lv.

[230] Pratt, 'Middle English Battle Poem', p. 130.

CHAPTER THREE:
CIVILIAN DISTINCTION AND IMMUNITY

Medieval writers frequently disagree with modern scholars on what conditions, if any, merit immunity from war.[1] Although it has been noted that there was no word for the concept of civilian or non-combatant in their current sense until the nineteenth century, it is clear that ideas of distinction and immunity were discussed and debated much earlier.[2] These debates were certainly inspired by the commonplace attacks on civilians, especially on the clergy, who narrated war and thought about such ideas in their own writings. The few medieval writers who spend much time justifying such actions, such as Augustine and later theologians, receive the bulk of scholarly attention, even though they represent only a fraction of writing on war.[3] I use the term 'civilian' to mean a person who is not a professional combatant and has a different role or profession in society, and 'non-combatant' to mean anybody not bearing arms at a given moment, regardless of whether they had earlier fought. I argue in this chapter that there was a notion of civilian immunity in fourteenth-century England, regardless of national allegiance, and that writers often describe instances in which such peoples were attacked in a way that suggests sympathy to their suffering.

1. INNOCENCE AND CULPABILITY

It is difficult to fix the exact meaning of civilian or non-combatant status, and therefore who deserves immunity in the chaos and confusion of warfare. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines a civilian as 'a person who is not professionally employed in the armed forces' or 'a non-military person', and a non-combatant, similarly, as 'a person who is not a combatant, as a civilian during war'.[4] These definitions simply suggest that civilians are people who are not combatants, and non-combatants are either combatants who have laid down their arms or civilians. These promote the idea of the 'principle of distinction' between two broad categories of persons, those

---

1 See for example B. S. Bachrach and D. S. Bachrach, *Warfare in Medieval Europe*, p. 373: medieval 'rulers and military commanders generally did not draw the same very strict distinctions between combatants and non-combatants that are drawn today'.

2 Helen M. Kinsella, *The Image before the Weapon: A Critical History of the Distinction between Combatant and Civilian* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011), pp. 28–29.

3 See p. 67 above.

4 *Oxford English Dictionary Online* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000–) <oed.com>, 'civilian, *n.* and *adj.*' (A. *n.* 4. b.), 'non-combatant, *n.* and *adj.*' (A. *n.*).

who are or are not involved in war, and are part of the larger 'principle of discrimination' in modern discussions of the laws of war.[5] While these scholarly debates, cited throughout this chapter, clearly distinguish between civilians, non-combatants, and combatants, the reasons why some people deserve immunity remain unclear and are only implied. Indeed, one might assume that a number of situations earn a person civilian or non-combatant status, such as: not bearing arms, being unable to bear arms (either inherently, through lack of training, or due to religious conviction), not wearing uniforms or other visual markers of participation, not directly (or indirectly) contributing to war, not desiring to involve oneself or contribute to war in any way, or simply not resisting an opposing armed force when it passes through the area.[6] These possibilities, although often asserted, are inherently contradictory and not universally accepted by thinkers, either in the Middle Ages or today.[7]

The question of what earns immunity is frequently abstracted into the vague notion of 'innocence', which implies that some types of people are inherently unsuited for or morally opposed to war.[8] Johnson repeatedly emphasises that women (along with children, the most commonly-cited category of civilian) are weak and unable to bear arms, which Kinsella interprets as an unfair and misogynistic assumption.[9] Medievalists, such as Keen in his influential monograph, take a similar position to the *Oxford English Dictionary* and often assume that people were civilians because of their lack of complicity, as an opposite category to combatants, in that they did not actively pursue or contribute to war.[10] This commonly accepted starting point for discussions of medieval civilians and non-combatants is overly-simplistic and ignores a wide body of didactic and narrative texts from the Middle Ages.[11] Indeed, few scholars of war in the Middle Ages bother to think about or define their categories at all.[12]

---

5 See Kinsella, *Image before the Weapon*, pp. 2–3 (and sources cited on 199–200); as well as James Turner Johnson, 'Maintaining the Protection of Non-Combatants', in *Ethics, Nationalism, and Just War: Medieval and Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. by Henrik Syse and Gregory M. Reichberg (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2007), pp. 151–89 (here 164–71); Slim, *Killing Civilians*, pp. 11–21; Slim, 'Civilians, Distinction, and the Compassionate View of War', in *Protection of Civilians*, ed. by Haidi Willmot and others (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 11–28.

6 Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations*, 5th edn (New York: Basic Books, 2015), pp. 42–44.

7 See for example Kinsella's spirited argument against ideas by Walzer, J. T. Johnson, and others: Kinsella, *Image before the Weapon*, pp. 1–52.

8 See for example David Fisher, *Morality and War: Can War Be Just in the Twenty-First Century?* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 77–79; Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars*, pp. 30, 146; Coates, *Ethics of War*, pp. 249–50.

9 James Turner Johnson, *Just War Tradition and the Restraint of War: A Moral and Historical Inquiry* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), pp. 131–50; Kinsella, *Image before the Weapon*, pp. 15, 32–34.

10 See for example Keen, *Laws of War*, pp. 189–90; implicitly in Allmand, 'The War and the Non-Combatant'; J. T. Johnson, *Just War*, pp. 132–33.

11 See also Kinsella, *Image before the Weapon*, pp. 5, 8–9.

12 For an exception see Alan V. Murray, 'Warriors and Civilians in the Crusade Movement: Military Identities and

The ambiguous idea of innocence as the factor that earns immunity is sometimes used to twist the concept as a whole to argue that civilians were actually complicit in war and therefore did not deserve protection. Some scholars, such as Strickland and Saul, argue that in the later Middle Ages nearly everybody contributed to a kingdom's ability to wage war, at least indirectly, through the production of food for campaigns or stocking castles, payment of tax revenue for military wages, crafting of arms and armour, construction of military structures, or in other ways.[13] They imply that such people had intentionally and freely contributed towards their leader's war effort, and thereby breached the conditions of their immune status. From this point of view it would make sense, and perhaps be seen as ethical, to attack an enemy's means to wage war, including those people who would otherwise be classified as civilians or non-combatants. Rogers, as discussed below, implies this is the case for Edward III's many campaigns of devastation, and that it was a better strategic option than to waste English resources and lives in futile attempts to pursue the enemy king across the countryside to capture him by force, in order to end the war.

Scholars who accept the notion that most people were complicit in war argue that in the fourteenth century the English deliberately pursued campaigns of devastation and targeted civilians not for their own sake, but rather to minimise the enemy's ability to wage war. Rogers suggests this is a sensible strategy used to end war more quickly than would be possible if a more discriminating policy were pursued, but his theory is based almost entirely on a letter by the English knight John Wingfield (d. 1361) to William Edington (d. 1366), bishop of Winchester, written during Edward of Woodstock's 1355 Gascony campaign, which he describes as the 'key document' for this argument.[14] Wingfield's letter, in contrast to the common practice of only mentioning destruction once or twice to represent the daily behaviour of a campaign lasting months, describes English devastation and attacks on civilians on eight separate occasions.[15] At the end of his long letter he asserts:

Status in the Liberation and Defence of the Holy Land (1096–1204)', *Millars: Espai i història*, 43 (2017), 97–127 (here 107–09, quote at 101): 'the terms "warriors" and "soldiers" are employed to denote people who had received training in fighting techniques and discipline, and who earned their living primarily by military activity. The term "civilians" is used to denote those who did not engage in military activities in the course of their everyday lives', but 'these categories did not remain hard and fast during the course of crusade expeditions, whose character often obscured distinctions which might have been clear cut in other contexts'.

13 Strickland, 'Rules of War', p. 110; Saul, *For Honour and Fame*, p. 149.

14 C. J. Rogers, 'Edward III', p. 101.

15 Wingfield's 1355 letter to Edington, interpolated in Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus*, pp. 439–43 (here 440, final quote on 441): 'et aad pris illesqes plusours villes enclosez et lez aad ars et destruitz', 'et laad ars et destruit et tut la pays enviroun', 'gasty et destruit tout le pays', 'lez fist ardre et destruire et tout le pays', 'et fist ardre et destruire plusors bones villes trespassez', 'les aad ars et destruitz et tut le pays enviroun', 'et tout cele ville et toutz lez aultres villes el pays fusrent

> There was never such loss or such destruction as there has been in the course of this *chevauchée*. For the lands and *bonnes villes* that are destroyed by this *chevauchée* had supplied more each year to the king of France to maintain his war than did half of his realm.[16]

Wingfield clearly understands such attacks in terms of destroying resources that would otherwise be used to wage war against England. His letter so clearly sets out intention, cause, and effect, that scholars accept it as true and representative of war in the period.[17] It might then be assumed that this was the purpose of campaigns of devastation from their start, and that military leaders did not see their victims as civilians or non-combatants at all, but as complicit in war and, therefore, legitimate targets.[18] This argument might be advanced further to suggest such behaviour by English armies was moral and praiseworthy, as it prevented the enemy from attacking English civilians in something like a pre-emptive strike.

Ideas of a nation-wide or 'national' war, which utilises the willing contributions of an entire society, and in turn makes every person a licit target, seems, however, to be drawn primarily from modern ideas of 'total war'. Such notions were adopted during the Second World War to justify indiscriminate aerial bombardment that killed large numbers of civilians, but the levels of organisation and advanced technology required to carry out such indiscriminate and impersonal large-scale destruction were unavailable in the fourteenth century.[19] Some scholars also suggest that in the later Middle Ages war became more 'national' in character and that everyone desired to contribute somehow.[20] They argue that the majority of civilians and non-combatants

---

ars et destruitz', 'et preismes plusors villes et les gastasmes'.

16 Wingfield's 1355 letter to Edington, interpolated in Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus*, p. 442: 'y nont unqes tiel part eu tiel destruccion come il aad eu a ceste chivachee. Car les pays et lez bones villes qe sount destruits a ceste chivache trova a roy de Fraunce plus chescun an a maintenir sa guerre qe ne fist la moite de soun roialme'.

17 See for example C. J. Rogers, 'Edward III', p. 101; C. J. Rogers, *War, Cruel and Sharp*, pp. 323–24; C. J. Rogers, 'By Fire and Sword', p. 57; Andrew Ayton, 'The Crécy Campaign', in *The Battle of Crécy, 1346*, ed. by Andrew Ayton and Philip Preston (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005), pp. 35–107 (here 36 n. 5); Sean McGlynn, '"Sheer Terror" and the Black Prince's Grand Chevauchee of 1355', in *The Hundred Years War (Part III): Further Considerations*, ed. by L. J. Andrew Villalon and Donald J. Kagay (Leiden: Brill, 2013), pp. 317–32 (here 319–20); David Green, *The Hundred Years War: A People's History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014), pp. 51–52.

18 As argued by Allmand, *Hundred Years War*, p. 56; but see also T. R. Smith, 'Willing Body, Willing Mind'.

19 For recent considerations of the ethics of total war strategies, in particular aerial bombardment, see Johnson, Crane, Slim, and Coates, and for limitations of medieval war to effect large scale killing, see Hay: J. T. Johnson, *Just War*, pp. 24–27; Conrad C. Crane, '"Contrary to Our National Ideals": American Strategic Bombing of Civilians in World War II', in *Civilians in the Path of War*, ed. by Mark Grimsley and Clifford J. Rogers (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002), pp. 219–49; Slim, *Killing Civilians*, pp. 53–59; Coates, *Ethics of War*, pp. 261–78, 282–86; David J. Hay, '"Collateral Damage?" Civilian Casualties in the Early Ideologies of Chivalry and Crusade', in *Noble Ideals and Bloody Realities: Warfare in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Niall Christie and Maya Yazigi (Leiden: Brill, 2006), pp. 3–25 (here 4).

20 Allmand, *Hundred Years War*, pp. 49, 53 (quote): 'war was coming increasingly to be regarded as a form of activity to be carried out by the whole community, which would endeavour in common'. See also Coates, *Ethics of War*, pp. 251–52.

were interested in and wanted to help the outcome of wars because of the wide dissemination and consumption of propaganda.[21] This may, however, simply reflect the widely held interest in military activity, which is evident in the many sermons that draw upon biblical or Roman war stories to illuminate, sometimes only tangentially, related moral problems.[22] It is therefore assumed that the supposed desire of people, who would otherwise be considered civilians, to contribute to war made them licit targets in military campaigns.

Some scholars make a rigid distinction between combatant and civilian to suggest that most civilians could and did take up arms. In doing so they deny the existence of civilian distinction entirely on the grounds that nobody could remain innocent in the most dire of situations. Kaeuper observes that

> Perhaps few nonclerical adult males were strictly noncombatants, since nearly all seem to have possessed at least rudimentary weapons and all might be summoned in an emergency to a rendezvous at a country crossroads or to rush to their positions atop the walls of an endangered town.[23]

To support his claim and deny the existence of one of the more obvious categories of civilian, he cites McNab's study of English churchmen pressed into military service to repel an invasion.[24] It would seem obvious that a civilian or non-combatant would be compelled to take up arms in self-defence, especially if threatened during the many incidents of devastation or attacks on cities that would threaten the livelihood or life of him or his family. But does this then mean that anybody, regardless of age, status, or experience, who was capable of picking up a weapon in self-defence, is then a combatant and licit target? Some scholars assume that any medieval thinker who advocates civilian immunity deliberately ignores the harsh reality of war to promote their idealistic position, and therefore probably received little attention from supposedly realistic thinkers in the Middle Ages.

---

[21] Allmand, 'The War and the Non-Combatant', pp. 164–65. See also McHardy, 'Some Reflections'.

[22] See for example Brinton's many sermons that touch on war, Bromyard's discussion of war in his preaching handbook, as well as Sherwood's discussion of the widespread use of Vegetius in sermons: Thomas Brinton, *Sermons, 1373–1389*, ed. by Mary Aquinas Devlin, Camden Third Series, 85–86, 2 vols (London: Royal Historical Society, 1954); John Bromyard, *Summa praedicantium*, ed. by Arcangelus Ritius, 2 vols (Venezia: Nicolinus, 1586), arranged alphabetically under *Bellum*; Sherwood, 'Studies in Uses of Vegetius', pp. 287–301.

[23] Kaeuper, *Medieval Chivalry*, p. 182.

[24] Bruce McNab, 'Obligations of the Church in English Society: Military Arrays of the Clergy, 1369–1418', in *Order and Innovation in the Middle Ages: Essays in Honor of Joseph R. Strayer*, ed. by William C. Jordan, Bruce McNab, and Teofilo F. Ruiz (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976), pp. 293–314, 516–22.

Medieval writers often cite the few occasions where civilians took up arms more actively, rather than in self-defence only, to more forcefully deny civilian distinction.[25] Some chroniclers praise civilians who take up arms to defend their land when the combatants, who were tasked with defending the area, failed to attack the invading army. Geoffrey le Baker repeatedly mentions that the people (*populares*) come out to defend their lands from raids. He describes such an attack by people, who would otherwise be civilians, on a Scottish force in 1340 and highlights the failure of the local military forces to defend their land: 'it was the people who bravely ran to oppose the returning Scots themselves, and recovered the captured plunder and killed many, and more than eighty of the magnates of the Scots they consigned to prisons for ransom'.[26] Such stories suggest that war was, indeed, conceived on a 'national' scale. It also implies that everyone had a duty to contribute, whether directly, in military defence, or indirectly, and therefore implies that civilians and non-combatants, when attacked, should have taken up arms and become combatants.

Combatants endorse the idea of the countryside and its civilian inhabitants as entirely hostile to invading armies in their writings on war.[27] Michael Northburgh, Edward III's counsellor (*c.* 1300–61), repeatedly describes civilians taking up arms to fight against the English campaign from Poissy to Calais in 1346:

> There came a great number of men-at-arms with the commons of the surrounding country and of Amiens, well armed. And the earl of Northampton and his men came out and attacked them so that there were killed more than 500 of our enemies [... and the English ...] killed a great multitude of the commons of France and of the city of Paris and others of the country, [who were] well armed, of the army of the king of France [... and then the English attacked ...] the commons of the country, who were assembled and well-armed, and they defeated and killed two hundred and more.[28]

---

[25] See also the problems of guerrilla warfare: Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars*, pp. 176–96.

[26] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, pp. 63, 70 (quote), 77, 80, 101, 115, 134: 'populares ipsis Scotis redeuntibus viriliter occurrentes predam captam abstulerunt et multos occiderunt, et plus quam octoginta de maioribus Scotorum redimendos carceribus manciparunt'.

[27] See also T. R. Smith, 'Willing Body, Willing Mind', p. 88.

[28] Northburgh's 1346 newsletter, interpolated in Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus*, pp. 367–69 (here 367–68): 'vindrent gentz darmes a graunt nombre od les comunes du pais et de Amyas, bien armez. Et le counte de Northamptone et ses gentz issirent sur eaux, issint qe fusrent mortz plus qe .d. de noz enemys', 'tuerent graunt plente de comunes de Fraunce et de la ville de Paris et aultre du pais, bien armez, del host de roy de Fraunce', 'issiront sour les comunes du pais, qe fusrent assemblez et bien armez, et lez desconfiteront et occirount .cc. et plus'.

These people, who came from the French countryside, are not shown to be merely defending their homes and farms against devastation, but are actively seeking out the English to fight against. Northburgh repeatedly describes these civilians as combatants who are 'well-armed' and includes them amongst the combatants-by-profession in every instance he mentions them, so that they are seen as legitimate enemies who are worthy to fight and kill. Most English sources describe the civilian victims of the sack of Caen as if they were combatants who willingly resisted the English force and were thus evenly matched and acceptable targets.[29]

Descriptions of civilian victims as being somehow culpable served propagandistic and rhetorical purposes. If such explanations and justifications are provided in a narrative, the otherwise responsible military leaders are then exonerated from any possible accusations of immorality. The simplest way to suggest that civilians were complicit was to depict them as rebelling against the English crown.[30] Indeed, in such cases the 'enemy' would be depicted as a whole and with the intent to act against England. However, such accusations of rebel status are not as common as might be expected, nor are they linked to any sort of revelling in attacks on civilians or destruction.[31] Indeed, the *Gesta Scotorum contra Anglicos*, a text almost entirely concerned with showing how the Scots owed fealty to the English, does not mention the English attacking Scottish civilians at all. These sources and their accusations of rebellion or treason function more in political terms, abstracted from military conduct, and are only rarely meant to resolve or justify any ethical problems.

As a whole, medieval sources that provide the justifications for dismissing the existence of civilians are uncommon and often have other reasons for doing so. They are not representative of descriptions of such situations in English narrative sources, especially chronicles. Newsletters and other writings by and for combatants are, with few exceptions, the only texts that clearly argue against civilian immunity.[32] Late medieval thinkers and writers of historical literature did not universally deny the existence of civilians. John Wingfield's letter, so often cited for clearly stating the concept of 'total war', is the only text to do so, and even then, it is not copied as widely as the other campaign letters and survives only interpolated in three manuscripts of Robert of Avesbury's chronicle.[33] If one views civilians as licit targets or active participants, one is

[29] See pp. 141–43 below.
[30] See pp. 67–75 above and 145–48 below.
[31] See for example Reading, *Chronicle*, pp. 99, 101.
[32] See T. R. Smith, 'Willing Body, Willing Mind'.
[33] The letter is not included in MS 4, the amalgamated text of Murimuth and Avesbury that precedes John of Reading's *Chronicle*, because it ends early.

encouraged to disregard the ethical problems in the common English conduct of war in the later Middle Ages, and instead focus on military movement and battle.[34] Indeed, this is precisely what military leaders' newsletters did in their promotion of their deeds in war.[35] This focus is obvious in many works on war in the fourteenth century that almost entirely ignore the civilian and non-combatant victims of war, and any related ethical problems.

2. CANON LAW AND CIVILIANS

Texts on canon law outline the concept of civilian distinction in high–late medieval England, contrary to the assumptions of scholars discussed in the previous section. These earlier texts are routinely overlooked, probably because it is assumed that later sources, such as Thomas Aquinas' *Summa theologica*, had superseded them as authorities.[36] Aquinas, drawing on Augustine, side-stepped the problem of civilan immunity and suggested that even the innocent could be killed in pursuit of a just war.[37] Scholars repeatedly point out that the *Pax* and *Treuga Dei* (Peace and Truce of God) movements had little effect on the conduct of war, and were thus unrealistic.[38] They presume that writers, especially those who should be the most reliable for providing seemingly realistic accounts of events, would ignore these earlier idealistic texts and ideas. I argue, however, that these texts' ideas were continually accepted by writers throughout high–late medieval England, both directly and through their use in later texts, and were promoted in historical literature through allusion and quotation.

The earliest calls for limitations on war in the Middle Ages were not abstract, but expressly meant to advocate immunity for the clergy and peasantry. The earliest written version of the *Pax Dei*, from the council of Charroux (989), proposes that certain groups should not be targeted, on pain of anathema.[39] The T*reuga Dei*, first discussed at the council of Elne (1027), takes a different approach and limits what days of the week wars can be fought legitimately, but

---

[34] Johnson, very reasonably, complains about how historians focus on battles rather than sieges, and therefore avoid moral issues: J. T. Johnson, *Just War*, p. 126. See also Hewitt, *Organization of War*, p. 111: scholars 'who exclude devastation from the study of medieval campaigns, or regard it only as a "custom", may deal adequately with the *art* of war. They cannot portray the *practice* of war' (Hewitt's emphasis).

[35] See Hewitt, *Organization of War*, pp. 110–11.

[36] See p. 67 above.

[37] For a concise summary of this approach to innocent victims see Richard Shelly Hartigan, 'Saint Augustine on War and Killing: The Problem of the Innocent', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 27 (1966), 195–204.

[38] See for example Contamine, *Guerre au Moyen Âge*, pp. 433–39. See also Keen, *Laws of War*, pp. 189–217; Russell, *Just War*, pp. 292–308 (esp. 303–08); Verbruggen, *Art of Warfare*, pp. 346–47.

[39] 'Concilium karrofense, 989', in *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, ed. by Giovanni Domenico Mansi, 54 vols (Venezia: Zatta, 1759–98), XIX, cols 89–90. See also Herbert E. J. Cowdrey, 'The Peace and the Truce of God in the Eleventh Century', *Past & Present*, 46 (1970), 42–67; Thomas Head, 'The Development of the Peace of God in Aquitaine, 970–1005', *Speculum*, 74 (1999), 656–86.

also lists people who should be immune from war.[40] These ideas were circulated and modified extensively until they took their standard form in the Second Lateran Council (1139), which itself drew on the ideas and phrasing of the councils of Clermont (1130) and Rheims (1131):

> We prescribe also that priests, clerics, monks, pilgrims and merchants, and rustics coming and going and working on the land, and animals with which they plough and carry seeds to the fields, and sheep, be free from danger at all times.[41]

The justifications for these groups of people being immune are not explicitly stated in the text, but they were certainly understood and accepted as such by readers. These early ideas, in the form of listed categories of civilians, were widely accepted and copied into other texts, with only minor changes, additions, and commentary, to act as comprehensive explanations of the ideas of distinction and immunity. They were included in the Third Lateran Council (1179) with the added category of 'lay brothers' (*conversi*), which was in turn copied almost word for word into the widely read *Decretals* (*c.* 1234) of Gregory IX.[42]

Gratian's *Decretum* (*c.* 1140–50), the most widely circulated version of these categories of civilians in the later Middle Ages, made important and influential contributions to ideas of immunity.[43] Drawing on the Second Lateran Council's canons, Gratian envisions several groups of civilians as distinct from combatants and therefore deserving of immunity:

> Let those who have preyed upon pilgrims, or suppliants of any saint, or clerics or monks, or women, or [in distinction to these] the unarmed poor, or [also] seized their goods or opposed them in evil, be struck by the fetter of anathema.[44]

---

[40] 'Synodus helenensis, 1027', in *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, ed. by Giovanni Domenico Mansi, 54 vols (Venezia: Zatta, 1759–98), XIX, cols 483–84.

[41] 'Lateran II, 1139', in *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. by Norman P. Tanner, 2 vols (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1990), I, 195–203 (here canon 11, p. 199): 'praecipimus etiam ut presbyteri, clerici, monachi, peregrini et mercatores et rustici euntes et redeuntes et in agricoltura persistentes, et animalia cum quibus aratur et semina portant ad agrum, et oves, omni tempore securi sint'.

[42] 'Lateran III, 1179', in *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. by Norman P. Tanner, 2 vols (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1990), I, 205–25 (here canon 22, p. 222): 'innovamus ut presbyteri monachi clerici conversi peregrini mercatores rustici euntes et redeuntes et in agricultura exsistentes et animalia quae semina portant ad agrum, congrua securitate laetentur, nec quisquam alicui novas pedagiorum exactiones sine auctoritate regum et principum consensu'; Gregory IX, 'Decretalium', in *Corpus iuris canonici*, ed. by Emil Friedberg and Aemilius Ludwig Richter, 2nd edn, 2 vols (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1959), II, 1.34.2 (col. 203): 'innovamus *autem*, ut presbyteri, (*clerici*), monachi, conversi, peregrini, mercatores, rustici, euntes et redeuntes, et in agricultura exsistentes, et animalia, quibus arant et *quae* semina portant ad agrum, congrua securitate laetentur. *Nec quisquam etc.*' (Gregory IX's emphasis).

[43] Gratian's *Decretum* survives in over 600 medieval manuscripts from throughout Europe, but no comprehensive list has yet been published: Anders Winroth, *The Making of Gratian's 'Decretum'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 10 n. 23. Winroth is currently preparing a manuscript list: Winroth 'Codices manuscripti operis Gratiani, repertorium breve', in *History of Medieval Canon Law X* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, forthcoming).

[44] Gratian, 'Decretum', in *Corpus iuris canonici*, ed. by Emil Friedberg and Aemilius Ludwig Richter, 2nd edn, 2 vols (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1959), I, pt 2 C. 24 q. 3 c. 25 (col. 997): 'illi, qui peregrinos, uel

Gratian here appears to explain the Second Lateran Council's broad category of 'peasants' as 'women' and 'the unarmed poor', and also assigns moral judgment by labelling these actions as 'evil' and advocating anathema as punishment, which was normally reserved for the most heinous crimes. It is surprising that women were not included in the earliest lists of civilian categories, as fighting in war was normally the preserve of men. Johnson argues that women were omitted from earlier lists because they were already protected by knights, according to repeated admonitions in chivalric literature.[45] However, these chivalric instructions are actually discreet indications that combatants, knights or otherwise, regularly mistreated women in war, otherwise there would have been no need to restate the ideal.[46]

The motivations for distinctions between combatants and civilians affect how attitudes towards war in the period are understood. As examined above, it is commonly assumed that medieval thinkers proposed immunity for those they viewed as innocent. This idea is vague enough to allow scholars to then argue for varying degrees of civilian complicity in war, as nobody could be completely innocent of contributing to war. However, Kinsella argues that these medieval attempts to separate people from war were motivated entirely by a selfish concern for ecclesiastical property.[47] If this were the case, then it would seem that ideas of civilian immunity were only superficial, not based on moral concerns, and medieval thinkers, so long as they were not affected by it, generally accepted attacks on civilians in war. The earliest councils, at Charroux in 989 and Elne in 1027, might support this argument because their basic categories of civilians are restricted to the peasantry and unarmed churchmen, of which the former might be seen as something like church property at the time of these councils. However, the later additions to the categories of civilians contradict Kinsella's and others' presumptions of these medieval writers' self-concern, as well as notions of 'innocence' as motivation for advocating

oratores cuiuscumque sancti, siue clericos, siue monachos, uel feminas, aut inermes pauperes depredati fuerint, uel bona eorum rapuerint, uel in malum eis obuiauerint, anathematis uinculo feriantur'. This was closely translated into continental French towards the end of the thirteenth century: Gratian, *Decretum: La Traduction en ancien français*, ed. by Leena Löfstedt, 5 vols (Helsinki: Societas Scientarum Fennica, 1991–2001), III, 201: 'cil qui roberont pelerins a quel saint que il aillent, ou clers ou moines ou fames ou povres desarmez, ou qui leur todront leur biens, ou quil mal leur feront, soient escommeniez, se il ne l'amandent dignement', also see V, 339 (note).

[45] James Turner Johnson, *Ideology, Reason, and the Limitation of War: Religious and Secular Concepts, 1200–1740* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), pp. 64–75; J. T. Johnson, *Just War*, pp. 131–50, 179–87. Although Kinsella's arguments against chivalry as a restraining force in war are well-founded, her discussion of women as fully capable of waging war is entirely without merit and relies heavily upon unfairly applying modern ideas upon medieval cultures: Kinsella, *Image before the Weapon*, pp. 41–49.

[46] See Kaeuper, *Medieval Chivalry*, p. 205.

[47] Kinsella, *Image before the Weapon*, pp. 37–40.

protection. This is especially obvious from the additions of 'merchants' by the Second Lateran Council and 'women' by Gratian, as they do not easily fit into these theories.

Medieval promotions of civilian distinction and immunity are motivated by a sense of compassion and a desire to better order humanity, even during war. Deuteronomy, one of the inspirations for medieval ideas of immunity, advocates killing in war only men and argues for the protection of women, children, and fruit-bearing trees.[48] It is implied that men are killed because they still pose a threat, but the other categories should be immune because they are the necessary supporters of society and life.[49] Medieval texts likewise show a concern for society, as their categories of civilians neatly fit into the groups of *oratores* (those who pray) and *laboratores* (those who work) in the classic medieval division of people into the 'Three Orders', along with combatants as *bellatores* (those who fight).[50] Honoré Bouvet drew upon these ideas in his *Arbre des batailles* because they are wholly overlooked in his main source, Giovanni da Legnano's *Tractatus de bello* (*c*. 1360).[51] Bouvet paraphrases the categories of civilians from the *Decretals*, but also gives explicit justifications for why they should be immune.[52] He argues that churchmen should be immune because 'according to the law it is written how the office of clergy is separated from all of war, because the service to which they belong makes them unsuitable to carry arms and any of the harness of worldly battle', and their duty was 'to maintain the sacred Christian faith and so absolve the sinners of their sins and administer to them the holy sacraments of salvation'.[53] He also declares that farmers should be immune because they 'till the earth, toil for everybody, and of their labour arises the lives of all people'.[54] Although Bouvet wrote in France

---

[48] *Bible*, Deuteronomy 20.13–20.14, 20.19: 'percuties omne quod in ea generis masculini est in ore gladii / absque mulieribus et infantibus iumentis et ceteris quae in civitate sunt omnem praedam exercitui divides et comedes de spoliis hostium tuorum quae Dominus Deus tuus dederit tibi', 'non succides arbores de quibus vesci potest', which are then shown in accounts of historical war in, for example, Numbers 31.8–31.11, I Maccabees 1.33–1.34, 5.13, 8.10.

[49] Kinsella rightly points out that the biblical rules for war do not suggest that this immunity grants freedom, but rather that they will all be, in practice, possessions of the conquerors. However, this would only be a fair criticism if the Old Testament, as a whole, envisions women and children as free and independent, which it does not: Kinsella, *Image before the Weapon*, pp. 30–31.

[50] See Georges Duby, *Les Trois ordres, ou l'imaginaire du féodalisme* (Paris: Gallimard, 1978).

[51] Giovanni da Legnano, *Tractatus de bello, de represaliis et de duello*, ed. by Thomas Erskine Holland (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1917). See also John P. McCall, 'The Writings of John of Legnano, with a List of Manuscripts', *Traditio*, 23 (1967), 415–37.

[52] Bouvet, '*Arbre des batailles*', ch. 167, 4.100 (p. 833): 'prelas, chappellains, dyacres, religieux et aussi convers, hermites, pelerins et toute gent de sainte Eglise doivent estre en seurté, et suppousé qu'il n'aye sauconduit, ne puet chaloir car droit leur a donné, aussi di je que boviers et tous gaigneurs et laboureurs de terrez avecques leur beufs quant il vont labourer et quant font ce meistier et quant il s'en reviennent sont asseur selon droit escript'. See also Raymond Kilgour, 'Honoré Bonet: A Fourteenth-Century Critic of Chivalry', *PMLA*, 50 (1935), 352–61 (here 355–56).

[53] Bouvet, '*Arbre des batailles*', ch. 164, 4.97 (p. 831): 'selon droit escript comment l'office de clergie est separéz de toute guerre, quar le service ou quel il sont les fait inhabiles de porter armes et tout harnois de bataille temporele', 'maintiennet la sainte foy crestienne et si absolvent les pecheurs de leur pechiés et leur administrent les sains sacremens de salvacion'.

[54] Bouvet, '*Arbre des batailles*', ch. 167, 4.100 (p. 833): 'labourent les terres travaillent pour tout le monde, et de leur

after Edward III's death, he encapsulates here how the tersely described ideas of canon law, widely circulated, were understood by writers throughout Europe.[55] He clearly argues that because civilians 'do not care to make war, or to do harm to anybody' they should be immune from war so that they can continue maintaining society.[56] As a whole, writers base their ideas of civilian distinction on such people being needed to sustain and improve society in their various roles, which thereby precludes them from actively participating in war.[57]

Fourteenth-century English writers based their categories of civilians more firmly on ideas of compassion than their predecessors. They show a clear empathy for people who have non-military roles in society, or have no desire to be involved in war for whatever reason. This concern is reflected in texts written in a variety of genres. In his *Philobiblon* (*c.* 1345) Richard de Bury, bishop of Durham, writes about books as if they were people and gives them character, desires, and emotions. In his text he spends an entire chapter lamenting the mistreatment of books in war and, after describing many books as seeking only to contribute to society and its understanding of the world, shows how they suffer unfairly in war. Bury then asks, 'who at such an accursed sacrifice [...] does not shudder? [...] where the voracious flame consumed so many thousands of innocents, in whose mouth was falsehood not found?'[58] The English canon lawyer and theologian William of Pagula, in both his *Epistola ad regem Edwardum III* (1331) and *Speculum regis Edwardi III* (*c.* 1331–32), complains about the common government practice of purveyance and its harm to the English people.[59] In his *Speculum* he presents its effects in terms

labour viennet les vivres de toutez gens'.

55 The 105 or 106 surviving MSS (13 of them in vernacular translations), as well as wholesale use by later writers, demonstrates the wide exposure, and perhaps acceptance, of Bouvet's ideas on war and, in particular, on civilians: Nicholas A. R. Wright, '*Tree of Battles*'; Philippe Contamine, 'Penser la guerre et la paix à la fin du XIV^{e} siècle: Honoré Bouvet (v. 1345–v. 1410)', *Quaestiones Medii Aevi novae*, 4 (1999), 3–19; Bouvet, '*Arbre des batailles*', pp. 54–59, 213–349 (MSS).

56 Bouvet, '*Arbre des batailles*', ch. 167, 4.100 (p. 833): 'n'ont cure de guerre faire ne d'ouffendre aultrui', also see ch. 169, 4.102 (pp. 834–35). See also pp. 38, 49 above.

57 Johnson argues that civilian categories were based on either function (people with professions other than war) or negative function (people physically unable to bear arms), but he does not consider their moral dimension in different genres or how they might be part of a larger overarching concept: James Turner Johnson, 'The Meaning of Non-Combatant Immunity in the Just War/Limited War Tradition', *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 39 (1971), 151–70 (esp. 154–56); J. T. Johnson, *Just War*, pp. 127, 132–33. See also Keen, *Laws of War*, pp. 189–90.

58 Bury's text was widely read, as is evident from the 46 surviving manuscripts found throughout Europe. Richard de Bury, *Philobiblon: Edizione critica*, ed. by Antonio Altamura (Napoli: Fausto Fiorentino, 1954), pp. 19–37 (MS list), 96–98 (here 97): 'quis tam infaustum holocaustum [...] non exhorreat? [...] ubi tot innocentium millia, in quorum ore non est inventum mendacium, flamma vorax consumpsit?'. See also Emily Steiner, 'Collecting, Violence, Literature: Richard of Bury's *Philobiblon* and the Forms of Literary History', in *The Medieval Literary: Beyond Form*, ed. by Robert J. Meyer-Lee and Catherine Sanok (Cambridge: Brewer, 2018), pp. 243–65 (here 258–61).

59 Pagula's two texts addressed to Edward III are sometimes seen as different recensions of the same text, with the *Speculum* as the 'B' recension. Although they both engage with the same problems of purveyance they are distinct in a number of ways: Leonard E. Boyle, 'William of Pagula and the *Speculum Regis Edwardi III*', *Mediaeval Studies*, 32 (1970), 329–36.

similar to devastation, in that the people were robbed of their goods and sometimes made destitute, but also borrows directly from Gregory IX's *Decretals* (which has until now gone unnoticed) to further suggest a condemnation on moral grounds.[60] Pagula wrote his later text in the form of a *speculum principis* (mirror for princes), which allows a more explicit consideration of ethical problems, through its use of impassioned example, than the didactic treatises of Gratian, Gregory IX, and others. The English scholar Walter de Milemete wrote his *De nobilitatibus, sapienciis, et prudenciis regum* (1326) in this genre as well and alludes to purveyance in his discussion of royal mercy with a similar strategy. However, in his discussion of war, based on Vegetius' *Epitoma rei militaris*, he makes no mention of civilians as victims, as it might then suggest that he thought Edward III was cruel and immoral.[61]

3. ENGLISH CIVILIANS

Contrary to common assumption, English chroniclers understand and draw upon ideas of civilian immunity often in their narratives of war. The absence of significant change or addition in the many later copies of, and commentaries on, conceptualisations of civilians from earlier works suggests that the ideas and justifications of Gratian and others remained valid and accepted by writers throughout the fourteenth century and later.[62] English writers often list categories of civilians, in a fashion very similar to the earlier texts described above, as terse allusions to the immorality of attacks on these people. They mostly invoke notions of civilian immunity when describing victims who are English, rather than those who are French or Scottish. This rhetorical strategy allows them to add moral judgments to attacks through allusion to these judicial and ethical treatises.

English chronicles consistently portray David II's 1346 invasion of England as immoral, most often through assertions that the English victims were civilians who should have been immune. The Scottish king's campaign is claimed to be incited either by letters from Philippe VI,

---

[60] William of Pagula, 'Speculum regis Edwardi III, ex codice bodleiano 624', in *De speculo regis Edwardi III: Seu tractatu quem de mala regni administratione*, ed. by Joseph Moisant (Paris: Picard, 1891), pp. 127–69 (here 3.5, p. 132): 'quia tempore guerre debent securitatem habere presbiteri, monachi, conversi mercatores, rustici euntes et redeuntes, in agriculturam existentes, et animalia que arant et semina portant ad agrum'. See also Ilana Krug, 'Purveyance and Peasants at the Beginning of the Hundred Years War: Maddicott Reexamined', in *The Hundred Years War (Part II): Different Vistas*, ed. by L. J. Andrew Villalon and Donald J. Kagay (Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 345–65.

[61] Walter de Milemete, 'A *speculum principis* for Edward III', ed. by Stanley J. Bird (unpublished master's thesis, University of North Carolina, 1975), chs 16, 17 (pp. 127–29, 131–57). See also Frédérique Lachaud, 'Un *miroir au prince* méconnu: Le *De nobilitatibus, sapienciis et prudenciis regum* de Walter Milemete (vers 1326–1327)', in *Guerre, pouvoir et noblesse au Moyen Âge: Mélanges en l'honneur de Philippe Contamine*, ed. by Jacques Paviot and Jacques Verger (Paris: Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 2000), pp. 401–10.

[62] Russell, *Just War*, p. 186.

by an expectation of there being no English resistance because Edward III was then besieging Calais, or a combination of these. Rogers and Buck assert that these different English accounts 'all carry the same meaning' and that the two enemy leaders were simply carrying out a clever plan, which, if it were true, would deter any further consideration of English rhetoric.[63] However, a close examination reveals that the many descriptions are in a variety of forms with different moral implications, most of which reveal a clear understanding of civilian distinction.

Most of the English accounts of the campaign claim that David II expected only various types of civilians to remain in England, and that they would be unable to offer any substantial resistance like the professional forces then fighting in France would. They emphasise his desire to attack these groups of civilians rather than combatants. These English accusations are largely based on a supposed 'copy of the letter that David the Bruce sent to Philippe de Valois, king of France', as it is described in rubric.[64] However, this text is in verse, not prose, and plays a propagandistic role as a popular poem on this major event.[65] In the supposed letter David exclaims to Philippe VI that:

> You lied to me, by truth,
> that in England there would be found
> only chaplains, ladies, and monks,
> and other women and shepherds.
> But there we found many men,
> and these defeated us [literally: put us to confusion].[66]

This description of David's intended campaign is meant to show him as immoral for wanting to conduct a campaign of devastation against only groups of people who were seen as civilians, and who should not, therefore, have been targeted.

The *Minorite Chronicle*, which was the basis for several northern chronicles, relies on the 'Letre Dauyd de Bruys' and other popular texts for many of its descriptions of Scottish misconduct, and allows for interesting comparisons. These later northern texts all place David II's belief that only civilians would remain in England immediately before the battle of Neville's

---

[63] Clifford J. Rogers and Mark C. Buck, 'The Scottish Invasion of 1346', *Northern History*, 34 (1998), 51–82 (here 54 n. 11).

[64] 'Letre Dauyd de Bruys', p. 112: 'la copie de letre qe Dauid le Bruys maunda a Philippe de Valoys roy de Fraunce'.

[65] See also the suspect nature of this claim at pp. 131–32 below.

[66] 'Letre Dauyd de Bruys', lines 37–42: 'vous me maundastes par verite, / qe en Engleterre ne serroit troue, / fors chapellayns dames [et] moignes / [et] autres femmes [et] berchers: / meys trouames illoeqes grant gent, / [et] ceo nous vynt en confusement'. David II complaining, albeit abstractly, to Philippe VI about having been misdirected by him to invade England is also used in Minot, *Poems*, 9.57–9.60.

Cross, rather than at the campaign's beginning, as most of the other sources do. The *Anonimalle Chronicle* gives its version of the Scottish king's speech, and its list of civilian categories, as:

> In England there are left only monks and canons, friars and priests, swineherds and shepherds, cobblers and skinners, because all of the knights are with their king [Edward III] across the sea [on campaign]. And be sure enough that they [who remain in England] dare not look me in the face, nor oppose me in battle in the open.[67]

The *Lanercost Chronicle* gives similar categories, but adds spiteful adjectives to David's speech: 'in England there are only miserable monks, dishonest priests, swineherds, cobblers and skinners'.[68] These categories, cobblers and skinners, are notably added by *Anonimalle* and *Lanercost* to the more traditional civilian categories in both historical literature and in earlier texts on canon law. People in these two professions routinely used hammers and knives in the course of their work and were therefore entirely capable of violent behaviour, both in and out of war.[69] Their mention here further suggests that immunity from war did not depend on the ability to wield weapons or do violent acts, but rather came from one's role in society and desire to not fight in war.

Many other English texts list categories of civilians as victims in their accounts of David II's speech. Some sources only list a few types of people immediately before the battle, such as the *Prophetic Latin Prose 'Brut'*s 'church men and merchants', which is slightly modified in the *Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut Continuation* and the *Short Anglo-Norman Prose Brut Continuation* as 'men of the Holy Church and shepherds'.[70] The Latin poem 'Tractatus belli apud Crucem' (*c.* 1346) elaborates with some peculiar categories, probably in order to fit the metre:

> Then said, as it is said, David to his magnates,
> 'there are not now in England warrior men,
> there are only clerics [and] carriers of water,

---

[67] *Anonimalle*, pp. 25–26: 'en Engleterre ne sount lessez fors moignes et chanouns, freres et prestres porchers et berchers, suers et pelters, mes entierment toute la chyvalery est ovesqe lour roi dela le mere. Et assetz su sure qils ne me oysent en la face regarder, ne en chaumpe en bataille encountrere'.

[68] *Lanercost*, p. 348: 'in Anglia nisi miseri monachi, improbi presbyteri, porcorum pastores, sutores et pelliparii'. *Durham LPB* notably does not mention civilians here, but is often more prosaic and terse than the other two chronicles based on their shared source. Other sources mention an exchange between Douglas and David II before the battle, sometimes implying civilians when they state that only combatants were supposed remain in England.

[69] See also Karl Steel, *How to Make a Human: Animals and Violence in the Middle Ages* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2011), p. 164.

[70] *Prophetic LPB*, fol. 38^{r}: 'viri eccleciastici [et] mercatores'; borrowed in *Long ANPB Continuation*, fol. 196^{v}: 'gentz de seinte Esglise [et] berchiers'; and *Short ANPB Continuation*, fol. 177^{v}: 'gents de seinte Esglise [et] berchers'.

therefore confessors will be made here into martyrs.'[71]

Most of the other sources, however, list categories of civilian victims at the beginning of the campaign, when they suggest that the French first proposed the idea of attacking England. The civilians are described by William Dene as 'priests and religious', by John of Reading as 'church men and farmers, women and children', or, perhaps most simply (and sarcastically), by Adam Murimuth as 'only womanly strength'.[72] 'Durham Feilde' includes a passage that is clearly based on these ideas, but creatively places the dialogue far later after the Scottish king is defeated and captured. In the poem Edward III asks David 'how like you my shepards [and] my millers, / my priests with shaven crownes?', to which the Scottish king replies, 'by my fayth, they are the sorest fighting men / that ever I mett on the ground'.[73] Murimuth and 'Durham Feilde' might have been intended to also suggest that the Scots were poor warriors, as they point out that even civilians entirely unsuited to war could defeat them. However, this was unlikely to have been the intended reading, as English sources do not describe their enemies as incapable so that they could instead praise victory over capable opponents, which is followed through all the other English sources.[74]

The use of civilian categories in these English texts is meant to allude to similar categories listed in texts by Gratian, Gregory IX, and others, to add an ethical meaning, especially in contrast to English motivation and conduct. Writers must have expected their audience to understand these references and their implied moral censure of the Scots for desiring to attack people who were proclaimed immune in their source material. If these lists of categories were merely incidental and not allusive, then their inclusion in these sources would be pointless and not function as rhetorical devices. It is clear, however, that they are used here and elsewhere in English writings to condemn attacks on civilians, even if a given writer's moral position is not explicitly stated, especially considering the great variety and changes to the categories. These representations of David II's motivation for invading England in 1346 were all meant to suggest that the Scots were far from keen to engage in battle, and instead wanted only to wreak devastation and attack civilians, in marked contrast to so many portrayals of English campaigns.[75]

---

[71] 'Tractatus belli apud Crucem', lines 101–04: 'tunc dixit, vt dicitur, Dauid ad maiores, / non sunt nunc in Anglia viri bellatores, / non sunt nisi clerici, aque portitores, / fient ergo martires isti confessores'.

[72] Dene, *Rochester*, fols 93^{r}–93^{v}: 'p[re]sb[ite]ri [et] religiosi'; Reading, *Chronicle*, p. 102: 'viris ecclesiasticis et aggrestibus, mulieribus ac parvulis'; Murimuth, *Continuatio*, p. 252: 'vi muliebri solummodo' (MS 5 variant).

[73] 'Durham Feilde', lines 229–32, also see 13–20, 137–40.

[74] See pp. 139–49 below.

[75] See pp. 102–06, 133–36, 161–62, 181 below.

Notions of civilian distinction and immunity are more clearly shown in the more bombastic English chronicles' criticisms of the Scottish invasion. The northern monastic *Lanercost Chronicle* is chief amongst these, and criticises the Scots not only by allusive lists of civilian categories like the other texts, but through elaborate moralising commentary. These colourfully critical descriptions have been denounced by scholars as merely 'crass alliterative effects and a couple of almost impenetrable puns', full of 'rhetorical excess', and of a 'useless character', owing to the writer's perceived patriotism and hatred of the Scots.[76] However, these all have a clear rhetorical purpose and show how one writer condemned actions that he judged to be immoral. The text provides many elaborate criticisms of David II and his army, and almost all of them mention civilians as victims of Scottish attacks. *Lanercost* makes heavy use of biblical allusion in its depiction of this campaign, but only does so sparingly elsewhere in its narrative.[77] These allusions are not mere decorations or unconscious 'formulaic building blocks', as Murray has shown is the case in some chronicle writing.[78] Equally, they should not be dismissed simply because writers employed them for rhetorical purposes.[79] In *Lanercost* they instead reveal how the writer saw events and people by allusion to biblical episodes and characters, in much the same fashion as sermons, which suggests the writer's primary intention was moral instruction.

Throughout *Lanercost*'s portrayal of this Scottish invasion, David II and the Scots are associated with the Devil. Pride, Lucifer's sin, and the desire for more lands, are repeatedly said to inspire the invasion and contribute to its ultimate failure.[80] The Scottish king is said to be 'deceived by a diabolical spirit, like another Ahab, [and led] all strong men of Scotland' against England.[81] The Scots are also sometimes labelled as 'the sons of iniquity' and 'the sons of cursed Belial'.[82] Although David is clearly associated with and compared to the Devil, he is not shown

---

[76] Offler, 'Note on the Northern Franciscan Chronicle', pp. 52, 53; *Anonimalle*, p. xxvii.

[77] Both the edition and translation of *Lanercost* fail to identify or analyse these clear and deliberate allusions, although Gransden mentions a few in passing: *Lanercost*, pp. 344 (comparison to Ahab), 345 (Pharoah), 345 (Herod), 346 (Nathan), 347 (Antiochus), 347 (Mattathias and his five sons), 348 (Cain and Abel), 348 (Absolom), 349 (Nebuchadnezzar), 349 (Aman and Achitophel), 350 (Peter), 350 (Judas Maccabeus); Gransden, *Historical Writing*, II, 117.

[78] Alan V. Murray, 'Biblical Quotations and Formulaic Language in the *Chronicle* of William of Tyre', in *Deeds Done beyond the Sea: Essays on William of Tyre, Cyprus and the Military Orders Presented to Peter Edbury*, ed. by Susan B. Edgington and Helen J. Nicholson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2014), pp. 25–34 (here 31).

[79] Macdonald recognises how English writers use these sorts of descriptions to criticise the Scots but casually dismisses them as rhetoric: Macdonald, 'Two Kinds of War?', p. 205.

[80] *Lanercost*, pp. 345, 347 (pride and desire for more lands), 348, 349 (direct comparison to the Devil's pride). See also Augustine of Hippo, *De civitate Dei*, ed. by Bernard Dombart and Alphonsus Kalb, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 47–48, 2 vols (Turnhout: Brepols, 1955), bks 12, 14 (pp. 355–85, 414–52).

[81] *Lanercost*, p. 344: 'diabolico spiritu deceptus ut alter Achab, omnes valentes de Scotia [blank spot in MS, verb missing]'. See also *Bible*, I Kings 21 (Ahab's unjust seizure of Naboth's vineyard [i.e. land] after having him killed).

[82] *Lanercost*, p. 344: 'filii iniquitatis', 'filii Belial maledicti'.

to be him incarnate. Rather, he works with him, when the Scots 'were moved by pride and led by the Devil', and 'David with the Devil is their leader'.[83] He is described as plotting destruction and acting against God: 'the work in the gardens of God he thus impeded, alas!'[84]

The Scots are not portrayed by *Lanercost* as the instruments of divine judgement, as a sort of *flagellum Dei* (scourge of God), divinely ordained to punish English sins, and thereby beyond censure.[85] Instead, the chronicle condemns them for attacks on churches and other civilians of England. In the chronicle's only interpolated lines of verse during the reign of Edward III, David II is described as:

> Not, however, that David whom Christ sanctified,
> but he was that David who dishonoured Christ,
> which he proved well when he defecated upon the altar.
> But he sinned more greatly when he burned to ash sacred temples.[86]

Maxwell argues that the writer includes these lines of verse, especially the mention of David's defecation, only out of 'monkish spite against everything Scottish'.[87] This passage draws on the earlier criticisms of David, often used to delegitimise the Scottish king in his youth.[88] *Lanercost*, however, uses this story expressly to criticise David for attacking people and places that should be immune. The Calais Anonymous' 'Neville's Cross' gives a greatly elaborated (and scatological) version of this story, wherein both the font and altar are defiled, as a way to elaborate on the Scottish misconduct that the poet complains about shortly before this point in his text.[89] In *Lanercost* this is one of many contrasts between David II's actions with that of his biblical namesake, King David of the Israelites, and thereby paints him as all the less ethical or praiseworthy by comparison.[90] In this campaign the writer repeatedly labels the Scottish king as 'David the defecator' to remind the reader of his persistently wicked character.[91]

---

[83] *Lanercost*, pp. 345, 346: 'moti superbia et ducti diabolo', 'David cum diabolo ductor est eorum', also see p. 349.
[84] *Lanercost*, p. 347: 'plantationes Deo fieri sic, proh dolor! impedivit'.
[85] See pp. 37–39 above.
[86] *Lanercost*, p. 346: 'non tamen ille David quem Christus sanctificavit, / sed erat ille David qui Christum inhonoravit, / quod bene probavit cum super altare cacavit. / Sed plus peccavit quando sacra templa cremavit'.
[87] Maxwell does not analyse this story because he thinks it scurrilous and includes in a footnote the first 10 lines from the Calais Anonymous' poem and moralises that it 'will not bear translation, and [the rest] I do not care to quote even in the original Latin', and Wright cites this episode as a 'disgraceful anecdote of [David II's] infancy' in his index: *Chronicle of Lanercost*, trans. by Maxwell, p. 333 n. 1; Thomas Wright, ed., *Political Poems and Songs Relating to English History, Composed during the Period from the Accession of Edw. III to that of Ric. III*, RS, 14, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1859–61), II, 346 (under 'Bruce').
[88] See pp. 43–46 above.
[89] Calais Anonymous, 'Durham', esp. lines 85–108.
[90] For example, the final line's mention of David II burning temples contrasts with King David's acquisition of the site where Solomon's Temple will be built: *Bible*, I Chronicles 21.19–21.26.
[91] *Lanercost*, pp. 346, 349: 'David cacator', 'ille David de quo in foro firmabant quod ejus fetor et faex altare fedavit'.

Scottish devastation in this campaign is shown in stark, brutal terms. Unlike the text's descriptions of earlier campaigns on the Anglo-Scottish border, where the writer abstracts the reality of an entire campaign's daily raids into short, formulaic, and suffering-free descriptions, *Lanercost* describes attacks on civilians ten times and in considerable detail.[92] Only once does he mention a strategic purpose behind these attacks, but not as any sort of pragmatic justification on the grounds of military necessity or even mercy. Instead the writer shows David II sparing some towns only so that his forces can prey upon them later in the campaign for their own provisions and housing.[93]

Throughout this campaign *Lanercost* notes that various categories of civilians should be exempt from attack. The ethical stance against attacks on churches and monasteries is recalled twice, in similar language, one shortly after the other:

> [The Scots] therefore coming to Lanercost Priory, where the canons dwell, venerable men and devoted to the Lord, there entered with pride into the sanctuary, threw out the vessels from the temple, seized the treasury, broke the doors, took the jewellery, reducing all that they could into nothingness.[94]

After labelling the perpetrators as 'polluted men', the writer immediately describes the Scots' attack on Hexham Priory:

> David, on that occasion and on others, totally stripped bare the aforesaid priory, which must be deplored. For the forces of the Scots lay there for three whole days. David was glad to burn up, destroy, and persecute the church of God.[95]

---

[92] *Lanercost*, pp. 345–46 (Liddel Peel sacked), 346 (Lanercost Priory sacked), 346 (Hexham Priory sacked), 346 (devastation from Hexham to Ebchester), 346–47 (pillage around Beaurepair Manor), 346–47 (biblical comparison, elaboration, burning churches), 347 (David II threatens London, etc.), 347 (personalised, emotive suffering), 348 (two descriptions of raiding before the battle of Neville's Cross). Some of these criticms, in far less colourful forms, are also in *Anonimalle*, pp. 23–28.

[93] *Lanercost*, p. 346; similarly in *Anonimalle*, p. 143.

[94] *Lanercost*, p. 346: 'venerunt igitur ad prioratum de Lanercost, ubi manent canonici, viri venerabiles et Domino devoti, ibi intraverunt cum superbia in sanctificationem, vasa templi projecerunt, thesauros rapuerunt, ostia fregerunt, jocalia ceperunt, omnia quae poterant in nihilum redigerunt'. Offler claims much of this is borrowed from Maccabees, but these are rather the 'formulaic building blocks' described by Murray: Offler, 'Note on the Northern Franciscan Chronicle', pp. 55–56; *Bible*, I Maccabees 1.23: 'et intravit in sanctificationem cum superbia et accepit altare aureum et candelabrum luminis et universa vasa eius et mensam propositionis et libatoria et fialas et mortariola aurea et velum et coronas et ornamentum aureum quod in facie templi erat et comminuit omnia'; A. V. Murray, 'Biblical Quotations and Formulaic Language'.

[95] *Lanercost*, p. 346: 'viri coinquinati', 'praedictum prioratum David, quod dolendum est, illa vice et alias totaliter denudabat. Exercitus nam Scoticani per tres dies naturales ibidem jacebant. David Dei ecclesiam comburere, destruere et persequi gaudebat'.

These two passages are far more elaborate than the equivalent versions in the *Anonimalle Chronicle*, with which it shares the *Minorite Chronicle* as a source, and also include explicit moralising passages with biblical allusions.[96] The writer's stress on the intentional nature of both attacks, and their targets as priories and other people or things that should be immune, portrays these acts as contravening expected conduct.

Lanercost blames David II personally, rather than all the Scots, for the atrocities his men commit and thereby prevents any reduction of culpability. Toward the end of the campaign, David's victims are compared to the biblical story of the poor man's sheep stolen by the rich man: 'so therefore David seized the sheep of the pauper when he himself possessed sheep and oxen to satisfy his desire'.[97] His jealous motivations are then compared to Antiochus' ambitions for conquest, and David,

> Believing himself to have the lesser of two kingdoms, suddenly charged upon [English] towns and hamlets, beat the people with blows, captured spoils, destroyed homes, led off wives captive, seized children and cattle, and, which is worst, ordered churches to be burned to ash.[98]

All the verbs in this description are active third-person singular, and the enslavement of women and children, universally understood as immoral, is explicitly stated.[99] These are clearly intended to mark these actions as unethical and David as their direct author.

The text clearly makes the victims of these attacks out to be civilians by showing them as innocent and illustrating, in detail, their emotive suffering. *Lanercost* begins a lengthy lament for the English victims with the proclamation that 'a voice was heard in Rama, and it did not wish to be consoled'.[100] The writer here alludes to the biblical Massacre of the Innocents, in

---

[96] *Anonimalle*, pp. 142, 143: 'le dit roi et Lescocez al priorye de Lanercoste repairerent et illoeqes les mesouns et les uses de seyntuarie debriserent, les ornementz de seinte Esglise trusserent et touz lour iewes deporterent', 'Lescocez devers la priorie de Hexham lour chemyn pristerent et illoeqes par .iii. iours demurrerent et graunt mal et destructioun de lour biens et de lour chateux firent'.

[97] This is also an allegory that censures the biblical King David for sleeping with Bathsheba: *Lanercost*, pp. 346–47: 'sic igitur rapuit David ovem pauperis cum ipsemet ad libitum oves et boves plurimos possidebat'; *Bible*, II Samuel 12.2, 12.4: 'dives habebat oves et boves plurimos valde', 'tulit ovem viri pauperis', also see 12.3 (details of pauper's poverty and suffering).

[98] *Lanercost*, p. 347: 'ut alter Antiochus, ad minus duo regna credens se habere, super villas et viculas repente irruit, populum plaga percussit, spolia accepit, domos destruxit, mulieres captivas duxit, natos et pecora possedit, et, quod plus est, ecclesias cremari praecepit'.

[99] Slavery was no longer practiced in Britain by the thirteenth century: John Gillingham, 'Conquering the Barbarians: War and Chivalry in Twelfth-Century Britain', *Haskins Society Journal*, 4 (1992), 67–84; Strickland, *War and Chivalry*, pp. 292–328. See also MacInnes, *Scotland's Second War*, pp. 209–10.

[100] Rama is also the birthplace of Samuel, who anoints King David. Italic text shared: *Lanercost*, p. 347: '*vox in Rama audita est, et noluit consolari*'; *Bible*, Matthew 2.18: '*vox in Rama audita est* ploratus et ululatus multus Rachel plorans filios suos *et noluit consolari* quia non sunt', also see I Samuel 1.20, 16.13. This biblical passage is similarly used in the related poem 'Tractatus belli apud Crucem', line 49: 'vox in Rama sonuit fletus et ploratus'.

which Herod orders all boys up to two years old to be killed in and around Bethlehem, to emphasise the deserved immunity of the English victims.[101] The chronicle then presents the suffering victims as individuals who are in no way involved in war:

> The scourges of the lamentable weak, the groaning of the younger people, the sicknesses of the mourning, the lamentation and wailing of all the people can hardly be reckoned by any alive [...] Truly, each husband took up lamentation, and those who sat in the bonds of marriage mourned without cheer, young and old, virgins and widows, cried aloud publicly. It is sad to hear, little children and orphans wailing in the streets, fainting from weeping.[102]

These are not faceless groups being attacked (such as 'the English') or anonymous categories of people (such as 'priests and farmers'), but individual civilians, with their own feelings and emotions, who have no desire to be involved in war.[103] Nowhere else in *Lanercost*'s coverage of Edward III's reign does such heart-rending description feature, and here it is clearly meant to provoke sympathy from the audience. Immediately after this account the writer shows William Zouche acting as the audience is expected to, 'seeing, therefore, the great wailing of the people, equally with the crying of the people', he is inspired to raise and lead an army against the invaders to stop these crimes.[104] These descriptions show that the writer of *Lanercost* considers devastation and attacks on civilians to be immoral precisely because these victims should not be involved in war and should have immunity from any attack.

Few sources describe devastation and attacks on civilians, in this campaign or elsewhere, in a fashion as elaborately critical as *Lanercost*, but they still take a moral position. Even if they do not explicitly mention civilians, writers allude to them as victims by mentioning that the Scots did not expect to face any combatants or other opposition, and imply that they would only encounter and attack civilians.[105] Many others sources list Scottish depredations,

---

[101] The Massacre of the Innocents is similarly used in visual art to criticise soldiers who attack civilians: *Bible*, Matthew 2.16; Allmand, 'Some Writers', p. 176. See also Laura Jacobus, 'Motherhood and Massacre: The Massacre of the Innocents in Late Medieval Art and Drama', in *The Massacre in History*, ed. by Mark Levene and Penny Roberts (Providence: Berghahn Books, 1999), pp. 39–54.

[102] Note also the heavy use of alliteration in this passage: *Lanercost*, p. 347: 'flagella flebilium debilium, juniorum gemitus, lugentium langores, totius plebiculae planctus et ploratus, ab aliquo vivente vix possunt computari [...] omnis vero maritus sumpsit lamentum, et qui sedebant in thoro maritali illaeti luxerunt, juvenes et senes, virgines et viduae, publice ploraverunt. Dolor est audire, parvuli et pupilli plangentes in plateis prae lachrymis defecerunt'.

[103] On the different emotive values of the individual versus large numbers for expressing the horrors of war see Mary A. Favret, 'A Feeling for Numbers: Representing the Scale of the War Dead', in *War and Literature*, ed. by Laura Ashe and Ian Patterson (Woodbridge: Brewer, 2014), pp. 185–204.

[104] *Lanercost*, p. 347: 'videns ergo episcopus Eboracensis plurimum populi planctum pariter cum plebis ploratu'.

[105] Dene, *Rochester*, fol. 93^{v}; Minot, *Poems*, 9.12, 9.18, 9.61–9.62; Murimuth, *Continuatio*, p. 218; *Canterbury Chronicle*, ch. 16 (p. 12); borrowed in *Gesta Scotorum*, MS 2 fol. 279^{v}.

mentioning only behaviour that might be viewed as immoral because of the implied victims, such as the *Eulogium historiarum*'s 'they invaded: robbing, killing, laying waste' and the *Canterbury Chronicle*'s 'they committed depredations, murders, and burning, and many evils'.[106] Several other English sources include some form of a list of attacks to narrate the daily depredations of the Scots.[107]

Only a few English texts besides *Lanercost* explicitly accuse the Scots of committing atrocities. John of Tynemouth indirectly draws attention to the civilian victims by explicitly mentioning that the Scots' loot was taken from English people: 'they drove off booty [...] and came up to Durham carrying the not-moderate possessions of the locals'.[108] The *Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut Continuation* describes how the Scottish '*chevauchée* of war robbed and plundered all the march and the country of the north until they came to Durham' and then waited until

> The people of the country came and paid ransoms so that their lands and their houses would not be put to fire, and they [the Scots] took such ransoms willingly, for their intention was to hold the area to ransom at their arrival and [then] to [put it into] the hands of arsonists at their return [to Scotland].[109]

---

[106] *Eulogium*, 5.182 (III, 212): 'intraverunt, spoliando, occidendo, depopulando'; *Canterbury Chronicle*, ch. 16 (p. 12): 'depredaciones, homicidia et incendia ac multa mala fecerunt'; borrowed in *Gesta Scotorum*, MS 2 fol. 279^{v}: 'depredaco[n]nes, homicidia [et] incendia, [et] mala multa fec[er]ant'.

[107] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 76 (II, 126, 126, 127, 127): 'venir gaster et exillier Angleterre', 'debvoit entrer en Angleterre à grande poissance, et ardoir, et exillier tout', 'si ardirent et gasterrent tout jusques à la riviere de Thyen', 'ilz virent que les Escots ardoient tout par devers le Neuf Chastel'; Gray, *Scalacronica*, p. 137: 'there did much hurte' (Leland's abstract); Minot, *Poems*, 9.24, 9.26: 'þai robbed and þai reued | and held þat þai hent', 'for couaitise of cataile | þo schrewes war schent'; Murimuth, *Continuatio*, p. 218: 'depraedando, occidendo et comburendo, pervenit'; *Pipewell*, fol. 15^{r}: 'p[at]riam deuastantes'; Reading, *Chronicle*, p. 102: 'praedis ac rapinis'.

[108] Tynemouth, *Historia*, MS 2.3, fol. 247^{r}: 'p[re]das egit [...] [et] dampna no[n] modica i[n]colis i[n]fere[n]do, usq[ue] Dunelmu[m] deuenit', not in edn; borrowed in *Kirkstall*, fols 83^{v}–84^{r}: 'p[re]das egit [...] et da[m]pna no[n] modica i[n]colis i[n]ferrendo vsq[ue] Duneluna[m]'.

[109] *Long ANPB Continuation*, fol. 196^{v}: 'chiuacha de guerre tote la marche [et] le pais del north derobbant [et] proiant tanqil vient a Duresme', 'les gentz du pais viendrunt [et] fierunt raunsou[n] p[ur] ceo q[e] lo[ur] t[er]res [et] lo[ur] manoirs ne dussent estre ars [et] ils pristrent tiels raunsons voluntiers qar lo[ur] p[ur]pos fuist de rendre la pais a lo[ur] entrer [et] ia le meyns de les ardoir a lour retourner'; similar to *Short ANPB Continuation*, fols 176^{v}, 176^{v}–177^{r}: 'ardant [et] destruant la pais', 'les gents de celle pais vindrent a ly [et] firent fin oue ly p[ur] sauuer lo[ur] t[er]res [et] tieus fins voluntrment il enp[ri]st kar il uia en so[un] reuenue gastier celle pais nient contresteant celle fin come il conustrent ap[re]s de lo[ur] bouche deineisne'; both of which are based on *Prophetic LPB*, fols 37^{r}, 37^{r}–37^{v}: 'eq[ui]tando modo guerre patria[m] deuastando ardendo [et] spoliando quousq[ue] deuenerunt ad Durh[a]m', 'et gentes patrie illius ad eum accesserunt [et] cu[m] eo fine[m] fecerunt ut nec terras nec maneria eo[rum] aliq[uo] modo destrueret huiusmodi, aute[m] fines libe[n]t[er] acceptauit. Nam ip[s]e [et] sui p[ro]posuerunt in redeundo tota[m] patria[m] deuastar[e] [et] cremare'. See also *Lanercost*'s assertion that David II spared some towns only so that he could use them for provisions in winter, above, and Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 87 (Scottish ransom of monks of St Cuthbert near Durham).

This duplicitous behaviour, with the aim to completely rob the people, burn everything else, and in the process kill many civilians, is described as an 'evil intention'.[110] Their actions are made all the worse for relying on breaking agreements with the English people.[111] The text concludes its narrative of the Scottish invasion with the execution of John Graham (d. 1347), earl of Menteith, and justifies it by stating that this Scot and others had 'burned and robbed the country and the people [of England], like traitors and thieves'.[112]

Newsletters sent out before and after the battle of Neville's Cross are exceptionally critical and harsh. They utilise many of the rhetorical strategies of chroniclers and poets, described above, and focus on civilian victims. In the letter of the English clerk Thomas Sampson to his friends after the battle, David II is described as having, 'on account of this wicked deed, became so proud, that by his intimidation and arrogance he overran the land' and the Scots 'burned, destroyed, seized, robbed, and did all the evil and all the shame that they could' when passing through several regions.[113] Although Sampson does not list the victims of these attacks, they are clearly alluded to by the many verbs used, as well as the explicit judgment of them as 'evil'. The letter of John Fossor (*c.* 1283–1374), prior of Durham, to Thomas Hatfield describes the Scots' behaviour before the battle in much greater critical detail:

> They invaded with hostility, devastated the inhabitants and their [possessions] by deadly swords and fires through twenty miles and more in length and as many in breadth. They cruelly butchered or took captive people of either sex, [whenever] they could seize them. In a few places through which they made passage they left nothing at all unburnt which was burnable.[114]

In another letter to Hatfield, after the English victory, Fossor abridges this passage from his earlier letter, but maintains the markers of atrocity to describe Scottish actions: 'they cruelly devastated all around by fires and deadly swords [the lands] through which they made passage,

---

[110] *Long ANPB Continuation*, fol. 196^{v}: 'malueys p[ur]pos'; similar to *Short ANPB Continuation*, fol. 177^{r}: 'malice'.

[111] See p. 190 below.

[112] *Long ANPB Continuation*, fol. 197^{v}: 'ardantz [et] derobbantz le pais [et] le poeple come treitours [et] larouns'. See also the rhetoric of Menteith's execution at pp. 199–200 below.

[113] Thomas Samson, 'Lettre aux amys et compaignouns (1346)', in Jean Froissart, *Oeuvres*, ed. by Joseph Kervyn de Lettenhove, 25 vols (Bruxelles: Devaux, 1867–77), V, 489–92 (here 490): 'le dit David de tiel malfait tant se orgoilla qe par ses menaces et bobances trespassa le pays [...] ardant, destruant, preiant, derobeant et fesant tut le male et tut le hount q'ils poaient'.

[114] John Fossor, 'Letter to Thomas Hatfield, Bishop of Durham, July 1346', in *Historical Papers and Letters from the Northern Registers*, ed. by James Raine, RS, 61 (London: Longman, 1873), pp. 385–86 (here 386): 'hostiliter invaserunt, ipsas et earum incolas feralibus gladiis et incendiis per .xx. miliaria et amplius in longitudine et totidem in latitudine devastarunt, utriusque sexus homines, quos apprehendere poterant, vel trucidarunt crudeliter, vel etiam captivarunt. Nonnullis locis per quae fecerunt transitum nihil penitus incombustum, quod erat combustibile, relinquentes'.

scarcely showing consideration for sex or age' when attacking people, which he then describes as 'evils'.[115] In both letters he criticises the Scots for destroying the land but also for cruelly killing and capturing both men and women, neither of whom are shown to be involved in war.

It is clear that English writers understood the concept of civilian distinction. Civilians were viewed as deserving immunity because they were key to supporting society and had no role in warfare. English writers use this idea of the civilian in their texts to condemn the enemy for attacking their people. The seemingly overly rhetorical or colourful descriptions should not be disregarded as lacking any sort of ethical charge. Instead, these are used by writers as allusions to the legal texts that prescribe the immunity of these people, which readers would be familiar with in some form, to better comment on specific behaviour.

4. ENEMY CIVILIANS

English criticisms of Scottish attacks on civilians and property that they portray as deserving immunity are not simply manifestations of anti-Scottish attitudes. They show a widely held conceptualisation of civilian distinction and immunity. These attitudes are expressed differently in English representations of their own devastation and attacks on enemy civilians. The reality, that all forces routinely performed such attacks, is rarely represented realistically or evenly. I argue below that the English representation of devastation, when performed by their forces, are deliberately terse and devoid of details or victims so that ethical problems can be minimised.[116]

Edward of Woodstock's 1356 Gascony campaign was highly destructive and violent, but its attacks on civilians are consistently minimised.[117] Most accounts present the widespread devastation of the campaign in only terse phrases. The *St Albans A Continuation* to Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon* describes it as '[the English] devastate and set on fire towns and the country', the *Peterborough Chronicle* alludes to devastation by stating that 'the lord prince rode upon France', and John of Reading states that the campaign 'burns many towns'.[118] Other English chronicles

---

[115] John Fossor, 'Letter to Thomas Hatfield, Bishop of Durham, October 1346', in *Historical Papers and Letters from the Northern Registers*, ed. by James Raine, RS, 61 (London: Longman, 1873), pp. 387–89 (here 387): 'eas incendiis et feralibus gladiis circumquaque, per quas fecerunt transitum, crudeliter devastarunt, vix parcentes sexui aut aetati [...] mala'.

[116] MacInnes notes this biased style of representation but does not investigate it further: MacInnes, *Scotland's Second War*, p. 209.

[117] For the campaign's destruction in reality see Hewitt, *Black Prince's Expedition*, pp. 100–12; C. J. Rogers, 'By Fire and Sword'.

[118] Higden, *Polychronicon SAA Continuation*, MS 1 fol. 295^{r}: 'villas cum patria deuastans et incendens'; *Peterborough*, p. 170: 'dominus princeps equitavit super Franciam' (under 1357 due to incorrect marginal years); Reading, *Chronicle*, p. 123: 'plures villas incendit'.

offer similarly formulaic descriptions, but add commentary to suggest that the victims were rebels, which minimises the ethical problems of attacking an inherently culpable category of people. The *Short Anglo-Norman Prose Brut Continuation* describes how the English 'rode towards France', and in the process 'warred on the rebels and wasted several towns'.[119] Higden's *Polychronicon* similarly states that the English 'took, demolished, preyed upon, and set on fire [several places] and certain other [cities] that rebelled against them'.[120] The *Kirkstall Abbey Long Chronicle* describes how the lands 'are unjustly rebelling against' the English, who, in response, 'hostilely ravaged' and 'deformed much by setting on fire'.[121] All of these formulaic descriptions, of what were in reality daily attacks on civilians, limit themselves to only vague mentions of 'devastation' or 'fire', without any allusion to acts that were inherently immoral, such as 'murder' or 'rape', as they often do when describing Scottish attacks on England.

Only two English texts offer more extensive narratives of this campaign's devastation, but these are limited to mostly formulaic descriptions that are repeated several times. The *Anonimalle Chronicle* describes English actions in formulaic terms, with little deviation from the standard terse phrasing in each instance: 'they burned and devastated', 'burned and destroyed', 'burned and destroyed', 'burned and wasted', and 'burned and destroyed'.[122] Jean le Bel provides a similar sort of repetition: 'burned and ravaged [the lands of] their enemies', 'burned and robbed everything', and 'burned and wasted everything'.[123] Later in his description of English movements he describes Edward of Woodstock's attempts to approach the French and, then, to take Tours. After finding his forces are unable to take the city 'they burned several houses in the suburbs and turned themselves to return by the way of Poitou, and always they burned and ravaged', without giving any sort of explanation.[124] Although these sources repeatedly mention devastation they consciously minimise any particular actions or victims that might highlight the ethically problematic nature of devastation.

---

[119] *Short ANPB Continuation*, fol. 179^{v}: 'chiuachant deuers Fraunce ils guerrient les rebelles [et] gasterent pluso[ur]s villes'.

[120] Higden, *Polychronicon A Continuation*, 7.56 (p. 422): '[et] quasdam alias sibi rebelles, cepit, diruit, depraedavit [et] incendit'.

[121] *Kirkstall*, fol. 86^{v}: 'sibi i[n]iuste rebella[n]te[m] hostilit[er] dep[o]p[u]lauit', 'i[n]cendio plu[r]i[mu]m deformauit'.

[122] *Anonimalle*, pp. 35, 35, 36, 36, 36: 'ardaunt et degastaunt', 'ardaunt et destruyaunt', 'ardaunt et destruiaunt', 'ardaunt et gastaunt', 'ardaunt et destruiaunt'.

[123] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 94 (II, 229): 'ardant et exillant leurs anemis', 'ardirent et roberent tout', 'ardirent et wasterrent tout'.

[124] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 94 (II, 232): 'ardirent aucunes maisons des fausbours et se mirent au retour par devers Poytou, toudis ardant et exillant'.

The accounts of the *Anonimalle Chronicle* and Jean le Bel, with their repeated mentions of devastation, do not attempt to criticise or praise English behaviour by showing its scale through repetition. Instead, they appear to be influenced by the general form of campaign journals. The few surviving diaries or journals of English campaigns conducted during Edward III's reign present the daily activities and movement of English armies, or at least their resting spots.[125] These descriptions are terse and focus on details, such as the places the army went through, and do not offer any sort of elaborate narrative or focus on the victims of attacks. Writers of historical literature often draw upon these narrative documents for details, such as locations and numbers, but rarely attempt to revise them into more straightforward narratives, with added cause and motivation but without the constant repetition necessary to such journals.

The writer of the *Eulogium historiarum* interpolates into his chronicle a journal of Edward of Woodstock's 1356 campaign, but significantly revises its content to minimise the victims of English acts.[126] Unlike the other surviving journals, the *Eulogium*'s text has no day-to-day descriptions in the standard formulaic fashion, although it retains its structure of listing the day and the army's movement through the countryside. The narrative, however, occasionally hints at the common practice of devastation and destruction when it mentions that the town of Belac was 'saved from being set on fire', as if this were uncharacteristic of normal conduct and therefore worth noting.[127] The journal, as revised in *Eulogium*, focuses more on the English abstaining from thoughtless destruction, such as when it mentions that an abbey, and later a church, both actively resist the English but are spared when they surrender.[128] In a brief passage of the text three separate instances of English destruction are described, with varying degrees of justification provided:

> The Captal de Buch [Jean III de Grailly, d. 1376] despoiled all that country. There was a noble's abbey that was very burned-up. On the same day lord John Chandos [*c.* 1320–69] and lord James Audley [*c.* 1318–69] put the town of

[125] See p. 19 n. 41 above.

[126] *Eulogium*, 5.185 (III, 215–23).

[127] *Eulogium*, 5.185 (III, 217): 'venit princeps ad villam de Belelak' quae fuit comitissae de Penbroke, pro cujus amore villa fuit salvata ab incendio'.

[128] *Eulogium*, 5.185 (III, 216–17, 217): 'venit ad quamdam villam Litherp vocatam. Ibi enim erat Quaedam abbatia fortissima, quae longo spatio diei resistebat contra principem, tandem se reddidit voluntati principis, salvis hominibus et ecclesiam', 'ecclesia enim illius villae longo diei spatio contra principem debellavit, tandem voluntati principis se submisit'.

> Aubigny to assault and by strength and arms they took it, and then wasted it by fire and flame.[129]

The first case is described in the standard, formulaic form, without any hint of criticism, and the third suggests that the town resisted, otherwise the English would not have taken it by force. The second instance only presents an action that could possibly be seen as immoral, as church property is clearly seen to be immune. However, *Eulogium* describes it as belonging to a noble, which might suggest it was a licit target by association, rather than an independent, innocent abbey. In only one case does the text's narrative of the campaign describe an English attack on a town without any sort of justification, when Woodstock 'burned-up the town' of Lussac after having spent the night there.[130] This campaign journal clearly shows signs of editorial changes that remove most instances of devastation, especially the formulaic day-by-day descriptions that are found in the *Anonimalle Chronicle*, Jean le Bel's *Chronicle*, as well as the other surviving campaign diaries. The writer also adds justifications for any remaining, more elaborate descriptions of attacks on civilians or their property. In doing so, he serves to make the English conduct less ethically problematic.

Most English sources, however, ignore English devastation during the campaign entirely. Both Thomas Gray and the English knight Bartholomew Burghersh (d. 1369) describe English movements, without any devastation, and Geoffrey le Baker mentions that the French devastated Gascony, but fails to say that Edward of Woodstock did so in his own campaign, shortly thereafter in his extensive narrative.[131] Even more sources omit all of the campaign movements and devastation that led up to the battle entirely, and mention only the English victory at the battle of Poitiers.[132] A few sources on Edward III's 1346 campaign claim that the English

---

[129] *Eulogium*, 5.185 (III, 218): 'praecedenti capitaneus de la Buche totam illam patriam spoliavit. Ibi fuit una abbatia nobilis valde combusta. Eodem die dominus Johannes Chaundos et dominus Jacobus de Audele dederunt insultum ad villam de Daubene et vi et armis eam ceperunt et igne et flamma eam vastaverunt'.

[130] *Eulogium*, 5.185 (III, 217): 'villam combussit'.

[131] Gray, *Scalacronica*, pp. 142–44; Bartholomew Burghersh, 'Letter to John Montagu, 1356', in Chandos Herald, *The Black Prince: An Historical Poem, Written in French*, ed. by Henry Octavius Coxe (London: Shakespeare Press, 1842), pp. 369–70; Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 140: 'certificatus comitem Arminiaci voluisse post eius recessum patriam depopulasse'.

[132] Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus*, pp. 469–71 (primarily casualty list); *Bridlington*, p. 149 (in annalistic section); *Canterbury Chronicle*, chs 28–34 (pp. 20–28); Edward of Woodstock, 'Letter to the Mayor, Aldermen, and Commonalty of London, 1356', in *A Chronicle of London, from 1089 to 1483, Written in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. by Nicholas Harris Nicolas (London: Longman, 1827), pp. 204–06; Edward of Woodstock, 'Letter to the Bishop of Worcester, 20 October 1356', in *A Chronicle of London, from 1089 to 1483, Written in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. by Nicholas Harris Nicolas (London: Longman, 1827), pp. 206–08; *York Short Chronicle*, fol. 29^{v}; *Gesta regum Angli*, MS 1 fol. 176^{v}; *Gestis Anglorum regum*, fols 35^{r}–35^{v}; *Hailes*, MS 2 fols 23^{v}–24^{r}. However, many of the less-elaborate narratives only describe the results of Poitiers to summarise the entire campaign.

attempted to restrain their men from attacking enemy civilians.[133] These have been accepted as genuine, most notably by Rogers and Ayton.[134] However, it is clear that these are used rhetorically to exonerate the military leaders, as both accounts go on to show that the English combatants attack civilians and pillage against the will of the leaders. Indeed, other sources blame devastation on different subgroups of the army that are seemingly less civilised than their leaders. In the *Lanercost Chronicle*'s only mention of an English attack on a church during the many campaigns in Scotland during 1327–45 the writer shifts the blame from the English by stating that 'especially the Welsh' combatants were culpable.[135] The ordinances drawn up for Richard II's 1385 campaign in Scotland seem to recognise ideas of restraint, but only briefly touch on the issue of civilian distinction and call for churchmen, men not bearing arms, and women to be spared.[136] However, as Cox has clearly demonstrated, the English still routinely attacked enemy civilians throughout this campaign.[137] The few English chronicles that do allude to devastation, as described above, focus most of their attention on the movement leading up to the battle, and also offer extensively detailed narratives of the battle.[138] These serve to divert focus onto the more praiseworthy and martial aspects of war.

5. ETHICS IN BIAS

The rhetorical strategy of emphasising enemy attacks on civilians and their property, while minimising such English acts, is not limited to accounts of the 1346 invasion of northern England and the 1356 Gascony campaign. English historical literature commonly shows this skewed

---

[133] *Acta bellicosa*, p. 160: 'nullus villas aut maniera incendere, ecclesias vel loca sacra depredari, senibus, parvulis aut mulieribus quibuscumque regni sui Francie malum seu molestiam inferre presumeret, seu quibuscumque personis aliis, nisi viribus instarent, malefacerent quovismodo, sub pena vite et membrorum'; Dene, *Rochester*, fol. 91^{r}: 'ne quis sacros[anc]te ecc[les]ie religiosis p[re]sb[ite]ris mulieribus p[ar]uulis neq[ue] alicui alteri se ad Regis pacem redder[e] volenti de Regno F[ra]ncie da[m]pnu[m] seu molestia[m] in p[er]sonis vel reb[us] fac[er]ent vel inferrent, sub pena [et] forisfactura membro[rum] [et] vite'. See also Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 130.

[134] C. J. Rogers, *War, Cruel and Sharp*, pp. 238–40; Ayton, 'Crécy Campaign', p. 62.

[135] *Lanercost*, p. 282: 'maxime Wallici'.

[136] 'Ordinances for the English Army, 1385', in Anne Curry, 'Disciplinary Ordinances for English and Franco-Scottish Armies in 1385: An International Code?', *Journal of Medieval History*, 37 (2011), 286–91 (here clause no. 3): 'item qe nully soit si hardys de robber ne piler eglise ne destruir homme de seinte eglise religious ne ancre ne nulle femme ne de prendre prisoner sil ne port armes ne denforcer nulle femme sur peine destre penduz', also see clause no. 7, which treats pillaging as non-violent. See also Maurice Keen, 'Richard II's Ordinances of War of 1385', in *Rulers and Ruled in Late Medieval England: Essays Presented to Gerald Harriss*, ed. by Rowena E. Archer and Simon Walker (London: Hambledon, 1995), pp. 33–48; Anne Curry, 'The Military Ordinances of Henry V: Texts and Contexts', in *War, Government and Aristocracy in the British Isles, c. 1150–1500: Essays in Honour of Michael Prestwich*, ed. by Chris Given-Wilson, Ann Kettle, and Len Scales (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008), pp. 214–49.

[137] Rory Cox, 'A Law of War? English Protection and Destruction of Ecclesiastical Property during the Fourteenth Century', *English Historical Review*, 128 (2013), 1381–1417.

[138] *Anonimalle*, pp. 35–39 (battle and related on 36–39); Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 94 (edn II, 228–38, battle and related on 233–38); *Peterborough*, pp. 170–71 (including battle and related); Reading, *Chronicle*, pp. 123–26 (battle and related on 124–26).

presentation of attacks on civilians throughout each text and representation of warfare. These should not be dismissed entirely on account of 'bias', however. Equally, it is dangerous to assume that seemingly formulaic descriptions carry no moral value.[139] Writers did not simply reflect and accept a knightly bias against peasants and other civilians.[140] A close examination of attacks by friendly and enemy forces in the same text reveals these carefully varied representations either supporting or condemning military action, and therefore allows us to better understand a writer's ethical perspective towards the act regardless of context.

Writers sometimes describe military acts in few words, but often employ language loaded with moral value, such as lists of categories of civilians to show that the victims of attacks were innocent. In other cases, these descriptions might be as brief as one word, such as labelling enemy combatants who attacked England as *pelers*, which might be translated as 'despoiler' but also carries the meaning of somebody who removes the peels or rinds from things.[141] Writers use this term figuratively to describe those who stripped the bodies of the people they killed to condemn them and their actions with more visceral imagery.[142] These carefully used terms, when considered in their proper intellectual and literary contexts, reveal writers to be aware of the ethical issues of war.

The *Lanercost Chronicle* constantly skews its representation of devastation in its descriptions of the near-constant Anglo-Scottish campaigns and in the process reveals its attitudes towards them. The writer's use of particular grammar shows he does not accept some acts as normal or morally neutral behaviour.[143] Sometimes he puts these actions in the active voice, such as '[the Scots] invaded and burned up Galloway, and led away spoil and cattle', or describes them indirectly, such as '[Cumberland and other areas] were devastated by slaughter and blaze'.[144] In doing so, the writer mostly presents Scottish acts of devastation directly to emphasise the agency and culpability of their perpetrators, but English and allied acts indirectly, in the passive voice or otherwise, to minimise agency and moral guilt. He does this consistently in his narrative from the beginning of Edward III's reign up to right before the 1346 invasion of England.[145] There are

---

[139] As implied by Ruddick, *English Identity*, pp. 148–50.

[140] It is often assumed, therefore, that the ideals of chivalry found no problems in attacks on civilians: Barnie, *War in Medieval Society*, p. 60; Saul, *For Honour and Fame*, p. 150; Macdonald, 'Two Kinds of War?', p. 207.

[141] Minot, *Poems*, 2.15: 'now haue þai, þe pelers, priked obout' (describing the Scottish raids before Halidon Hill). For the meaning and other uses of 'peler' see Minot, *Poems*, pp. 46–47; Pratt, 'Middle English Battle Poem', p. 117 n. 24.

[142] For pejorative use of 'peler', with details of associated slander trails, see N. A. R. Wright, *Knights and Peasants*, p. 57.

[143] The nuances of seemingly formulaic descriptions of devastation are almost universally overlooked.

[144] *Lanercost*, pp. 269, 341: 'invaserunt Galwithiam et combusserunt, et spolia et pecora abduxerunt', 'caede et incendio devastantes'.

[145] *Lanercost*, Scottish direct: pp. 259–60, 269, 288, 291, 292, 292–93, 335, 341, indirect: two on 272, 341, English direct:

no special literary structures in *Lanercost* that might encourage these different grammatical constructions, and if the writer thought devastation and its results were normal, pragmatic, and acceptable, there seems little reason for his particular style of representation.

The writer's attitude is further revealed when he justifies English devastation by including military leaders' strategic or tactical reasoning. In 1336 Edward Balliol's forces 'set on fire two towns' near the Scottish army besieging Cupar Castle in order to cause panic and force the siege to be lifted.[146] The writer provides justifications six times for English and allied acts, but only once for Scottish acts.[147] But on many occasions he makes it clear that the purpose of a raid is simply to do devastation, such as when he describes the 1337 Scottish invasion of England being conducted 'in order to despoil the country', or in the same year the Balliol forces campaign near Edinburgh 'so that plunder would be taken'.[148] The repeated emphasis of devastation without any strategic reasoning or purpose besides greed, as with the Scots, implies that these attacks, as described, were made for their own sake and were therefore less morally defensible.

English writers sometimes express their unease over devastation and its civilian victims by portraying them in allusive terms. Laurence Minot draws on animal symbolism from a version of the prophecies of Merlin to depict Edward III campaigning in France as 'the Boar'.[149] For his narrative of the 1346 Normandy campaign he calls Edward 'Boar' nearly four times as often as he calls him by his own name.[150] The first part of this poem, up to line 76, covers Edward's movements through the enemy countryside, and associates 'the Boar' here with rampaging and thoughtless destruction. Minot does not use Edward's name until line 79, when the devastation has completely ended and more traditionally praiseworthy deeds, such as battles, begin.[151] Minot uses the prophetic idea of 'the Boar' as a substitute for Edward's actions, to suggest that they were meant to happen and were just.[152] The French knight Philippe de Mézières appropriates this imagery from popular prophecies in his later *Epistre au Roi Richart* (1395) to condemn

272, 278–79, 288, 290–91, indirect: 281–82, 282–83, 286–87, 291–92, 341, Balliol indirect: 279, 285–86, 293.

146 *Lanercost*, p. 285: 'fecit igne accendi duas villas'.

147 *Lanercost*, English: pp. 278–79, 287, 288, 290–91, 341, allied: 279, Scottish 291.

148 *Lanercost*, pp. 292, 293: 'ut illam patriam spoliarent', 'pro praeda quadam capienda', also see p. 295.

149 Minot, *Poems*, 6.3, 6.53, 7.9, 7.21, 7.42, 7.44, 7.47, 7.52, 7.96, 7.97, 7.106, 7.150, 7.167, 8.19, 8.25, 8.49, 8.87, 9.8, 11.34, also see 6.3, 7.1 note. See pp. 39–41 above.

150 Called by his name at Minot, *Poems*, 7.79, 7.163, 7.170.

151 His name is in the rubric in a hand similar to that of the main text, but the rubrics are clearly separated from the narratives of the poems: London, British Library, MS Cotton Galba E IX, fol. 54^{v} (s. XV ¼).

152 Collette notes Minot's use of animal symbolism here but fails to grasp its meaning: Minot, 'Poems', ed. by Collette, pp. lviii–lix.

English destruction. He directly associates 'the Boar' as a symbol of immoral destruction that plagues the French people:

> It may be said, and not without tears in our Christian community, that the valiant chivalry of England for around sixty years, to chastise sinners by divine sentence, has been changed and made into a needle, or goad, of iron, truly so very sharp that countless souls are damned by it, and boil, in Hell. And so the black boars, cruel to their Christian brothers, under the guise of prowess and worldly valour, or of some evident right, have sharpened their teeth on the great cities of the kingdoms of Spain, France, and others, according to that which Merlin has written in his book. And all the same, it may be said that after the dreaded cruelty of the aforementioned goad, and after most wondrous victories, and worldly and transitory honour, little of their worldly profit remains to the aforementioned black boars.[153]

Although he portrays the 'Black Boars' as prophesied he still criticises their destruction, and by extension the English campaigns in France for their immorality and for acting against Christianity.[154] Minot, however, uses 'the Boar' to sidestep any ethical concern of the English king attacking the land and civilians, by removing part of Edward's agency.

These English texts undoubtedly show bias, but the vehicle for its expression is that of increased enemy culpability and emphasis on the civilian victims of their attacks, whereas all equivalent acts committed by English armies are sanitised. For these writers to consistently present the conduct of war in this fashion would serve no purpose unless they distinguished certain people as civilians who deserved immunity. This position does not require the writers to always condemn attacks on civilians at length or even in a simple fashion. These groups of people are viewed as civilians regardless of which kingdom they live in, or ostensibly owe allegiance to. If

---

[153] Philippe de Mézières, *Letter to King Richard II: A Plea Made in 1395 for Peace between England and France*, ed. by George W. Coopland (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1975), pp. 86–87: 'il se puet dire, et non pas sanz larmes en nostre crestiente, que la vaillant chevalerie d'Engleterre environ .lx. ans, pour chastoier les pechiez par la sentence divine, a este transmuee et convertie en une aguille ou aguillon de fer, voire si tres poingnant que ames infinies en sont dampnees et boulent en enfer. Et que les noirs sengliers, crueux a leurs freres crestiens, sur fourme de prouesse et de vaillance mondainne, ou d'aucun droit apparant, ont aguisie leurs dens aus maistres citez des royaumes d'Espaigne, de Gaules et d'ailleurs, selonc ce que Merlin l'avoit escript en son livre. Et toutefoiz il se puet dire que apres la cruaute redoubtee du dit aguillon, et apres victoires mout merveilleuses, et honnour mondaine et transitoire, aux diz noirs sengliers peu de proufit temporel leur en est demoure'.

[154] See also Philippe Contamine, 'Guerre et paix à la fin du Moyen Âge: L'Action et la pensée de Philippe de Mézières (1327–1405)', in *Krieg im Mittelalter*, ed. by Hans-Henning Kortüm (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2001), pp. 181–96; Michael Hanly, 'Philippe de Mézières and the Peace Movement', in *Philippe de Mézières and his Age: Piety and Politics in the Fourteenth Century*, ed. by Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski and Kiril Petkov (Leiden: Brill, 2012), pp. 61–82.

this were not the case, and French and Scottish people were all viewed as a whole, as an enemy force that deserved to be attacked, then English narratives would surely revel in such behaviour, rather than minimise their victim status. However, no English historical literature from Edward III's reign takes this sort of cruel attitude with civilians.

* * *

English writers during the reign of Edward III take a nuanced approach to devastation, so commonly practised by their own men, and the resulting attacks on civilians. They distinguish civilians as separate from people actively involved in war, and thus believe them to deserve immunity. Mentions of attacks on civilians, rather than simple, formulaic mentions of campaigning or burning, are uncommon and mean to add a moral value to attacks on them. This is evident through the partisan and contrasting description of English or 'enemy' attacks. Accordingly, English writers had to take great care in narrating the deeds of their own military leaders who so often attacked civilians on a day-to-day basis.

CHAPTER FOUR:
ETHICAL STRATEGIES

It is difficult to reconcile the activities of campaigns of devastation with chivalry, the martial ideal that most knights and many combatants tried to follow, especially in the modern world where professional forces go to great lengths to avoid causing civilian casualties. During Edward III's reign English armies moved through the enemy countryside in a wide swathe, all the while putting the land to fire and attacking civilians on a daily basis. While chivalric ideals varied depending on time, place, and a number of other factors, amongst the key principles are the pursuit of battle with equal opponents and the protection of weaker members of society.[1] Huizinga and Kilgour point out the contradictions in chivalric conduct to argue that the martial ideal could not be reconciled with common behaviour and must therefore be a sham.[2] Keen forcefully rejects their arguments and asserts that chivalry was an important and useful ideal for knights.[3] More recent scholars of chivalry, such as Kaeuper and Taylor, argue that knights pursued their military activities in a variety of settings, amongst which battle was central but not necessary.[4] They assert that knights and other combatants did not care about civilians due to class differences and did not subscribe to any sort of ideal that might require them to go out of their way to protect civilians, especially those in an enemy kingdom.[5]

While knights themselves may not have cared about enemy civilians and happily profited from attacking them, the common practice of devastation still conflicts with medieval ethics of war. After all, how could a strategy that required day-to-day attacks of innocent civilians be justified and ethical? Some scholars assume that there was little strategy in the Middle Ages beyond avoiding battle, and that warfare's constituent acts of devastation, plunder, and

---

1 Keen provides the classic summary of chivalric ideals: Keen, *Chivalry*, pp. 1–17. See also J. T. Johnson, *Just War*, pp. 131–50.

2 Huizinga, *Autumn of the Middle Ages*, pp. 61–125; Kilgour, *Decline of Chivalry*.

3 Keen, 'Huizinga, Kilgour and Chivalry'.

4 Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence*, pp. 161–65; C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, pp. 91–98. Charny discusses the various activities that chivalrous knights might perform: Charny, *Book of Chivalry*, § 2–16 (pp. 84–102). See also Geck's critical evaluation of the developments in studies of chivalry: John A. Geck, 'Chivalry', in *Handbook of Medieval Studies: Terms, Methods, Trends*, ed. by Albrecht Classen, 3 vols (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), pp. 1459–68.

5 Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence*, pp. 176–85, 185 (quote): 'chivalry had next to nothing to do with ordinary people at all'; C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, pp. 208–17, 227–30, esp. 213 (quote), 227–28: 'nonchalance about strategic decisions to harry non-combatants reflected in part the self-confidence of an aristocratic elite that believed automatically in its inherent superiority and right to use violence against people of lower status'.

murder were pursued only for profit.[6] Others consider narrative and record sources with more care and argue that campaigns of devastation were meant to undermine the enemy king's political support, cause widespread chaos, and minimise his ability to wage war, all to force the enemy into making a treaty that was advantageous to the attackers.[7] These arguments, however, do not reconcile the ethical problems inherent to campaigns of devastation, and can be seen by some to demonstrate the callous immorality of the period.[8] In response many scholars have assumed that since devastation was the only way to effectively wage war in the period it must have been accepted as a pragmatic necessity.[9]

Rogers, however, argues that English military leaders devastated the enemy countryside and attacked their people to force their king into fighting a decisive battle, which would be in a place selected to benefit from the superior army composition, organisation, and tactics of the English, which Rogers calls 'tactical defense'.[10] This argument reconciles all of the contradictions outlined above: devastation is then not done out of greed but only out of necessity, to force a cowardly enemy to do battle, and the French and Scots are instead to blame for any civilians attacked because they had avoided battle. Battle-seeking has since been widely accepted because it so neatly resolves all the ethical issues of medieval war.[11] However, it is problematic and frequently disregards passages or details from narratives if they do not conform to the seemingly 'realistic' conduct that is expected.[12]

---

6 Rogers summarises the positions of these earlier considerations of medieval strategy: Clifford J. Rogers, 'Edward III', pp. 83–85. See also Hosler, 'Reframing the Conversation on Strategy'.

7 Hewitt, *Organization of War*, pp. 93–110, 116–18; Barnie, *War in Medieval Society*, pp. 9–10; Gillingham, 'Richard I'; Allmand, *Hundred Years War*, pp. 54–58. See also C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, pp. 208–12.

8 Lynn compares the conduct of war with various ideals and, sometimes explicitly, portrays knights and military leaders as unethical: John Lynn, *Battle: A History of Combat and Culture*, 2nd edn (Boulder: Westview, 2004), pp. 73–109, 380–85.

9 In addition to many of the other scholars cited in this discussion, see Hanley, *War and Combat*, pp. 43–44; Livingstone and Witzel, *Road to Crécy*, pp. 113–17; Hoskins, *In the Steps of the Black Prince*, p. 116; Macdonald, 'Two Kinds of War?', pp. 203–09, 204 (quote): 'infliction of suffering on ordinary people was normal and accepted and we must embrace this before even beginning to investigate the extremes of atrocity and brutality'.

10 His argument is most clearly stated in C. J. Rogers, 'Edward III'. He qualifies and elaborates upon his initial thesis in C. J. Rogers, 'The Offensive/Defensive in Medieval Strategy', in *Von Crécy bis Mohács: Kriegswesen im späten Mittelalter (1346–1526)*, ed. by Leopold Auer and others (Wien: Heeresgeschichtliches Museum, 1997), pp. 158–71; C. J. Rogers, *War, Cruel and Sharp*, esp. pp. 220–37; C. J. Rogers, 'As if a new sun had arisin', esp. pp. 25–34; C. J. Rogers, 'The Vegetian "Science of Warfare" in the Middle Ages', *Journal of Medieval Military History*, 1 (2002), 1–20.

11 See for example Prestwich, *Armies and Warfare*, p. 310; Ayton, 'Crécy Campaign'; Whetham, *Just Wars*, p. 241; L. J. Andrew Villalon, 'Battle-Seeking, Battle-Avoiding or Perhaps Just Battle-Willing? Applying the Gillingham Paradigm to Enrique II of Castile', *Journal of Medieval Military History*, 8 (2010), 131–54; Barber, *Edward III*, pp. 197–98, 205–06; Hoskins, *In the Steps of the Black Prince*, pp. 77–82, 116–17, 127–28, 151, 153, 162–64; Gribit, *Henry of Lancaster's Expedition*, pp. 15, 21. Battle-seeking is further promoted throughout Clifford J. Rogers, ed., *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Medieval Warfare and Military Technology*, 3 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

12 Few have questioned Rogers' thesis, and of these none offer sustained critiques: Hanley, pp. 20–22; John Gillingham, '"Up with Orthodoxy!" In Defense of Vegetian Warfare', *Journal of Medieval Military History*, 2 (2004), 149–58; Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, pp. 190–93, 255 (highlights problems of using chronicles to understand strategy); Michael

In this chapter I examine the ethics of devastation, battle-seeking, and bellicosity, so frequently employed in rationalising the conduct of war. I reassess the various frameworks used to understand these difficult actions and ideals. I argue that English writers use these ideas not to report what happened, but as part of their rhetorical strategies to portray the English in the best possible light, and their enemies as cowards. Their particular style of representation allows them to reconcile the contradictions that they, like so many scholars today, saw in medieval warfare and chivalric ideals.

1. PROPAGANDA AND REALITY

Rogers' battle-seeking theory has been applied to a variety of times and places, but is most clearly expressed for Edward III's 1346 Normandy campaign that resulted in the battle of Crécy, from which I draw most of the examples discussed below.[13] However, a careful examination of the sources, in their historical and rhetorical contexts, shows that they do not universally support battle-seeking. Rogers focuses on sources that mention the English conducting devastation and burning the land so that the resulting fire and smoke would act as a signal or beacon to the French, and thus deny them an excuse to not engage in battle. He assumes the English thereby meant to draw the enemy to battle.[14] He focuses on these quotations at length as if they objectively reflect intention, cause, and effect. However, these details are only found in two sources (*Acta bellicosa* and Jean le Bel's *Chronicle*, the latter of which is not as straightforward as he suggests) out of over forty chronicles on contemporary warfare composed in England during the reign of Edward III.[15] I argue that these passages are flourishes of authorial imagination rather than any attempt at objective report, as they are meant to have rhetorical purposes and not

---

Livingston, 'Losses Uncountable: The Context of Crécy', in *The Battle of Crécy: A Casebook*, ed. by Michael Livingston and Kelly DeVries (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2015), pp. 1–13 (here 7). See also Stephen Morillo, 'Battle Seeking: The Contexts and Limits of Vegetian Strategy', *Journal of Medieval Military History*, 1 (2002), 21–42. Others mention battle-seeking but do employ it in their studies: H. J. Nicolson, *Medieval Warfare*, p. 135; C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, p. 210.

13 He argues that the Crécy campaign is an ideal model to study late medieval strategy: C. J. Rogers, *War, Cruel and Sharp*, p. 237: 'the Crécy *chevauchée*, the paradigm for virtually all the major English campaigns for the remainder of the century'. He also forces this thesis on Henry V's 1415 campaign with less convincing results: C. J. Rogers, 'Henry V'; C. J. Rogers, 'Battle of Agincourt'.

14 C. J. Rogers, 'Edward III', pp. 96–97.

15 Rogers gives the wrong page number for the first passage and omits it for the fourth. *Acta bellicosa*, pp. 163, 163, 168–69, 170–71: 'preparabat enim se adversariorum obstaturum, ac si eodem die bellum sibi compescere, ut sperabatur immineret', 'villam et patriam concremando Regi properabant sparsim ex omni parte patrie concurrentes', 'et licet Anglicorum adversarius ex opposito fuerat exercitui Anglicorum, et aque transitus diversis locis cligere poterat, numquam se eisdem exhibuit nec obtulit pugnaturus [...] Anglici sunt armati ex omni parte vexilla flammea erigentes, ut eorumdem adversarius obviam posset erigere', 'pululant rumores in exercitu, quarta decimadie, quod Anglie adversarius in Parisiensi civitate fortissime latitabat, et mansitibidem strenuissimus Rex Anglorum illo die et sequenti, adventum dicti adversarii, quem sperabat verisimiliter cordialius expectando'.

corroborated by contemporary sources. Indeed, Rogers elaborates upon these brief details in his own arguments far more than their sources do. Their writers probably added these considerations of intention and causation to make their texts seem intelligent and authoritative, but also to paint enemy leadership in a bad light.

It is necessary to selectively read these texts in order to conclude that they reflect a battle-seeking strategy. The seemingly more reliable evidence, campaign correspondence and newsletters by eyewitnesses and participants, often only suggests, rather than demonstrates, this strategy. In support of his argument, Rogers repeatedly points out that the English wait for three days at Poissy for the French to attack them during Edward III's 1346 Normandy campaign.[16] However, there is no consideration of whether this is true, what other reasons the English might have had for waiting, or whether they even wanted to wait. Other, non-rhetorical evidence, such as the *Kitchen Journal* and *Cleopatra Itinerary*, flatly state where the army camped each day.[17] These sources suggest that much of Edward III's campaign was spent fleeing from French forces and attempting to join with his allies in the north for reinforcement and resupply. These problems have recently been considered, along with a more thorough investigation of the sources and their language, as well as logistical limitations and local geography, to show that it would have been nearly impossible for Edward to have sought battle during the campaign, especially at the late stage when the battle of Crécy happened.[18]

Rogers argues that the surviving supposedly eyewitness texts support his position because they do not mention that the English might have been avoiding an engagement with the French.[19] However, this is an argument from lack of evidence and far from conclusive. Several other problems in the battle-seeking thesis remain: how could Edward III ensure that he would be attacked in a position that was advantageous to his army, despite a numerically superior enemy? If he intended to be attacked while besieging Calais, how could he possibly be certain that his army would be in a fit condition to win a battle, after enduring the inevitable hardships of disease, exhaustion, and poor supplies that result from a long campaign, and an even longer siege, all while overseas with minimal support? Additionally, most writings that explicitly give direct intentions were composed well after the events were fully resolved, which encouraged *post*

---

[16] C. J. Rogers, 'Edward III', pp. 96–97, 99.

[17] See p. 19 n. 41 above.

[18] Livingston, 'Location of Crécy'. See also Yuval Noah Harari, 'Inter-Frontal Cooperation in the Fourteenth Century and Edward III's 1346 Campaign', *War in History*, 6 (1999), 379–95.

[19] C. J. Rogers 'Edward III', pp. 95–96.

hoc ergo propter hoc narratives that show the English to have planned the positive results from the beginning. Nearly all of the writings composed before the English victory at Crécy fail to explicitly state that Edward's objective was to do battle with the French royal army, and the few that might implicitly suggest this seem instead to be alluding to the vague objective proposed by the 1344 Parliament.

English narratives of successful English campaigns are rarely considered as propaganda. Rogers considers, only to dismiss, the possibility that these writings were intended to serve rhetorical purposes or not present the facts. He asserts that Edward III's actions show that he was acting strategically, not thoughtlessly, by picking out moments that seem to suggest a thought-out, modern sort of military reasoning, while ignoring the far more numerous cases that might suggest otherwise. Letters from combatants on campaign explicitly claim that they sought battle with their enemies. During the 1346 Normandy campaign, in his letter to John Offord and others in London, Edward reports that he and his army will 'hasten towards our adversary [Philippe VI and his army], wherever that he might be, from one day to another, as best as we can'.[20] John Wingfield claims that during Edward of Woodstock's 1355 Gascony campaign, the prince eagerly turned his army from its current task, a siege, to attack the French force upon hearing of its approach.[21] Woodstock, in his 1356 letter to Simon Francis (*c.* 1326–75), mayor of London, and others after winning his victory at the battle of Poitiers, asserts that upon hearing of the approach of Jean II and his army, he 'hastened towards him on the road which he would have to pass to fight with him'.[22] Rogers asserts that this, and the other letters by combatants claiming they sought battle, are 'doubtless sincere', but gives little argument or evidence in support of his claim.[23]

Letters are accepted as entirely truthful and thus accepted as fact, despite contradicting claims in other sources. Rogers asserts that the sources he quotes from, especially those supposedly by eyewitnesses, should not be 'dismissed as mere propaganda for public consumption'.[24] He cites in support of this a 'private letter by the King to his Council in London' that suggests Edward III is pursuing Philippe VI's army. This, according to Rogers, represents an entirely

---

[20] Edward III, 'Letter to London, 29 July 1346', p. 84: 'hastier devers nostre adversaire, queu parte q'il soit de jour en autre, tant come nous purrons'.

[21] Wingfield's 1355 letter to Edington, interpolated in Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus*, pp. 439–43 (here 441).

[22] Woodstock, 'Letter to London, 1356', p. 205: 'p[re]ismes p[ur]pos de hastier dev[er]s lui s[ur] le chemyn qil devereit passer p[ur] estre combatuz ove lui'.

[23] C. J. Rogers, *War, Cruel and Sharp*, p. 364.

[24] C. J. Rogers, 'Edward III', p. 96.

honest, heartfelt message, without any possible motivation for exaggeration or distortion. However, these types of letters were meant for public consumption, even if they might have personal addressees, as should be obvious through any comparison of supposedly 'personal' with 'public' letters for content and structure.[25] Additionally, many of these letters are written by (or for) people, such as Edward or his son Edward of Woodstock, who had considerable motivation to distort the truth, misrepresent their intentions, or, at the very least, display subtle partisanship.

Rogers argues that Edward III himself states his battle-seeking objectives in several instances. The English king asserts in his 15 August response to Philippe VI's challenge: '[we are] making our way to you [Philippe] to make an end to war by battle'.[26] Rogers argues that Edward was simply following the 1344 Parliament's advice that he should 'make an end of this war, either by battle or a proper peace, if such might be had'.[27] He understands 'proper peace' here to mean peace through battle. He does not include, however, the Parliament's several full proposed campaign objectives:

> Seeing clearly that an end of this war or good peace ought to be seized, but that this cannot be [done] without great force of men and great power, so they asked all of one accord, and each individual great man by himself, to our said lord the king that he wished to make an end of this war, either by battle or by suitable peace if it could be had.[28]

Then later they petitioned Edward:

> That he would make himself as strong as he could to cross the sea, in assurance of the aid of God and of his just quarrel, forcefully to make an end, at this time, of his war, either by way of peace or by force.[29]

---

[25] See pp. 25–27 above.

[26] C. J. Rogers, 'Edward III', p. 97; which he translates from the letter in *Calendar of the Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office, Edward III*, ed. by Henry Maxwell Lyte, 16 vols (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1891–1916), VII, 516–17: 'tenant nostre chemyn devers vous pour faire fin de la guerre par bataille'. These two letters are translated into Latin in Tynemouth, *Historia*, MS 2.3, fols 245^{r}–245^{v} (here 245^{r}), MS 3, pp. 578–79 (here 578), edn, pp. 423–26 (here 425).

[27] C. J. Rogers, 'Edward III', p. 95; *The Parliament Rolls of Medieval England, 1275–1504*, ed. by Chris Given-Wilson and others (Leicester: National Archives, 2005) <sd-editions.com/PROME>, 1344.8: 'vousist faire fyn de ceste guerre, ou par bataille ou par pees covenable s'il la purra avoir' (Rogers' translation).

[28] *Parliament Rolls*, 1344.8: 'veantz overtement qe si fyn de ceste guerre ou bone pees se deveroient prendre ce ne poet estre saunz grant force des gentz et grant poair, si prierent touz d'un assent, et chescune singuler persone des grantz a par lui, a nostre dit seignur le roi q'il vousist faire fyn de ceste guerre, ou par bataille ou par pees covenable s'il la purra avoir'.

[29] *Parliament Rolls*, 1344.14: 'q'il se feist si fort come il plus purroit pur passer la mier, en assurance del eide de Dieu et de sa bone querele afforcement pur faire fyn a cest foitz de sa guerre, ou par voie de pees ou par force'.

The charter for the clergy again states that: 'in assurance of the aid of God and of our just quarrel, we would strengthen ourselves by all the good ways that we could, to make an end, at this time, of our war'.[30] These suggest that Edward's campaign was intended to be a show of force and a demonstration of his rights to France and divine support.

The evidence from the Parliament Rolls suggests that the English sought to threaten the French, and perhaps act out some revenge for various raids earlier made on the English coast, and thereby, through a show of force, negotiate for a reasonable peace treaty, not necessarily do battle with Philippe VI as Rogers suggests from his particular selection.[31] Other versions of Edward III's 15 August letter, both in the Anglo-Norman version in the *Acta bellicosa*, and those translated into Latin in two of the three manuscripts of a variant of John of Tynemouth's *Historia aurea* that continue Walter of Guisborough's *Chronicle* for 1327–46, omit the means of ending war as battle.[32] In the process they diminish any possibility that the English might have sought battle. It is possible that the scribes intentionally omitted these passages because they thought them to be untrue. Indeed, readers were sometimes keen to correct what they saw as incorrect details, such as the few occasions when they crossed out the fictitious, but not-uncommon, English claims that Philippe was seriously wounded at the battle of Crécy in the sole manuscript of the *Lanercost Chronicle* and a variant manuscript of Adam Murimuth's *Continuatio chronicarum*.[33] There is little in Edward III's letter to suggest that the English objective was first and foremost a decisive battle. The one direct use of *bataille* here might not even refer to a battle as such, but instead judicial combat, as was proposed several times by Edward and Philippe in the years before the campaign.[34]

There are many reasons why Edward III might have wanted to portray his military actions in a particular way. His public image, especially to parliament, was important in the mid-1340s because his wars were for the most part financially dependent on parliament's belief in his ability to produce results. But by 1346 Edward's war with France had little to show for its massive costs over the previous nine years, not to mention the many attacks on the north of England

---

30 *Parliament Rolls*, 1344.24: 'en asseurance del eide de Dieu et de nostre bone querele, nous nous afforceons par totes les bones voies qe nous purrons, de faire fyn a ceste foitz de nostre guerre'.

31 It remains to be argued how Edward III might have expected to be able to lure Philippe VI to battle if his invading army was so powerful, especially considering the French king had, on several occasions before, decided to not do battle upon learning the strength of the English force.

32 *Acta bellicosa*, pp. 171–72 (here 172): 'pur maire fyn de la guerre' then omitting 'par bataille'; Tynemouth, *Historia*, not in MSS, edn pp. 425–26 (here 425): 'ad terminandam guerram et nostrum bellum' then omitting 'versus te dirigentes iter nostrum'.

33 See pp. 155–57 below.

34 See pp. 124–27 below.

suffered during the recurring Anglo-Scottish conflict.[35] The English had won a naval victory at Sluys in 1340 and fought off a few coastal raids but had failed to win any other battles or sieges. English campaigns thus far had achieved only endless manoeuvring through the French countryside, which was neither praiseworthy, nor morally defensible, as their men had devastated the land throughout and inflicted massive harm on civilians without engaging any significant enemy forces. As Rogers points out, parliament granted a second year of subsidy to Edward on condition that he personally pursue these objectives in France.[36] It was entirely sensible for Edward, and others, who wrote letters while campaigning back to members of government and the English public, to portray themselves as pursuing the most morally righteous and praiseworthy of these means to end war.

The English were keen to spread the news of their achievements and conduct in their various campaigns to the people of England so that they could gain and maintain support. This is obvious from the ten letters and newsletters that Edward III and his men sent back to England during the 1346 Normandy campaign alone.[37] In one of these, by Edward to John Offord and others in London, sent before the battle of Crécy, he lays out all his achievements so far, expresses his financial problems, and then asks for the letter to be forwarded to important persons throughout England and abroad, including William Zouche, archbishop of York, who then had copies disseminated and proclaimed throughout the north.[38] Jean Froissart succinctly notes:

> To tell the truth, it was necessary, for one king and the other, since they wished to wage war, that the details of their quarrel be put in words and displayed to their people, so that each would be more eager to wish to aid their lord, and by this they [the people] were all aroused in one kingdom and in the other.[39]

Many other letters, too, state the importance of showing their contents to many people, and suggest that they played a key role in propaganda.[40] His many letters requesting prayers from

---

[35] See for example Anthony R. Bridbury, 'The Hundred Years' War: Costs and Profits', in *Trade, Government and Economy in Pre-Industrial England: Essays Presented to F. J. Fisher*, ed. by Donald C. Coleman and Arthur H. John (London: Weidenfeld, 1976), pp. 19–34.

[36] C. J. Rogers, 'Edward III', p. 95.

[37] See also C. J. Rogers, 'Edward III', p. 95 (cites only 7 letters).

[38] Edward III, 'Letter to London, 29 July 1346'. See also discussion of correspondence and newsletters at pp. 25–27 above.

[39] This propagandistic need is noted later in the fourteenth century (1369 in the narrative) in Froissart, *Chronicles, 'B'*, § 616 (VII, 126): 'au voir dire, il estoit de necessité, à l'un roy et l'autre, puisqui guerriier voloient, que il fesissent mettre en termes et remoustrer à leur peuple l'ordenance de leur querelle, par quoi çascuns entendesist de plus grant volenté à conforter son signeur, et de ce estoient il tout resvilliet en l'un royaume et en l'autre'. See also Froissart, *Chronicles, 'A'*, fols 298^{r}–298^{v}; *Chronicles, 'Amiens'*, § 753 (IV, 4); *Chronicles, 'C'* and *Chronicles, 'N'* omit this passage; *Chronicles, 'Rome'* ends well before this point.

[40] See also W. R. Jones, 'English Church', p. 19; Barnie, *War in Medieval Society*, p. 7.

people throughout England also demonstrate Edward's concern with having divine as well as worldly support.[41]

Edward III was not above using documents, even those that might be spurious, to justify his actions. He sent to the 1346 Parliament, for wide dissemination and publication, what he claimed to be a 1339 Franco-Norman plan for the invasion of England that his men supposedly found in Caen after they took and sacked it during his Normandy campaign.[42] This invasion plan was further disseminated, probably to various centres around the country, and was copied into Adam Murimuth's *Continuatio chronicarum*, with considerable variations in some manuscripts that likely result from the large number of copies written.[43] Two letters from Jean de Vienne, captain of Calais when Edward was besieging it in 1346–47, are also interpolated into the English chronicles of Robert of Avesbury, John of Tynemouth, and Henry Knighton (written 1379–97).[44] In them Vienne complains about the privations suffered by the French garrison and people of Calais during Edward's eleven-month siege, and begs Philippe VI to relieve them, as was his duty as their king. Two letters from Philippe to David II, asking him to invade England to force some of the English armies that were then attacking France to return, survive interpolated in Tynemouth's *Historia aurea*, and are probably spurious.[45] A version of a supposed letter from David to Philippe, complaining because he was lied to about the state of England, is in Anglo-Norman verse and certainly a piece of literature meant to praise the English.[46] Even seemingly sober and factual documents were used as propaganda or rhetoric. Chroniclers often based their texts around these sources, or happily copied them out in various forms, as they were in keeping with their narrative objectives to criticise the enemy and praise the English for their intentions.

Although it is beyond the scope of this thesis to examine continental texts in depth, it is worthwhile to consider how the French viewed Edward III's 1346 campaign differently. Many

---

41 See for example a list of the thirty-three English calls for prayer in support of England's pursuits during Edward III's reign: McHardy, 'Some Reflections', pp. 190–92. See also W. Mark Ormrod, 'The Personal Religion of Edward III', *Speculum*, 64 (1989), 849–77.

42 *Parliament Rolls*, 1346.7 (introduction and discussion), 1346.8–9 (letter itself). Another full text of the invasion plan, although it is unclear which extant version it is from, is edited as: 'Convention entre Philippe de Valois et les normands pour la conquête de l'Angleterre (23 mars 1338)', in Jean Froissart, *Oeuvres*, ed. by Joseph Kervyn de Lettenhove, 25 vols (Bruxelles: Devaux, 1867–77), XVIII, 67–73.

43 Murimuth, *Continuatio*, pp. 205–08, 257–61 (MS 3 variant).

44 Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus*, pp. 385–86; Tynemouth, *Historia*, MS 3 p. 582, not in MS 2.3 or edn; copied in a shortened version in Henry Knighton, *Chronicle, 1337–1396*, ed. by Geoffrey H. Martin, OMT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), p. 78. See also pp. 167–70 below.

45 Tynemouth, *Historia*, MS 2.3, fols 244^{v}–245^{r}, edn, pp. 421–23. See pp. 131–32 below.

46 'Letre Dauyd de Bruys'.

French texts accuse the English king, rather than Philippe VI, of cowardice, because he failed to show up to challenges that they had both agreed to. The *Norman Chronicle* (written in stages to 1372) contradicts Edward's 15 August letter to Philippe when it explains that:

> King Edward [...] asked and sought battle through the bishop of Meaux, and King Edward agreed to be there the following Thursday, in a place between Paris and Vaugirard. And when King Philippe learned this, he went to Paris with all his army to cross the river Seine, and he lodged at Antony, fairly close to the place where the battle was to be the following day. But in the night, King Edward had built the bridge at Poissy, which the French had had taken down, and crossed the river Seine during the night [...] And when King Philippe learned that King Edward had broken the agreed rules of the battle, as he had crossed the river Seine, King Philippe decamped and followed him very quickly.[47]

The French chronicler then repeatedly asserts that Edward was continually fleeing from Philippe's army, with an implicit accusation of cowardice, especially considering the English army was devastating the French countryside and attacking its people the entire time, rather than engaging enemy combatants. This example, and other sources written in France and elsewhere in Europe, show how the presentation of reality was entirely subjective and reliant upon what details a given writer chooses to include or omit, and how contextual details shaped them. A writer's careful selection and presentation of details in his narrative allows him to make subtle arguments against certain behaviour. The careful presentation of these events in texts shows that writers were keen to present the military action of whichever king they supported according to their own ideals.

There is little reason to agree with Rogers' assertion that these sources accurately reflect Edward III's intentions. One should not assume that English armies were seeking battle during the mid-fourteenth century simply because several scholars state it to be the case. Equally, it is dangerous to disregard whether the English sought battle or simply meant to devastate the

---

[47] *Chronique normande du XIV^e siècle*, ed. by Émile Molinier, ShF, 205 (Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1882), pp. 78–79: 'le roy Edouart [...] demanda et requist bataille par l'evesque de Meaulz, et le roy Edouart lui octria à estre au jeudi ensuivant, en une place entre Paris et le Vaugirart. Et quant le roy Phelippe le sceut, il ala à Paris à tout son ost pour passer la riviere de Saine, et s'en ala loger à Antourgny, assez prés de la place où la bataille devoit estre l'andemain. Mais en celle nuit, le roy Edouart fit faire le pont de Poissi, que les François avoient despecié, et passa en celle nuit la riviere de Saine [...] et quant le roy Phelippe sceut que le roy Edouart avoit failli les convenans de la bataille, car il avoit passé la riviere de Saine, adonc se desloga le roy Phelippe et ala aprés mout hastivement'.

countryside and attack the people living there simply because it seems to be the preserve of 'military historians', as there are moral implications within either position.[48] It should be clear that when texts, be they newsletters, chronicles, or in other forms, state that a leader desired battle with his opponent, or that his enemy avoided battle, these were intentional rhetorical strategies. Most important of these was the officially-endorsed propaganda campaign to portray the English as brave and confident in pursuing their rights and defending their country, along with their enemies as cowards. In employing such strategies, these writers implicitly, and sometimes explicitly, engage with issues of ethics as they relate to the desire to do battle, as well as to the consequences for battle once joined. They also allow the reader to disregard the devastation and suffering of civilians as the means to bring the enemy army to battle, and therefore judge it to be only a necessary evil rather than an unethical objective.

2. BELLICOSITY AND CHALLENGES

English chronicles sometimes explicitly reflect a battle-seeking attitude, in a fashion similar to newsletters written by combatants. The English knight, later chronicler, Thomas Gray, claims that in 1360 English forces 'had traversed as much of France as was in their ability, seeking battle, to have proof of the right of their lord'.[49] Here Gray seems to simply restate the justification commonly given by Edward III for his campaigns. This is curious, considering that Gray does not seem to make use of documents, as Adam Murimuth, Robert of Avesbury, and others do, in writing his chronicle.[50] He might have been unconsciously restating the intention and causation that he himself had heard when participating in these campaigns with Edward in his younger years. However, this is the only instance in which Gray, a military knight of some renown, mentions that leaders sought battle with enemy forces.

Several other civilian writers suggest that the English sought battle in their offensive campaigns. [51] However, these are typically vague expressions of English bellicosity and

---

[48] See for example the unjustified avoidance of this problem by Kaeuper, *Medieval Chivalry*, p. 183: 'One technical issue will not be considered: the debate over whether medieval commanders and their armies ardently sought battle or prudently avoided it. Specialists in campaign and combat own that debate, which can be left in their care. Most scholars will also slip past the steel-toothed trap of moral judgment as they picture the flames licking at the vulnerable homes of two poor families and will focus on analysis rather than judgment, fearing it too facile, too readily disregarding of context'; Kaeuper, 'Medieval Warfare', p. 25 (similarly suggests the problem of intention has no bearing on moral issues).

[49] Gray, *Scalacronica*, p. 188: 'ouoint enuyrounez le plus de Fraunce en qanqe en lour fust, queraunt batail, dauoir derenez le droit lour siris'.

[50] His wholesale use of other chronicles for the earlier portions of his narrative is more in the tradition of chroniclers continuing existing authorities in order to bring them up to date.

[51] See for example Le Baker, *Chronicle*, pp. 66, 82, 98, 136, 137, 141–42, 142, 144; *Long ANPB*, chs 170 (pp. 218), 180

willingness to do battle. This is often the case in some of the more famous campaigns, such as those that culminated in the battles of Crécy and Poitiers. In these cases chroniclers clearly draw upon, and are influenced by, official newsletters that were circulated and copied widely, and especially those chronicles that interpolate these sources into their narratives, which consequently made them more authoritative.[52] They put the English pursuit of their objective (to establish and maintain Edward III's just rights as king of France) above all else, even their own personal well-being, by seeking battle with their enemies.

Seeking battle for the sake of justice is only rarely mentioned by English chroniclers. Many texts rarely give any motivation for military leaders and simply state where armies went and what they did. The *Lanercost Chronicle* describes the 1346 Normandy campaign more from the perspective of the French, and explains Philippe VI's actions leading up to the battle, in a marked contrast from Edward III's detailed letter on the sack of Caen interpolated immediately before in the manuscript.[53] In contrast, the *Anonimalle Chronicle*, based on the *Minorite Chronicle*, the same source as *Lanercost*, presents the campaign in great detail.[54] While the letter gives some detailed explanations of why the English acted as they did, as well as the challenges they overcame, *Lanercost* reports their itinerary before and after in only a simple and cursory fashion. The chronicle does not seek to understand what the English intentions were at all.

The portrayal of English armies and their leaders as seeking battle with the enemy is part of a more commonplace narrative strategy to paint them as confident and bellicose. Not all writers felt the need to portray the English as seeking battle, but many more show them as willing to do battle only. Jean le Bel, for example, shows the English in 1346 flagrantly displaying their presence to Philippe VI, when Edward III 'sent Sir Godfrey [of Harcourt, d. 1356], his marshal, to ride up to Saint-Cloud, and put it to fire, which is just two short leagues from Paris, so that King Philippe could see the smoke'.[55] He then expresses his bewilderment, at length, at Philippe's inaction, and directly accuses him of cowardice:

---

(226), 188 (234), 223 (252); Reading, *Chronicle*, pp. 121, 121–22.

52 For the authoritative value of including explicit citations in chronicles see Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, p. 105. This could sometimes cause monastic chroniclers, who often drew upon these official sources, to take on a pronounced bias: Given-Wilson, 'Official and Semi-Official History in the Later Middle Ages: The English Evidence in Context', in *The Medieval Chronicle V*, ed. by Erik Kooper (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2008), pp. 1–16; Ruddick, *English Identity*, pp. 173, 208–09.

53 *Lanercost*, pp. 341–44, fols 243^{r}–243^{v}.

54 *Anonimalle*, pp. 19–23; *Durham LPB*, MS 2 fols 33^{v}–34^{r} (presents essentially the same narrative as *Lanercost* but with Edward III's letter omitted).

55 Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 71 (II, 85–86): 'il fit chevauchier messire Godeffroy, son mareschal, de là jusques à Saint Clou, et là bouter le feu, qui est à .ii. bien petites liewes de Parys, affin que le roy Philippe en poeut vir les fumieres'.

> The second wonder is that why, when the bridge was repaired, King Philippe, who was in Paris, seven short leagues nearby, with all of his greatest resource of lords and of men-at-arms, whom he had summoned to defend his lands, did not harry those enemies who had made smoke and flames fly above his head in Paris, or did not at least come to bar the way. The third wonder is that why, when he knew they were so close by him, he did not harry them along the river Seine, when he knew that all the bridges across the Seine had been destroyed, and that they could neither flee nor cross the Seine unless they re-made a bridge at some point. I do not know how this could be. In short, he never had the boldness or courage to fight.[56]

These passages do not suggest that Edward was burning the land to provoke the French to battle, but rather that he was supremely confident in his cause and abilities and sought to devastate their lands, and that the chronicler thought the lack of reaction by Philippe demonstrated his cowardice.

Earlier in his narrative, Le Bel describes how during the 1327 Scottish raid the English repeatedly see evidence of the Scottish destruction by the smoke it left. They then seek to find the Scots at the source of this smoke, day after day.[57] This defensive action takes considerably longer than expected and the English suffer extensive hardship and loss before they manage to find the Scots, even though they move through familiar land.[58] It is reasonable to infer from such descriptions, however, that armies burning the countryside should be prepared to be attacked in battle, even if it were unlikely. Indeed, for martial culture the idea of battle held prime place, so one should expect an army of combatants ostensibly aiming for such ideals to be ready for battle should the opportunity present itself.

---

[56] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 71 (II, 86–87): 'l'aultre merveille, sy est quant le pont fut refait, comment le roy Philippe, qui estoit à Parys, à .vii. petites lyewes prez, à tout son plus grand pouoir de seigneurs et de gens d'armes, et qu'il avoit mandé pour deffendre son pays, comment fut ce qu'il n'ala courir sur ces anemis qui luy faisoient voler la fumiere et les flamesches par dessus sa teste à Parys, ou au mains qu'il fust venu deffendre le passage. La tierce merveille fut quant il les sçavoit sy prez de luy, pourquoy il ne leur aloit courir sus par de là la riviere de Saine, quant il sçavoit que tous les pons sur Saine estoient deffais et qu'ilz ne pouoient fuir ne passer la Saine sy ne refaisoient ung pont en aucun lieu. Je ne sçay comment ce poeut estre. A brief parler, il n'eut oncques hardement ne courage de combattre'.

[57] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 11 (I, 53): 'on chevaucha avant tout de rench aprez les Escots, là où on veoit les fumieres', also see chs 9, 11 (I, 50, 53): 'ilx ne poeurent sçavoir nulles nouvelles des Escots, maiz adoncques poeut on veoir apparaument les fumieres des hameaulx et villages qu'ilz ardoient en celluy pays', 'quant le roy d'Angleterre et tout l'ost eurent veu la fumiere des Escots, ainsy que dessus est dit'.

[58] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, chs 11–12 (edn I, 53–63). See also pp. 162–63 below.

To burn the land and leave smoke as a trail to provoke the enemy to battle hardly seems effective, as Rogers suggests Le Bel means to demonstrate.[59] In reality the smoke would quickly spread out to appear as haze, and the different types of material burning at different rates would obscure the invading force's current location, and thereby prevent the defending force from catching up unless they were already very close. The instances of using smoke to seek battle in Le Bel's *Chronicle* are rather for different narrative ends: the 1327 Scottish campaign was meant to highlight the suffering endured by the English and the 1346 Normandy campaign was used to accuse the French of cowardice in contrast to the brave English behaviour.

Chroniclers often interpolate, paraphrase, or discuss the several formal challenges to battle between the English and French kings. The repeated mentions of challenges throughout chronicles, as well as those of Philippe VI's poor excuses, often emphasised, contribute to their overall criticism of the French. Writers focus on the fact that the French commonly act as if they are keen to do battle in their own challenges, or in their responses to those made by the English, but in the end never turn up. The *Lanercost Chronicle* paraphrases Edward III's 1336 challenge to Philippe to do battle in England, setting up the conditions so there would be little reason to refuse, and states that the French:

> Should come, and, if they wished, freely enter England, and he himself would assign for them twenty-four miles in which to rest their army peacefully until the day of battle had been established, and afterwards each should stand by the fortune which might fall upon them.[60]

The French king does not take up the offer to do battle, however. Later in *Lanercost*, the chronicler paraphrases Edward's 1340 challenge to Philippe, in which it is proposed:

> That they two themselves should fight a battle alone for the revelation of justice, or that Philippe himself and one hundred of the most powerful men-at-arms of France, among whom Philippe himself was also one, should step forth [from the rest of the army], and Edward himself with as many of the [most powerful] English, among whom Edward himself was one.[61]

---

[59] C. J. Rogers, 'Edward III', pp. 97 n. 64, 99 n. 73.

[60] *Lanercost*, p. 286: 'venirent et libere, si vellent, Angliam intrarent, et ipse assignaret eis viginti et quatuor miliaria, in quibus quiete suum exercitum recrearent, donec dies belli esset statutus, et extunc quilibet staret fortunae quae sibi forte accideret'.

[61] *Lanercost*, p. 334: 'quod ipsi duo soli pro declaratione justitiae proelio decertarent, vel quod ipse Philippus centum milites de Francia potentiores, inter quos etiam idem Philippus esset unus, et ipse Edwardus totidem Anglicorum, inter quos ipse Edwardus unus exsisterent', followed by more details. The original challenge in Anglo-Norman circulated widely and is interpolated in Murimuth, *Continuatio*, pp. 110–11 (reply on 112–14); Avesbury, *Gestis*

However, Philippe refuses the challenge because the letter was not addressed to him as the king of France, but instead to 'the so-called Philippe of Valois', a pejorative title used in English writing, in the not uncommon tradition of abusive titles given to the French kings, such as 'tyrant' and 'crowned one'.[62]

These challenges, although implicitly critical of the French, are sometimes explicitly made out to condemn the enemy on moral grounds. The *Kirkstall Abbey Long Chronicle*, drawing on the account of John of Tynemouth, describes the motivation for Edward III's challenge to Philippe VI in 1340:

> The king of England, desiring to make a quicker conclusion, pleasing to God, [to the problem] of his claim, presented himself pursuing his right in this way only. Because the dispute was between the two themselves, in such a way thus among themselves it should conclude, so that oppression, devastation, and massacre of the people will be avoided, then there should be single combat between themselves. And if by chance that way does not please you, then from either side a hundred of the stronger and more valiant, with their king, should meet and do battle.[63]

Here the chronicler claims that Edward's motivation was to minimise unnecessary bloodshed, but also to take responsibility for his personal dispute with Philippe. He then states that if Philippe does not accept this very reasonable offer then 'wars carried out by armies presses upon him immediately'.[64] But the French king, 'led by glory rather than reason', gave no effective response, and thereby justifies the later English attacks on France in the chronicle's narrative.[65]

French challenges to the English are also creatively used for rhetorical ends by the English in their writings. Philippe VI's 1339 challenge to Edward III, seems to be earnest, and includes reassurances that

---

mirabilibus, pp. 314–15 (reply on 315–16); and also translated into Latin and interpolated in Tynemouth, *Historia*, MS 2.3, fol. 235^{v} (reply on 235^{v}–236^{r}), edn, p. 361 (reply on 362–63).

62 For example in Murimuth, *Continuatio*, p. 112: 'au dite Philippe de Valoys'. See also pp. 67–75 above.

63 *Kirkstall*, fol. 82^{r}: 'rex Anglie de jure suo fine[m] deo placabile[m] affecta[n]s facere breviore[m], isto modo t[an]tu[m] se obtulit jus suu[m] p[ro]secuturu[m]. Q[ui]a sicut causa int[er] ip[s]os duos fu[er]at mota, sic int[er] ip[s]os foret t[er]mimata [*sic*] p[ro] opp[re]sione p[o]p[u]li, vastac[i]one ac strage euita[n]dis, t[u]m ip[s]o[rum] bellu[m] fieret sing[u]lare. Et si via forte ista sibi no[n] placeret, [et] p[ar]te vt[er]q[ue] centu[m] cu[m] suo rege forc[i]ores ac validiores co[n]uenire[n]t bellu[m]q[ue] co[m]mittere[n]t'.

64 *Kirkstall*, fol. 82^{r}: 'q[uo]d si nec ista[m] via[m] sibi acceptare curaret, bella ex[er]cituu[m] sup[er] ip[su]m sciret celerit[er] i[m]minere'.

65 *Kirkstall*, fols 82^{r}–82^{v}: 'rex au[tem] Francie poci[us] elacione duct[us] q[uam] rac[i]one, ad oblata cu[m] effectu r[espo]ndere neglexit'.

> If the above-said was not believed, my lord of Bohemia [Jean l'Aveugle, king of Bohemia, 1296–1346], lord [count Louis] of Nièvre [*c.* 1304–36], lord constable [of France, Raoul I de Brienne, count of Eu, d. 1344], my lord of Lotharingia [Raoul, duke of Lorraine?], just as I write to you will give witness through their letters.[66]

The English king's reply emphasises that he had waited for the French to attack: 'his delay passed noted and disclosed, so that your lord the king of France, if he had wished, for a long time would have had battle', and repeats that he will wait for battle if the French king still wishes it.[67] Edward III states that he put his army in an agreed upon position that the enemy knew of, as he had learned from some of their scouts.[68] However, the French fail to show and the English depart after waiting, ready for battle, from dawn through dusk. In other cases, chroniclers, such as Robert of Avesbury when narrating Woodstock's 1355 campaign, mention that the French challenge the English to combat or battle under similar conditions and again fail to show, perhaps paraphrasing documents like those interpolated elsewhere in these chronicles.[69] It is notable that there are no formal challenges to settle legal disputes or to quickly end campaigns in conflicts with the Scots, either in their original forms, or mentioned by chroniclers, perhaps because of varying attitudes towards their conduct.

These publicised challenges were meant to highlight Philippe VI's arrogance, but more especially Edward III's courage and moral superiority for his desire to submit himself to judgement in battle.[70] They are intentionally formulated in such a way that they could act as boastful gestures and political statements, which are made all the more effective considering they could not have been accepted in reality, as one side would have a considerable advantage.[71] This is

---

[66] Philippe VI's 1339 letter to Edward III, interpolated in Tynemouth, *Historia*, not in MSS, edn pp. 342–43 (Jean l'Aveugle's letter on 344–45): 'si praedicta vera esse non creditis, dominus meus Boemiae, dominus de Niez, dominus constabularius, dominus meus Lotharingiae, sicut vobis scribo per literas suas testes fient'.

[67] Edward III's 1339 letter to Philippe VI, interpolated in Tynemouth, *Historia*, not in MSS, edn pp. 343–44 (here 343): 'mora sua ita est notoria et aperta, quod dominus vester rex Franciae, si voluisset, diu est quod bellum habuisset'.

[68] Edward III's 1339 letter to Edward of Woodstock, interpolated in Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus*, pp. 304–06; paraphrased into Latin in Knighton, *Chronicle*, pp. 16–22. See also a similar French challenge and the English response, interpolated into Tynemouth, *Historia*, MS 2.3, fol. 245^{r} (reply on 245^{r}–245^{v}), edn pp. 423–25 (reply on 425–26). The original Anglo-Norman response by Edward III is edited in *Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward III*, VII, 516–17.

[69] Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus*, pp. 429–30.

[70] See Philippe Contamine, 'L'Idée de guerre à la fin du Moyen Âge: Aspects juridiques et éthiques', *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres*, 123 (1979), 70–86 (here 71–74); Matthew Strickland, 'Provoking or Avoiding Battle? Challenge, Judicial Duel, and Single Combat in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century Warfare', in *Armies, Chivalry and Warfare in Medieval Britain and France: Proceedings of the 1995 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. by Matthew Strickland (Stamford: Watkins, 1998), pp. 317–43 (here 320–25).

[71] Strickland, 'Provoking or Avoiding Battle', pp. 325–26; Ludwig Vones, 'Un mode de résolution des conflits au bas Moyen Âge: Le Duel des princes', in *La Guerre, la violence et les gens au Moyen Âge I: Guerre et violence*, ed. by Philippe

further supported by the historical reality that duels or arranged battles were rarely, if ever, carried out.[72] Regardless of any real applications, writers interpolate documents on challenges or describe them in their narratives to better praise the English and harangue the French for their cowardice or lack of confidence.

Notions of personal or small-scale challenges, as represented in these writings, often seem to be modelled on the biblical story of the duel between David and Goliath.[73] Narratives sometimes directly reference this story, such as when Geoffrey le Baker claims that before the battle of Halidon Hill (1333) 'in the way there was [a Scottish] champion of great stature and, like another Goliath, holding trust in the great strength of his body more than in God, standing in the middle between the armies, challenged any single Englishman to single combat'.[74] The English knight Robert Benhale agrees and defeats the Scottish champion, along with his giant dog. Because the terms are not exactly fair (the champion is huge and has a large dog fight by his side), Benhale is praised for overcoming this adverse situation, but also for doing so in a cool and collected manner, as opposed to the angry and unbalanced Scot. Le Baker links this story to its biblical precedent, which his audience would certainly have been familiar with, through his description and direct reference. In doing so he makes the English victory all the better for overcoming great odds, suggesting its justness, and paralleling the English knight with David.[75]

Descriptions of the French failing to join battle were different from their rejections of formal challenges because in the more formal situations the French had not yet set their army against the other. Accordingly, French writers could blame English leaders for not making it immediately explicit where the battle was meant to take place, or simply claim that they had not

---

Contamine and Olivier Guyotjeannin (Paris: Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques, 1996), pp. 321–32 (here 329, 332).

72 Johan Huizinga, 'La Valeur politique et militaire des idées de chevalerie a la fin du Moyen Âge', *Revue d'histoire diplomatique*, 35 (1921), 126–38 (here 131): 'Il y a là un exemple curieux d'une idée politique qui a hanté les esprits durant plusieurs siècles comme une possibilité très séreuse et un moyen très pratique, sans s'être jamais réalisée'. See also Malcolm Vale, 'Aristocratic Violence: Trial by Battle in the Later Middle Ages', in *Violence in Medieval Society*, ed. by Richard W. Kaeuper (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000), pp. 159–81.

73 Strickland, 'Provoking or Avoiding Battle', pp. 320–28; K. A. Smith, *War and Medieval Monastic Culture*, pp. 2–3, 34, 137–38. For the David and Goliath story see *Bible*, I Samuel 17; Titus Flavius Josephus, 'Antiquitatis', in *Opera*, ed. by Johann Froben (Basel: Froben, 1524), pp. 1–592 (here 6.11, pp. 162–64). For reception see Walde and Egger, eds, *Reception of Classical Literature*, pp. 190–94; Galderisi, ed., *Translations*, nos 11–12 (II, 73–75); Josephus, *The Antiquities*, ed. by Franz Blatt, Acta Jutlandica, 30.1, Humanistisk Serie, 44, 2 vols (Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget i Aarhus, 1958–), I, 13–116 (I do not use this edition's text because it represents an early tradition that was mostly inaccessible to readers and writers in fourteenth-century England). See also Trevor Russell Smith, 'The Influence of Josephus on Ideas of National Identity and War in Fourteenth-Century England', in *The Latin Josephus in the Western Middle Ages*, ed. by Paul Hilliard and Karen Kletter (Leiden: Brill, 2019 forthcoming).

74 Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 51: 'obviorum quidam satelles magne stature et ut alter Golias, in magna virtute corporali maiorem quam in Deo habens confidenciam, medius inter exercitus consistens, singulos Anglicos ad monomachiam provocavit'.

75 See pp. 65–66.

made it clear that there was supposed to be a battle at all. Accordingly, for a writer to criticise enemy leaders for not joining an informal battle requires further contextual rhetoric.

As a deliberate contrast to English bravery writers repeatedly claim that Scottish and French leaders, as well as their men, flee when they encounter English forces that may not even be seeking to do battle. The French are often depicted as more duplicitous for making repeated gestures towards seeking or engaging in battle and inevitably failing to follow through with their own terms of battle. The *Canterbury Chronicle* describes Edward III as willing to do battle with Philippe VI's forces during his 1346 Normandy campaign:

> Philippe de Valois [...] gathered a great army there [in Rouen], and although they were in a fierce multitude, the said Philippe, fearing the king of England, broke the bridge over the Seine. Philippe himself followed the king of England daily from the opposite side of the Seine, demolishing and defending all bridges so that there was no way he could cross [...] yet the adversary himself, although he could have, was unwilling nor dared to cross the water in defence of his people and kingdom.[76]

These accusations of the French being unwilling, or afraid, to fight, through contrast show the English as being all the more aggressive, as well as more honest, for their attempts to conduct war in a straightforward fashion.

The Scots are portrayed as avoiding battle in a different fashion from the French. Writers show the north of England to be frequently invaded or raided on a small scale, but rarely differentiate between the size of campaigns or whether they were royally sanctioned. The English are shown to respond with improvised forces to resist and stop any further harm. The Scots are invariably shown to flee once the armies approach each other, and sometimes are explicitly said to be afraid. The *London French Chronicles* repeatedly conveys this frustration in its descriptions of campaigns during Edward III's earlier years. After the Scots invade in 1327, Edward raises an army and leads the Weardale campaign. He and his army find and surround the invading Scottish army in Stanhope Park, but instead of fighting with the English 'the Scots escaped at night from the park'.[77] During this escape the Scottish leader James Douglas ('Black Douglas') sneaks

---

[76] *Canterbury Chronicle*, ch. 8 (p. 6): 'Philippus uero de Valesio [...] magnum exercitum congregauit ibidem, et licet essent in multitudine graui idem Philippus, regem Anglie metuens, pontem Secane frangi fecit. Ipse Philippus regem Anglie ex aduerso ex una parte Secane diebus singulis sequebatur, diruens omnes pontes et muniens ne ad eum pateret transitus quouismodo [...] ipse tamen aduersarius noluit nec audebat in defensionem populi sui et regni, cum potuisset, aquam transire'.

[77] *London French*, p. 60: 'les Escoces nutaundre eschaperent hors de la parke'.

into the English camp attempting to capture Edward but flees as soon as he meets opposition.[78] In 1333 the English king again campaigns against Scotland 'because they did not want to maintain peace at all, but always wanted to wage war', while stressing that the repeated Scottish raids on the English border are in contravention of the implied peace agreement.[79] When the English king moves through enemy territory the writer notes that whenever he approached 'the Scots always put themselves to flight, so that no encounter then could be had', although in reality the English fought and defeated them at the battle of Halidon Hill at the end of the campaign.[80] The chronicle emphasises the apparent futility of these attempts to meet the Scots in battle when the Scots attack England in 1337–38 (the precise time of year is unclear in the text) and, 'the third time', Edward 'rode through the land of Scotland, but he could not find any to oppose him', again shows that the Scots lack the will to do battle with an opposing armed force, but only want to raid.[81]

Many other English chronicles portray the Scots similarly attacking the land but fleeing from armed resistance. The *Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* claims that, upon the approach of an English army in 1322, 'the Scots went and hid themselves in woods and in mountains and harassed the English from one day to the other, so that, however cunningly the king acted, he could not find them on open ground'.[82] Geoffrey le Baker repeatedly mentions that the Scots flee and hide as the English approach, and sometimes suggests animalistic traits, such as when he writes that in 1303 the Scots fled 'from the face of the sword to islands or subterranean lairs'.[83] He adds this passage to his source for the 1303–41 portion of his narrative, Adam Murimuth's *Continuatio chronicarum*, to more strongly emphasise the difference between the behaviour of the Scots and the English. Murimuth has similar passages, which Le Baker copies elsewhere into his narrative, such as his description of how in 1336 Edward III 'sent his earls with the king of Scotland [Edward Balliol] through the country [of Scotland], to find, if they could, resisting Scots. But none dared to await them, but by means of mountains, swamps, and woods they remained hidden'.[84] In English chronicles the Scots consistently avoid fighting on even terms with the English.

---

78 *London French*, p. 60.
79 *London French*, p. 68: 'pur çeo q'ils ne voleyent tenir nul pés, mes tous jours guerroyer'.
80 *London French*, p. 68: 'les Escoces touz jours se mistrent à le fuite, si qe nule encountre adonkes ne poeit trover'.
81 *London French*, pp. 69–70: 'le tierce foythe', 'chivacha par my la tere d'Escoce, mais il ne put trover nul encountre'.
82 *Long ANPB*, ch. 199 (p. 252): 'les Escotz alerent [et] lour muscherent en bois [et] en mountaignes [et] tarierent les Engleis de iour en autre qe le roy ne oueryst vnqes si subtilement qe il les pout trouer en la plein champe'.
83 Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 1: 'vel a facie gladii fugatis ad insulas seu latebras subterraneas'.
84 Murimuth, *Continuatio*, p. 77: 'suos comites misit cum rege Scociae per patriam, si possent invenire Scotos resistentes.

The English, by contrast, are shown to target the enemy's strength (such as combatants or fortified positions) whenever possible, rather than their weaknesses (civilians or their land). Jean le Bel describes how the English pursue the Scots daily to do battle with them in the 1327 Weardale campaign. Eventually they come upon the Scots camped upon a mountain, in a superior position. The English propose that the Scots come down or otherwise put themselves in a position to allow for a fair fight.[85] The Scots respond sharply that it is Edward III's responsibility to go up to meet them in battle:

> They would do neither one. But the king and all his council knew well that they were in his kingdom, and had burnt and wasted it. If this troubled him, they would have to make amends, for they would remain there as long as they pleased.[86]

Le Bel uses this story to condemn the Scots for seeking only to attack civilians rather than do battle with the English forces, who were capable of doing so. He also praises Edward for attempting to end the suffering of his people. In direct contrast to this, later in his narrative Le Bel describes the English entrenched around Calais, after the battle of Crécy, when Philippe VI arrives with a force to relieve the city. The French scouts discover that Edward is in an ideal situation, not unlike the Scots in 1327, and that their own forces would suffer significant casualties if they were to approach and fight him where he was. The French, as did the English with the Scots, ask the English if they will come out and fight on open ground.[87] Edward, however, complains about the large losses in both men and money that the campaign has cost him so far, and, echoing the Scots, declares: 'I am not advised to do anything at his [Philippe's] will, nor at his comfort, nor for his pleasure, nor to abandon what I have conquered or intend to conquer'.[88] Le Bel then criticises the French king for fleeing with his army, as do many other English sources.[89] Despite their twisted justification to praise the English in both situations, these two

---

Sed nulli audebant eos exspectare, sed per montes, paludes, et nemora latitabant'; closely borrowed in Le Baker, *Chronicle*, pp. 57–58: 'misit comites suos cum rege Scocie conquestore ad patriam transequitandum et scrutandum Scotos resistentes. Set nulli audebant eos expectare, in montibus et paludibus ac nemoribus se occultabant'.

85 Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 13 (I, 66).

86 Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch .13 (I, 66): 'ilz n'en feroient ne l'un ne l'aultre. Maiz le roy et tout son conseil veyoient bien qu'ilz estoient en son royaume, et l'avoient ars et gasté. Sy luy en ennuyoit, si le venissent amender, car là demour(r)oient ilz tant qu'il leur plairoit'.

87 Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 80 (II, 157): 'luy prierent de par le roy qu'il voulsist livrer passage par où il poeut convenablement passer, et il le combateroit, et se ce faire ne vouloit, il se retrairoit arriere et liverroit par delà bonne place de terre, et se combasteroient à cui Dieu en donnast la grace de la victoire si l'eust'.

88 Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 80 (II, 158): 'si ne suys pas conseillié de tout faire à sa devise, ne à son aise, ne à son plaisir, ne d'eslongier ce que j'ay conquis ou pensé à conquere'.

89 Several English texts claim that after both sides agree to do battle the French flee: Le Baker, *Chronicle*, pp. 79–80; Edward III's 1347 letter to John de Stratford, archbishop of Canterbury, interpolated in Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus*,

episodes are meant to suggest the importance of attacking military objectives, rather than civilians, in war. In both of them the enemy fails to pursue military objects and avoid battle with English armies when presented with the opportunity.

English writers depict different intentions for campaigns to better praise the English and criticise the enemy. The English are invariably shown to only want to do battle with the enemy, which allows writers to conveniently sidestep the moral problems in the daily attacks on civilians. Instead some of the blame for these attacks can be shifted onto the enemy for avoiding a battle, especially if pre-arranged, that might have prevented the need for devastation and its civilian victims. The French and Scots, in contrast, are shown to only want to attack areas that are incapable of defence, primarily civilians, and never want to do battle with the English. Through this careful rhetorical strategy the enemy are shown to be immoral and the English just and ethically sound, although they both wage war in the same manner.

3. OBJECTIVES OF WAR

English writers directly contrast the enemy's objectives in going to war with those of the English. The French and the Scots go to war out of a desire to attack the people of England and destroy their property. The English, by contrast, are repeatedly shown to go to war only to restore justice and peace to the land, which have been spoiled due to the French and Scottish leaders resisting Edward III's rights. This skewed presentation allows English writers to convey a further moral dimension to their narratives of warfare, as well as to minimise any sort of ethical critique of perhaps questionable English behaviour.

On the few occasions that enemy forces directly attack England, its land, or its civilian inhabitants, it is only because they expect there to be no military forces there to oppose them. The many narratives of David II's 1346 invasion of England use this idea and claim the Scots only wanted to invade because they would then be able to prey on the civilians and land, as the English armies were campaigning in France at the time.[90] These accounts seem to be based originally on two supposed letters that Philippe VI sent to David before the battle of Crécy (fought

pp. 391–93, claims English and French agreed on a combat of four versus four but the French fled the next day, as if defeated: 'se departi, od toutes ses gentz, auxi com descomfit'; Reading, *Chronicle*, p. 104. Other sources simply state that the French flee after coming to Calais: *Eulogium*, 5.182 (III, 212); Gray, *Scalacronica*, p. 137 (via Leland's abstract); Higden, *Polychronicon*, 7.44 (VIII, 342–44); Higden, *Polychronicon SAA Continuation*, MS 1 fol. 294^{v}; *Osney*, p. 352. Most of these sources show the French burning their tents and leaving their goods to be looted in an allusion to the Syrians fleeing during their siege of Samaria: *Bible*, 2 Kings 7.5–7.8.

[90] See pp. 91–102 above.

on 26 August). In them Philippe suggests that the lack of opposition would be a good reason for the Scots to invade, although he does not revel in the suffering to be inflicted on civilians, as the many English accounts do.[91] An English letter written during the invasion in July, before the battle of Neville's Cross that ended the invasion, states that the Scots 'to this [invasion], as many guess, by Philippe de Valois, who calls himself king of France, were variously roused and induced'.[92] This suggests that a rumour of Philippe's instigation was already circulating in England well before the battle on 17 October. It seems unlikely that such a letter could have fallen into English hands and written about in Durham before the Scots were defeated at Neville's Cross, or that a popular rumour could have been based upon real correspondence, officially publicised, and then spread so quickly that Fossor could have written a letter mentioning it in the same month, on logistical grounds alone.[93] Additionally, the two letters from the French to the Scottish king date from 20 and 22 July, although most of the narrative sources state that the Scottish invasion was meant to draw English forces away from the siege of Calais, which did not begin until 4 September.[94] The letters, whether genuine or fabricated, play a propagandistic role in criticising the Scots for not seeking out fair battle with an opposing, capable army, but desiring only to attack civilians. They also show the French as scheming and fighting their battles only through proxies.

English writers also show the enemy as desiring to go to war with England so that they can destroy it and its people. The *Lanercost Chronicle* states that the Scots desire to invade England in 1346 in a parallel to that of the Pagans' intention to destroy the Israelites. The text shows them freely urging their fellow countrymen to go to war and conduct genocidal destruction: 'come and let us purge England of people, and their name will no longer be remembered', which the Scots thought was good.[95] Other writers suggest that the Scots intended to destroy the entire

---

[91] The letters only survive interpolated in Tynemouth, *Historia*, MS 2.3, fols 244^{v}–245^{r}, edn, pp. 421–23.

[92] Fossor, 'Letter to Hatfield, July 1346', p. 386: 'ad hoc, sicut multi conjiciunt, per Philippum de Valoys, dicentem se regem Franciae, animati multipliciter et inducti'.

[93] Campbell claims that there is 'no reason to doubt the authenticity of the letters', which has been universally accepted and cited by, for example, DeVries, Grant, and Rogers and Buck: James Campbell, 'England, Scotland and the Hundred Years War in the Fourteenth Century', in *Europe in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. by John R. Hale, John R. L. Highfield, and Beryl Smalley (London: Faber, 1965), pp. 184–216 (here 195 n. 1). DeVries, *Infantry Warfare*, pp. 177–80; Alexander Grant, 'Disaster at Neville's Cross: The Scottish Point of View', in *The Battle of Neville's Cross, 1346*, ed. by David Rollason and Michael Prestwich (Stamford: Tyas, 1998), pp. 15–35 (here 18); C. J. Rogers and Buck, 'Scottish Invasion', pp. 53–54.

[94] This discrepency in dates is noted, but not investigated, by C. J. Rogers, *War, Cruel and Sharp*, p. 277 n. 23.

[95] *Lanercost*, p. 344: 'venite et disperdamus Angliae de gente, et non memoretur nomen ejus ultra, et bonus visus est sermo in oculis eorum', also see pp. 347 (David II's boast that he would soon see London), 345–46 (Scots celebrating after murdering). See also Minot, *Poems*, 9.9–9.12; *Bible*, Psalm 82.5; Len Scales, 'Bread, Cheese and Genocide: Imagining the Destruction of Peoples in Medieval Western Europe', *History*, 92 (2007), 284–300; Ruddick, *English Identity*, pp. 168–69.

kingdom, and assert that David II invaded 'to destroy the land of England', 'to waste the land and the nation', or 'to be able to ravage the whole land'.[96] Writers also occasionally claim that the enemy want to destroy the English tongue, in an appeal to national identity and defence.[97]

The English, by contrast, are shown to only desire to end war through battle. Such declarations in English narratives add a moral element to Edward III going to war with the French and the Scots. Indeed, war is often shown to be a last resort or sometimes even started by the enemy. English writers often show their leaders as wanting only to defend their country and people by suppressing those who would destroy them and their people. Geoffrey le Baker alludes to this when he states that Edward of Woodstock was eager for battle when he began his 1356 campaign 'because of the peace which typically follows war'.[98] The *London St Paul's Annals* makes this assertion, too, after its source, Adam Murimuth's *Continuatio chronicarum*. After the text's final military encounter, the victory at the siege of Berwick and battle of Halidon Hill, but before the thanksgiving in London that the writer adds to his source for emphasis, he states that 'because of this [victory] it was declared thus publicly that the war with Scotland would then finally be ended, because none remained of that nation who could, knew how to, or wanted to assemble or guide assembled men to battle'.[99] Large-scale hostilities with the Scots did not resume until David II's 1346 invasion, and, since the *London St Paul's Annals* ends before this, there are no more details or comments by the writer. Later versions of Murimuth's *Continuatio chronicarum* that extend past 1337 or 1341 add an expression of doubt immediately after the quotation given above: 'yet it was not true, as will be evident below', meaning the later descriptions of Scottish attacks on England, which is expanded upon and made more explicit in Le Baker's account.[100] The final version of Murimuth's text ends shortly after the English victory at the battle of Neville's Cross, which is then made into the final victory and attainment of peace.

---

[96] *Long ANPB Continuation*, fol. 196^{v}: 'destruire la t[er]re Denglet[er]re'; *Short ANPB Continuation*, fol. 176^{v}: 'pur gaster la t[er]re [et] la naciou[n]'; Murimuth, *Continuatio*, p. 252 (MS 5 variant): 'totam terram pro posse depopulaturus'. See also Ruddick, *English Identity*, pp. 1, 52.

[97] *Prophetic LPB*, fol. 37^{r}: 'ad destruenda[m] terra[m] [et] lingua[m] anglicana[m] simul cu[m] nacione totis virib[us] conaret[ur]' (David II's 1346 invasion of England). See also Scales, 'Bread, Cheese and Genocide', pp. 289–90; Ruddick, *English Identity*, pp. 161–63, 223.

[98] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 141: 'propter pacem que solet bellum comitari'.

[99] *London St Paul's*, p. 358: 'ita quod dicebatur tunc puplice guerram Scotiae tunc fore finaliter terminatum, quia nullus remansit de natione illa qui posset sciret aut vellet, homines ad praelium congregare aut regere congregatos'; which borrows directly from Murimuth, *Continuatio*, p. 68.

[100] Murimuth, *Continuatio*, p. 68: 'non tamen fuit verum, sicut inferius apparebit'; which is borrowed and more explicitly doubted in Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 52: 'post istud bellum opinio falsa fuit pupplicata quod guerra Scotica fuerat finaliter terminata, eo quod vix aliquis de illa nacione remansit, qui posset, sciret, et vellet preliaturos congregare, et regere congregatos'.

Other texts use this notion of battle ending war to show God's hand in events, and, implicitly, divine endorsement of the English. The *Lanercost Chronicle* begins its description of the final campaign in the text, David II's 1346 invasion of England that concludes with the battle of Neville's Cross, with the statement: 'blessed is the Lord God of Israel! who visited and made redeemed his people, and rose up a horn of salvation for us [the English] from the house of David [king of the Scots], our enemy'.[101] This passage has always been seen as alluding to the English victories in France that immediately precede it in the narrative. Both Ormrod (who curiously quotes the *Jerusalem Bible* translation rather than *Lanercost* or the Vulgate) and Ruddick omit 'inimici nostri' from their translations, and thereby (perhaps intentionally) sidestep the issue entirely, so that they can use the quotation as praise of Edward III at the battle of Crécy.[102] Livingston implies the passage is merely a truncation of Luke 1.68–1.69 until the middle of 1.71 at 'ex inimicis nostris', in order to arrive at his own reading.[103] However, reading this phrase as enthusiastic praise of Edward's Normandy campaign goes against the writer's attitudes to war as seen elsewhere in *Lanercost*.

Stevenson, in his edition of the *Lanercost Chronicle*, made the poor editorial choice of placing this statement in its own paragraph, and added punctuation not found in the manuscript. The meaning here is therefore confused, as it is unclear whether it refers to the 1346 Normandy campaign which precedes it, or the battle of Neville's Cross, which follows, and whether 'inimici nostri' refers to 'cornu salutis' or 'David'. If the *Benedictus* passage was meant to serve as the conclusion of the Normandy campaign, we would expect it to follow the sentence that describes the beginning of the siege of Calais immediately and without any marks of division in the manuscript. However, the Calais passage makes up its own paragraph in the manuscript and is set as a subsection of the preceding Crécy narrative, exactly as it is in the

---

[101] Italics text altered by chronicler from source: *Lanercost*, p. 344: 'benedictus Dominus Deus Israel! quia visitavit et fecit redemptionem plebis suae, et erexit cornu salutis nobis *de* domo David, *inimici nostri*!'; *Breviarium ad usum insignis ecclesiae Sarum*, ed. by Francis Procter and Christopher Wordsworth, 3 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1879–86), II, 35–36 (here 35): 'benedictus Dominus Deus Israël: quia visitavit et fecit redemptionem plebis suae. Et erexit cornu salutis nobis: *in* domo David *pueri sui*'; which is based on *Bible*, Luke 1.68–1.79 (here 1.68–1.69): 'benedictus Dominus Deus Israhel quia visitavit et fecit redemptionem plebis suae et erexit cornu salutis nobis *in* domo David *pueri sui*'.

[102] Ormrod, 'Personal Religion of Edward III', p. 849: 'Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he has visited his people, he has come to their rescue and he has raised up a power for salvation in the House of his servant David'; Ruddick, *English Identity*, p. 284: 'Blessed be the God of Israel! He has come and redeemed his people, and he has raised up a horn of salvation for us from the house of David!' (which Ruddick believes is meant to allude to Calais).

[103] 'Lanercost Chronicle', in *The Battle of Crécy: A Casebook*, ed. by Michael Livingston and Kelly DeVries (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2015), pp. 86–89, 349–50 (here 89): 'Blessed be the Lord God of Israel! He has visited and redeemed His people and raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of David, even from our enemies!'; Ruddick suggests it is abridged from Luke 1.68–1.71, but omits the final parts of the quote: Ruddick, *English Identity*, p. 283 n. 123.

Anonimalle Chronicle and *Durham Latin Prose 'Brut'* manuscripts that are based on the same source, the *Minorite Chronicle*.[104] On the next line a large blue capital B with red flourishes that occupies all available space between the lines, signals the beginning of the *Benedictus* passage and a new section of the narrative.[105] The passage is not separated from the following Neville's Cross narrative by a paragraph mark or line break, but is instead enjambed with the sentence that follows.[106] This is the final enlarged capital in the manuscript, and there is no paragraph mark after the *Benedictus* passage until a blue paragraph mark almost halfway through the following folio at Selby's appeal to David II.[107] It also has none of the commas or exclamation marks that Stevenson adds.[108]

The modified *Benedictus* passage is well suited to initiate the narrative of David II's invasion. It presents David as the false king in one of several rhetorical plays on him sharing his name with the biblical King David.[109] The writer ironically claims that the campaign began on the vigil of St Luke, whose gospel the *Benedictus* is based upon, whereas, for example, both the *Anonimalle Chronicle* and the *Durham Latin Prose 'Brut'* simply state that it began on 6 and 9 October.[110] This passage, as a whole, is borrowed and altered from its source, the *Benedictus*, not directly from its biblical antecedent, which was chanted every dawn at Lauds (and on some other occasions) in medieval England, which makes it appropriate for opening the narrative of a campaign.[111] A reader, especially of the monastic audience that this style of writing suggests, would certainly understand the allusion to the rest of the *Benedictus* and notice the changes immediately. The passage in the *Lanercost Chronicle* is a celebration of the foretold deliverance of the English from their Scottish enemies, as is clear by the conclusion of the *Benedictus*, which prophesies that John the Baptist will prepare the people for Christ, who will bring prosperity, stop strife, and 'guide our feet into the way of peace'.[112] Conversely, the writer declares in biblical

---

[104] The Calais passage begins about two-thirds through fol. 243^{v}, col. b, line 41, after a red paragraph mark, and ends on line 43. About one-fifth of its final line is blank. The only other paragraph mark on the folio is almost a full column before, on col. a, line 45, before 'Tunc civitas Baiocensis se sponte reddidit'. *Anonimalle*, fol. 283^{v}; *Durham LPB*, MS 2 fol. 34^{r}. See also *Minorite Chronicle* in the Appendix at p. 254 below.

[105] *Lanercost*, fol. 243^{v}, col. b, line 44. The passage lasts three and a half lines. This large capital and other paragraph marks are unnoted by Stevenson in his edition and Maxwell in his translation of the text.

[106] The next sentence begins with a non-rubricated capital, which is used elsewhere in the manuscript to indicate the beginning of sentences.

[107] *Lanercost*, p. 345, fol. 244^{r}, col. a, line 40, before 'Tunc dominus Walterus de Selby, custos fortalitii'. See also pp. 185, 196–99 below.

[108] Punctuation is occasionally used in the manuscript but nowhere in this passage.

[109] See T. R. Smith, 'Ethics and Representation of War'.

[110] *Lanercost*, p. 344: 'in vigilia sancti Lucae evangelistae'; *Anonimalle*, p. 23; *Durham LPB*, MS 2 fol. 34^{r}.

[111] As dictated in Benedict of Nursia, *Regula monachorum*, ed. by Eduard Wölfflin, BT (Leipzig: Teubner, 1895), ch. 12 (p. 25).

[112] *Breviarium*, II, 36: 'ad dirigendos pedes nostros in viam pacis'; based on *Bible*, Luke 1.79.

language the Scots' bellicose desire 'to put sword to the land, and disturb peace' when setting out on their 1346 invasion.[113] This implies that the original and ideal state of the world is peace. The final campaign, in which the English are beset by the Scots and suffer greatly, shows God's ultimate judgement in their favour. The text suggests that this victory ends war and returns peace, which thereby explains its greatly expanded narrative compared to events earlier in the text.[114]

However, the expectation that battles could end war in a decisive fashion, as seen in these chronicles, was unrealistic. None of the major English victories of Edward III's reign (Crécy, Neville's Cross, and Poitiers) were decisive in this way, despite the seemingly major results and the often extensive narratives they received by contemporary and later writers. Regardless of these unfortunate realities, writers could focus on these supposed objectives to paint the English leaders as benevolent, only doing the unsavoury acts of war to make the world better for its people.

These narrative structures show the French and Scottish leaders as cowards and uncertain in their abilities and the validity of their causes, especially as they conflict with English interests. This is emphasised when narratives contrast their avoidance of battle with the English bellicosity or battle-seeking attitudes. Since these conflicts were officially founded on political disputes, portraying the enemy as fleeing shows them as being unconfident in the justness of their cause, and also the English, in contrast, as justly confident in theirs. The common portrayal of the objectives of war in this fashion gives the English more praise for their justly confident behaviour and criticises the enemy for unjustly pursuing their cause.

* * *

Barber, in his examination of Edward III's 1346 Normandy campaign, states that 'there is always a danger of reading intentions after the outcome is known, but the argument that a battle was the purpose of Edward's invasion is hard to resist'.[115] However, it should be clear, given the many

[113] Italic text shared: *Lanercost*, p. 344: '*gladium in terram mittere*, et pacem perturbare'; *Bible*, Matthew 10.34: '*in terram* non veni pacem *mittere* sed *gladium*'.

[114] *Lanercost*, p. 353. Other texts also end their narratives with or shortly after Neville's Cross, such as *Gesta Scotorum*, MS 2 fol. 279^{v}; Murimuth, *Continuatio*, p. 219; Tynemouth, *Historia*, MS 2.3, fols 246^{v}–247^{r} (places the 1346 battle after events in 1347), MS 3 returns the battle to its place in chronological order on pp. 579–80, MS 1 and edn break off early.

[115] Barber, *Edward III*, p. 198.

sources examined above, that the presentation of the English as seeking battle during their campaigns, or displaying an eagerness to fight with the enemy in a more general sense, is not simply a reflection of the reality of a strategy of English warfare developed and promoted by Edward III. It is instead part of a nuanced and persistent propaganda campaign that, depending on the details of its representation, appealed to different groups of people on a wide scale and helped earn popular and financial support for the English conflicts with the French and Scots.

Edward III, as well as the many chroniclers, poets, and others who wrote to support him, sought to portray his campaigns as aggressive, yet not overly bloodthirsty, as desiring to engage the enemy in direct combat, and yet not necessarily wanting to attack their civilians and land. They contrast this behaviour with the enemy reluctance to engage, typically when they are in an ostensibly superior position, to thereby blame them for the destruction and death of English campaigns. English writers have to deal with and excuse the occasional English leader who fails to engage, or is defeated, and in the process often contradict their own routine condemnation of enemy leaders for similar behaviour. This was part of a more general tendency to portray combatants and their leaders in a chivalric and ethical fashion.

These bellicose attitudes were not universally endorsed, however, and writers present conflicting views. In many cases, however, the widely copied and consumed texts were those that endorsed Edward III's preferred attitude of extreme bellicosity. This was partly because they present a more palatable view of warfare, but also because they were the authorities that were deferred to because of their interpolated documents. This militaristic image, along with successful petitions for popular and governmental support, allowed Edward to defend his kingdom and attack others through war, but distorts our understanding of attitudes to the ethics of war.

CHAPTER FIVE:
VIOLENCE AND KILLING

Scholars often consider violence to be a necessary and, perhaps, laudable aspect of war in late medieval writings.[1] Kaeuper asserts that 'what is at issue is not whether medieval people accepted and valorized violence. We know that they did, laity and clergy alike—as most people in other times and places have done'.[2] Although he critically examines how thinkers, knights and clerics alike, rationalised the problems of chivalric desire to do violence with the seemingly pacifistic ideals of Christianity, he does not examine the problems of varied representation of violence and its consequences. It is important to question the attitudes of writers rather than simply presume they accepted all aspects of violence because there are no loud voices that explicitly condemn them. This chapter examines the ethical problems of fighting against combatants who are not capable of putting up a reasonable defence, doing violent acts that are shown only abstractly, and the suffering that results from violence in war.

1. CAPABLE COMBATANTS

English writers commonly attempt to portray both sides of any given encounter to be equally capable in order to better allow for praise of the typically victorious English forces. They often describe how enemy forces fought well, in a general sense, but rarely offer any comment on the possible differences in the courage or ability of armies, and instead simply state that they are worthy opponents. The *Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* repeatedly describes enemy forces in positive terms, such as 'these were the most valiant people', or asserts that they were difficult for the English to defeat, although in somewhat formulaic terms, such as 'vigorously defended himself', they 'fiercely defended themselves', or they 'defended themselves extremely well'.[3] Geoffrey le Baker, despite his criticisms of Jean II earlier in his text, describes how the French stoutly resist Edward of Woodstock's attack at the battle of Poitiers:

> He meets wild resistance of the most valiant [combatants]. The English fight, the French fight back, of whom their leader, although yet of age, yet with the

---

1 As argued throughout Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence*.

2 Kaeuper, *Holy Warriors*, pp. 5–9 (here 8).

3 *Long ANPB*, chs 223 (pp. 305), 164 (209), 168 (215), 196 (242): 'ceux furent les plus vaillantz gentz', 'vigerousement soi defendi', 'eux defenderent egrement', 'eux sibien defenderent'.

> waxing youthful anger of the recruit repeats his exceptional acts [...] through all he shows that he did not at all fall short of the royal stock of France.[4]

Le Baker also shows the Scots to be equal opponents in battle in his narrative of the battle of Neville's Cross. He begins his description by stating that 'pugnacious men [combatants] from both sides stand, prepared for death more than flight'.[5]

Any differences of equipment between combatants of different allegiance are rarely mentioned, despite the commonplace focus on these differences in modern historiography. It is frequently assumed that the English armies fought as dismounted men-at-arms and 'longbowmen' against the French armies that were composed nearly exclusively of mounted knights but sometimes with some mercenary crossbowmen as well.[6] Medieval writers, however, rarely dwell on such issues or explain the composition of forces in technical detail. The *Lanercost Chronicle*, for example, never discusses equipment and rarely distinguishes between types of combatants, and, even then, only does so to vary vocabulary in a seemingly random fashion.[7] Modern notions, in contrast, oversimplify the very diverse composition of armies into strict modern archetypes of 'units'. Writers use various terms for units that do not signify the level of detail or organisation that we would like them to. Thomas Gray repeatedly describes English combatants as simply *glayues* (glaives), which are a type of polearm weapon.[8] However, he does not mean to suggest that this was the weapon that all these combatants, and indeed all armies, wielded exclusively. It is dangerous to suppose that medieval writers held to modern terminological definitions, with precise boundaries, that might allow events to be exactly reconstructed.[9] Instead, these writers try to show how even if there might be some differences, such as in training or experience, between the English and their enemies, that these might be compensated for in other areas, most importantly courage. The occasional instances when chroniclers use varied

---

4 Le Baker, *Chronicle*, pp. 152–53: 'validissimorum trux resistencia reperitur. Pugnant Anglici, repugnant Gallici, quorum dux, licet etatis premature, attamen, ira iuvenescens tyronis, egregios geminat actus [...] per omnia monstrans quod a regali stipite Francie non omnino degeneravit'. For Le Baker's criticisms of enemy rulers see pp. 74–75 above.

5 Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 88: 'stant pugnaces ex utraque parte morti quam fuge paraciores'.

6 For an examination of the use of typologies see Gribit, *Henry of Lancaster's Expedition*, pp. 23–34.

7 *Lanercost*: *armigeri* (squires) pp. 345, 348, 349, *equites* (horsemen) 346, 347, *homines armorum* (men-at-arms) 346, 347, *pedites* (footmen) 346, 347–48, and all together 347–48.

8 See for example Gray, *Scalacronica*, pp. 158, 166, 168, 172, 176, 178, 182, 184, also see p. lxiv (King's commentary on use of this word). For a thorough investigation of the glaive, in the context of other types of staff weapons, see Iason-Eleftherios Tzouriadis, 'The Typology and Use of Staff Weapons in Western Europe, *c*. 1400–*c*. 1550' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Leeds, 2017), pp. 72–85.

9 Dupuy, 'Clock-and-Bow', pp. 70–75, 81.

terminology or vocabulary to describe combatants seems, in most cases, to be merely for the sake of variety, or to demonstrate knowledge of obscure words.[10]

English letters and newsletters often try to describe the victims of attacks on unprofessional opponents, especially civilians forced to take up arms in self-defence, as reasonable and capable opponents. Edward III describes the defenders of Caen as resisting the English attack in 1346 and includes amongst them 'the commons, armed and capable of defence' and again, when listing casualties, as 'a great number of the commons'.[11] He explicitly states that amongst the defenders were the 'commons', but his declaration that they were 'armed and capable of defence' allows him to show them as fair adversaries for the English army attacking them. This letter was widely circulated and copied in a variety of forms, but in every one of them these terms are preserved intact so that the non-professional defenders can be seen as capable opponents.[12]

The English knight Bartholomew Burghersh similarly lists non-professionals fighting as combatants at Caen when he states that the 'commons of the country and the city, who had decided to have held the said city against the king, my lord, and all his power' were in the French force.[13] The English chronicler Henry Knighton integrates into his later chronicle a version of this letter, translated into Latin from the original Anglo-Norman, in which the civilians take up arms as 'citizens and countrymen, who had disposed themselves to have held the city against King Edward', and when casualties as 'burghers, truly, and the commons and rabble'.[14] His translated version makes more explicit the meaning of *communes* as amateurs drawn from the city's populace, rather than any sort of less wealthy or poorly equipped professional combatant. However, in both accounts those resisting are shown to be capable of doing so. They are not coerced or forced into acting against the besieging army, but rather fight of their own free will.

---

[10] See Allmand's consideration of the problems of understanding obscure military vocabulary, even when contextualised in manuals that should allow the reader to figure them out, through a case study of readers and translators of Vegetius' manual: Allmand, *'De re militari'*, pp. 148–96, 350–53.

[11] Edward III, 'Letter to London, 29 July 1346', pp. 83, 84: 'communes armez et defensables', 'communes grant nombre'.

[12] Edward III's 1346 letter to the archbishop of York, interpolated in *Lanercost*, pp. 342–43 (here 342): 'communes armes et defensables', 'communes grant noumbre'; a similar version, but integrated into the text without salutations, in *Anonimalle*, pp. 19–20 (here 20): 'communes armes et defensables', 'communes graunt noumbre'; Edward III, 'Lettre, fin de juillet 1346', p. 286: 'communes armés et defensables', 'communes graunt nombre'; reused and continued in Edward III, 'Letter to Lucy, 3 September 1346', p. 352: 'comunes armes et defensables', 'communes grant noumbre'.

[13] Burghersh's 1346 letter to John de Stratford, the archbishop of Canterbury, interpolated in Murimuth, *Continuatio*, pp. 202–03 (here 202): 'comuns de pais et de la ville, les queux se avoient ordeyne daver tenuz la dite ville encountre le roi mon seignur et tot soun poair'.

[14] Knighton, *Chronicle*, pp. 54, 56: 'ciuium et compatriotarum, qui disposuerant se tenuisse ciuitatem contra regem Edwardum', 'de burgensibus uero et communibus ac plebeis, capti sunt et mortui circiter .v. millia'.

Michael Northburgh portrays civilians who take up arms as combatants at Caen in a similar fashion.[15] In his newsletter he initially states that 'a great number of men-at-arms were in the city' and fought against the English.[16] However, he also includes civilians amongst the captured and killed, in perhaps questionable places: 'there were killed knights, squires, and other people of the city in great numbers, in the streets, houses, and in the gardens'.[17] Northburgh clearly tries to associate the less-than-capable 'other people of the city' with the more professional 'knights' and 'squires' by having them all killed together, implying that they willingly fought and died in the same combat. Although he shows an awareness of the qualitative difference between men-at-arms and lesser combatants, he still shows them to be willing and capable enemies.

These letters and newsletters portray what were clearly large numbers of undertrained, likely ill-equipped, civilians-by-profession, as casualties, as if they had been evenly matched combatants, so that the sack of Caen might be portrayed as a praiseworthy event in their narratives. They make no suggestion that any of these people were killed outside of combat or were actually unarmed, or perhaps not equal to the experienced English army. They suggest that those killed were fair opponents, licitly killed, because they had willingly fought against the English. The many letters and newsletters on this event that circulated, and their consistently skewed representation, suggests that there was a pervasive attempt to portray the event in this particular way that made the English look all the better, which was especially important considering the generally unsavoury nature of a sack.[18]

These accounts of evenly-matched combatants at Caen were widely accepted and used in English chronicles. All of them, in one way or another, attempt to paint the victims of the sack as willing combatants. The *Canterbury Chronicle* narrates the action as:

---

[15] Murimuth misidentifies Northburgh as the king's confessor: Murimuth, *Continuatio*, p. 212: 'confessor regis Angliae'. See also David R. Carlson, *John Gower: Poetry and Propaganda in Fourteenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2012), p. 39.

[16] Northburgh's 1346 newsletter, interpolated in Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus*, pp. 358–60 (here 359): 'graunt foisoun dez gentz darmes fusrent deinz la ville'; translated into Latin and interpolated in Murimuth, *Continuatio*, pp. 212–14 (here 213): 'galeatis et armatis aliis erat plena'.

[17] Northburgh's 1346 newsletter, interpolated in Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus*, pp. 358–60 (here 359): 'mortz chivalers, esquiers, et autres gentz de la ville graunt foisoun, en lez rues, mesouns, et es gardines'; translated into Latin and interpolated in Murimuth, *Continuatio*, pp. 212–14 (here 214): 'sunt occisi milites et armigeri et alii, in hortis, domibus, et plateis jacentes'.

[18] See also the 1346 letters of Thomas Bradwardine, chancellor of London St Paul's, to his friends in London interpolated in Murimuth, *Continuatio*, pp. 201–02; and Richard Wynkeley, Edward III's confessor, to the Prior and Convent of the Blackfriars in London, interpolated in Murimuth, *Continuatio*, pp. 215–17, 245–48 (MS 4 expanded version); this letter is also partially interpolated in Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus*, pp. 362–63.

> And then the enemies of the king of England in Caen prepared themselves to resist strongly, but at once, by the power of the said king, it was as though all the military of Normandy were captured or slaughtered [... and many prominent persons ...] and others, however, were captured or cut down to a great number, and shamefully took flight whoever could, and so that in the said city of Caen none remained and the said town was despoiled to its bare walls.[19]

John of Reading presents a similar account in which non-professionals are not mentioned at all.[20] Geoffrey le Baker makes the event into something closer to a battle and focuses on the skirmish outside rather than any events inside the city: 'by a great contest they entered the noble city of Caen, to the bridge, which was most sharply defended'.[21] But shortly afterwards in his narrative he makes it clear that any non-professionals killed had willingly fought against the English: 'of the citizens who resisted were killed more than one thousand and three hundred'.[22] John of Tynemouth simply declares that there were killed 'men-at-arms and the people', but then goes on to list prominent combatants captured, and thereby suggests that all killed had fought willingly.[23] The *Kirkstall Abbey Long Chronicle* states that some of the common people were killed in the event, without stating under which conditions this happened, while the *Eulogium historiarum* mentions the citizens amongst those who were captured, but not amongst the killed.[24]

---

[19] *Canterbury Chronicle*, ch. 3 (p. 4): 'et deinde inimici regis Anglie in Cadamo se ad resistendum fortiter parauerunt, sed statim dicti regis potencia quasi tota milicia Normannie extitit captiuata uel gladio trucidata, ubi captus fuerat constabularius Francie, comes de Eu, et camerarius de Tankeruille, qui ante alium conflictum Francie marescallus fuerat proclamatus, ceteri autem capti uel cesi sunt usque ad magnum numerum, et qui poterant fugam turpiter inierunt, ita quod in dicta ciuitate de Cadamo nullus remansit et dicta uilla fuit usque ad nudos parietes spoliata'.

[20] Reading, *Chronicle*, pp. 99–100: 'versus Cadomum progrediens villam, quasi omnibus, itinerando circumquaque, igne consumptis, .xxvi. die Julii ad pontem Cadomi viriliter munitum conflictum cum Normannis habuit nimis fortem, quo maxima multitudo Normannorum in vicis, domibus et hortis interierunt. Et captivatis comite de Ew, domino Tankervilo centumque militibus ac hominibus ad arma sexcentis, peditibus innumeratis, ad nudos usque parietes suburbium omnibus portabilibus et villa spoliata fuerunt'.

[21] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 80: 'cum magno certamine ingressi sunt nobilem civitatem de Came, ad pontem, qui acerrime fuerat defensus'.

[22] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 80: 'de civibus ville qui resistebant fuerunt occisi amplius quam mille trecenti'.

[23] Despite Galbraith's claim that he includes all portions of Tynemouth's text not included in the printed edition of Guisborough's chronicle and its continuation, a variant of Tynemouth's text for 1327–46, he fails to include the beginning of the Crécy campaign in his printed excerpts: Vivian H. Galbraith, 'Extracts from the *Historia aurea* and a French "Brut" (1317–47)', *English Historical Review*, 43 (1928), 203–17 (here 212–13); Tynemouth, *Historia*, MS 2.3 fol. 245^{v}: 'occisaq[ue] multitudine armato[rum] et plebis', MS 3 p. 579: 'occisaq[ue] ibide[m] armato[rum] m[u]ltitudine et plebis', MS 1 breaks off early.

[24] *Kirkstall*, fol. 82^{v}: 'vrbs Cadome[n]sis in manu valida subiugata est, ac ignis ince[n]dis non iusdicu[m] deformata, vbi occisa est m[u]ltitudo armato[rum] [et] plebis. Comesq[ue] de Eu co[n]stabulari[us] Fra[n]cie [et] cam[er]ari[us] de Tankerville cu[m] .lxxx. militib[us], [et] eo ampli[us]. Scutiferisq[ue] [et] burge[n]sib[us] no[n]nullis capti su[n]t'; which somewhat borrows from Tynemouth, *Historia*; *Eulogium*, 5.181 (III, 207): 'cum autem rex venisset ad Cadomum, illam in manu forti cepit et devastavit. Comitem de Ew constabilarium Franciae, de Tankervyle marescallum multosque alios barones ac milites, majorem civitatis cum populo multo cepit, quorum centum et .xl. in

The most famous attack on a city during Edward III's reign is undoubtedly Edward of Woodstock's 1370 assault and sack of Limoges. Jean Froissart describes the act in emotionally critical detail:

> Pillagers on foot, who were all set up to do evil and to raid the town and to kill men and women and children, for they had been commanded to do so. It was a great pity, for men, women, and children threw themselves to their knees before the prince and cried: 'Mercy, noble lord, mercy!' But he was so enflamed by ire that he did not listen at all, nor was any man or woman heard, but all, whoever they found or met with, were put to the sword, men and women who were not culpable at all. I do not know how they could not have pity for the poor people, who were not cut out to do any treason, but they paid for it, and paid more than the fine lords who had done it. There is none so hard a heart, if he had been at Limoges and thought himself on God, who would not have wept tenderly over the great wrong [or: suffering] done there, for more than three thousand individuals, men, women, and children, were there killed and beheaded that day. May God receive their souls, for they were indeed martyrs![25]

Here Froissart clearly attempts to condemn the English for their cruelty and targetting categories of civilians, who are empathised with so much that they are given the voice to ask for mercy, and concludes his judgement by labelling the victims as martyrs. This description has obvious parallels in *Lanercost*'s rhetorical narrative of David II's 1346 invasion of England, and explicitly states that the civilian victims are innocent and not responsible for any sort of actions against the English that might merit their deaths.

Many scholars attempt to reconcile Froissart's depiction of this act with the ethics of war and chivalric ideals that Woodstock ostensibly followed.[26] Barber argues that Froissart was

---

custodia comitis Huntyngdoniae commisit, maximam enim multitudinem interfecit'.

[25] Froissart, *Chronicles, 'B'*, § 666 (VII, 250): 'pillart à piet qui estoient tout apparilliet de mal faire et de courir le ville et de occire hommes et femmes et enfans, car ensi leur estoit il commandé. Là eut grant pité, car hommes, femmes et enfans se jettoient en genoulz devant le prince et crioient: "Merci, gentilz sires, merci!" Mais il estoit si enflammés d'aïr que point n'i entendoit, ne nuls ne nulle n'estoit oïs, mès tout mis à l'espée, quanques on trouvoit et encontroit, cil et celles qui point coupable n'i estoient. Ne je ne sçai comment il n'avoient pité des povres gens qui n'estoient mies tailliet de faire nulle trahison, mais cil le comparoient et comparèrent plus que li grant mestre qui l'avoient fait. Il n'est si durs coers, se il fust adonc à Limoges et il li souvenist de Dieu, qui ne plorast tenrement dou grant meschief qui y estoit, car plus de trois mil personnes, hommes, femmes et enfans, y furent deviiet et decolet celle journée. Diex en ait les ames, car il furent bien martir!' See also Froissart, *Chronicles, 'A'*, fols 332^{r}–332^{v}; *Chronicles, 'Amiens'*, § 809 (IV, 111); *Chronicles, 'C'*, fols 229^{r}–229^{v}; *Chronicles, 'N'*, pp. 501–02; *Chronicles, 'Rome'* ends well before this point.

[26] The ethical problems of the sack, especially in relation to the ideals of chivalry, are outlined by Kilgour, *Decline of Chivalry*, pp. 66–67.

merely depicting what he thought a typical sack was like and that the event was not nearly as violent, but he fails to ask why the depiction includes so many critical passages.[27] Others draw on this position and assert that sacks, like that in Froissart's narrative, were common and accepted in war, and blame any exaggeration on bias.[28] Skorge argues that Froissart's account of the sack, along with his elaborate description of defending knights demonstrating their prowess and surrendering to Woodstock, reflect the chronicler's concern with mercy.[29] Jones, in the most recent attempt to understand the event and its black reputation, draws on an assortment of record sources to argue that Froissart's account of Limoges is inaccurate.[30] He argues that the number of casualties was not as high as Froissart describes because, as he claims, the English were well disciplined and attacked only the castle and its combatant defenders, not the city of Limoges and its civilians. Jones gives prominent place to a previously unknown letter from Woodstock to Gaston Phébus, count of Foix (1331–91), recently discovered in a Spanish archive by Guilhem Pépin, that asserts that two hundred knights and men-at-arms were taken prisoner, and makes no mention of civilian victims.[31] He claims that Froissart exaggerated his account because he had heard oral testimony of English cruelty and wanted to craft a story of Woodstock that fit within existing literary traditions of the fallen hero. However, he does not seek to understand why Froissart would only display here, nearly at the end of his lengthy first book, any sort of empathy for the suffering of civilians in war when he had surely heard countless tales in his travels, or even why he might want to criticise Woodstock in such a viceral and damning fashion.

Scholars investigating Woodstock and the ethics of war have not yet examined the three English accounts of Limoges written during the reign of the Edward III.[32] If Froissart's description of the event as a violent and immoral massacre is untrue, as is supported by the various documents and Woodstock's letter, then we might expect English sources to report the event in

---

[27] Richard Barber, *Edward, Prince of Wales and Aquitaine: A Biography of the Black Prince* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1978), pp. 224–26, 264.

[28] Bradbury, *Medieval Siege*, pp. 161, 166, 318; Purton, *History of the Late Medieval Siege*, pp. 130–31. Hewitt also argues that Woodstock was encouraged to be harsh with the Limoges because of his debilitating condition Herbert J. Hewitt, 'The Organisation of War', in *The Hundred Years War*, ed. by Kenneth Fowler (London: Macmillan, 1971), pp. 75–95, pp. 120–21.

[29] See also Skorge, 'Ideals and Values in Froissart's *Chroniques*', pp. 118–20.

[30] Michael K. Jones, *The Black Prince* (London: Head of Zeus, 2017), pp. 360–68, 371–73, 405–08. See also Alfred Leroux, 'Le Sac de la cité de Limoges et son relèvement, 1370–1464', *Bulletin de la société archéologique & historique du Limousin*, 56 (1906), 155–233; Barber, *Edward III*, p. 410.

[31] Only Pépin knows where the document is held and has refused my requests to examine the letter. He claims to be currently producing an edition of the letter, but it is unknown when this will be published. I have therefore been unable to examine the rhetoric of this letter.

[32] Besides Pepin's transcript of Woodstock's letter Jones only examines two English sources, Chandos Herald's *La Vie du Prince Noir* and a version of Thomas Walsingham's chronicle, both of which were written after the death of Edward III, when English writings seem to take a different attitude towards English military activity.

a transparent fashion and heap praise on the action as a standard military victory. The *A Continuation* of Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon*, slightly modified here in the *Short Anglo-Norman Prose Brut Continuation*, begins its narrative of the event by stating that 'the city of Limoges rebelled against the prince, just as other cities in Aquitaine did, on account of heavy taxation'.[33] The text then states again that the city rebelled and 'because of which [Woodstock] was provoked. In returning towards England he subdued that [city] by harsh struggle and assault, and he nearly destroyed it down to the ground, [and] he killed and seized those who were found in it'.[34] The *St Albans A Continuation* of Higden's *Polychronicon* has a similar account, but with additional details:

> Several different fortified towns and castles in Gascony deserted the prince [Woodstock] on account of heavy taxation with which they were imposed, and adhered firmly to the king of France. Among them the city of Limoges withdrew itself from fealty to the lord prince. Afterwards he [Woodstock] undertook a dire siege, and by art of digging he destroyed [it] down to the ground, killing all the rebels [and] sparing few to live.[35]

These accounts all suggest that the attack is harsh and destructive, and that nearly everybody in the place, implied to be the city and not a separate castle, is killed. They paint the event as a rebellion, caused by taxation and disloyalty, but conceive the whole city as an entity that willingly participates in its rebellion against England, embodied as Woodstock.[36] There are no innocent victims here, only rebels who deserve the harshest treatment. These highly rhetorical descriptions were meant to allow the event to be praised as an example of good governance for

---

[33] Higden, *Polychronicon A Continuation*, 7.59 (p. 437): 'civitas Elinavicensis rebellavit contra principem sicut ceterae civitates in Aquitania, propter graves exactiones'; modified in *Short ANPB Continuation*, fol. 186^{r}: 'la cite de Limois [et] aut[re]s villes [et] chausteus en Gascoine deuindrent rebeux contre le p[ri]nce de ce qil lo[ur] lourmist graunt charges [et] imposic[i]ons uieu[n]t portables [et] la dite cite p[ar] cell[e] cause sei rendist al roy de F[ra]unce'.

[34] Higden, *Polychronicon A Continuation*, 7.59 (p. 437): 'quare exasperatus, in redeundo versus Angliam duris impugnationibus et insultibus illam expugnavit, et solo tenus fere destruxit, inventos in ea occidit et cepit'; modified in *Short ANPB Continuation*, fol. 186^{r}: 'p[ar] qi le p[ri]nce greuousement coruce en soun repeire v[er]s Englet[er]e il mist a cel poaist bu[n] es p[ar]tres dela attendre'.

[35] Higden, *Polychronicon SAA Continuation*, MS 1 fol. 297^{v}: 'plures ville munic[i]o[n]es varie et castella in Vasconia defecerunt a p[ri]ncipe p[ro]p[ter] graues exacciones illis impositas, et regi Francie adheserunt. Int[er]que ciuitas Lemouicensiu[m] a fidelitate d[omi]ni principis se subtraxit. Quam post diram obsidionem cepit, arte fodienciu[m] solo ten[us]q[ue] destruxit, quosq[ue] rebelles p[er]imens paucos ad vitam res[er]uans'.

[36] Barnie, Prestwich, and Green consider the historical and cultural contexts and conclude that the attack was in response to rebellion against Woodstock, and thus entirely legitimate, but do not look at any of the contemporary English sources or examine why Froissart's account is so critical: Barnie, *War in Medieval Society*, pp. 76–79, 168; Prestwich, *Armies and Warfare*, p. 239; David Green, *Edward the Black Prince: Power in Medieval Europe* (Harlow: Longman, 2007), pp. 91–93, 213–14.

putting down a rebellion. All the verbs in these descriptions are active third-person singular to better attribute the actions to Woodstock himself and thus praise his military skills.

Chandos Herald's commemorative biographical poem (*c.* 1385) follows a similar style of representation. Tyson states that the poet's objectives are 'to speak well of his hero and omit any reference which might detract from the Prince's glory or offend his patron'.[37] This is certainly evident in Chandos Herald's account of the event:

> Limoges, the good city,
> was surrendered by treachery [to the French].
> And the prince [Woodstock] came to this place,
> who held the siege in front
> until he gained it by assault,
> then he had a very high heart
> because there was [Guillaume III] Roger of Beaufort [1332–95],
> who exerted himself to hold it,
> and Sir Jean de Villemur,
> who said that he could guard the wall,
> and a good three hundred men-at-arms,
> besides the burghers of the place therein.
> But all were killed there or taken
> by the noble prince of renown.[38]

Chandos Herald, like the contemporary accounts, does not mention civilians as victims but shows the burghers to take an active part in the defense, thus asserting, like the accounts of Caen, that all victims were culpable. The final two lines only are cited in most of the above discussed scholarship in direct contrast to Froissart's account to show callous disinterest in the massacre amongst English writers. Jones, however, claims that the poet here is 'likely referring to those bearing arms rather than the civilian population as a whole' to support his own argument that

---

[37] Chandos Herald, *La Vie du Prince Noir*, ed. by Diana B. Tyson (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1975), p. 35, also see pp. 15–18 (composition date, although Godfried Croenen argues that the text was composed earlier, per personal correspondence).

[38] Chandos Herald, *Vie du Prince Noir*, lines 4037–50 (pp. 159–60): 'Limoges, la bone citée, / fuist rendue par fauxetée. / Et li prince celle part vint / qui par devant l'assiege tient / tan qe il le gaigna par assaut, / dont moult ot le coer haut / car la fui Rogier de Beaufort, / qi de tenir se fesoit fort, / et monsire Johan de Villemur, / qui dist q'il garderoit le mure, / et des gent d'armes bien trois centz, / sanz les burgeises de par dedeins. / Mais touz y feurent mortz ou pris / par le noble prince de pris'.

there were, in reality, no civilians killed.[39] However, it is clear that the poet employs his words with care here to praise Woodstock, rather than to transparently report the action. He describes the attack as fought only between the English army and the defenders of Limoges, and quietly mentions that all the defenders were captured or killed.

It is clear from a comparison of Froissart's account with the contemporary accounts and Chandos Herald's laudatory poem that there is a conscious rhetorical strategy amongst the English texts. All four of those examined here are clear to paint the victims of the attack as culpable, either as rebels, which makes them deserve harsh treatment at the hands of the English victors, or combatants who are treated according to convention, captured or killed in combat. Their narratives make it clear that none of them felt that the attack on Limoges was inherently praiseworthy, let alone justified, without the addition of so many qualifiers. These writers follow the common style of siege narratives, such as are found in the many accounts of Caen examined above, and likewise appear to have had anxieties about its depiction.

It is beyond the scope of this thesis to make any claims about the reality of specific events in late medieval war, but it would be surprising if the assault on Limoges did not result in attacks on at least some civilians, as it was common practice in sieges and an expected bonus for those in the attacking army. Although I have been unable to examine the rhetoric of Woodstock's letter to Foix, I suspect that it too follows the narrative strategies found in the English accounts examined above. It is only to be expected that Woodstock would not mention civilians as victims in his letter, regardless of whether his forces had attacked them or not, given late medieval attitudes towards civilians and the ethics of war. We should be more suspicious of what Woodstock claims in his letter on Limoges because, after all, he had a greater motivation to distort the truth than anybody else, even Froissart.

English writers, on the other hand, were eager to emphasise the inability of their own men when they were defeated. The *Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* describes how, at receiving news of the Scottish invasion of 1319, the English respond:

> All those who could serve rose up together, and so monks, priests, friars and canons, as well as seculars [...] alas, such anger and such loss, for the English freeholders, who knew nothing of war, were killed there and drowned in the

[39] M. K. Jones, *Black Prince*, p. 406.

> estuary [...] alas, for there were killed many men of religion, priests, clerks, and seculars.[40]

Here, in the battle of Myton, or the so-called 'White Battle', that was fought to the northwest of York, the writer demonstrates how the problems of disproportionately capable forces affect the results of battle. He describes how the English force was made up of categories of civilians-by-profession rather than proper combatants so that the defeat might be properly lamented as an immoral attack. This battle was viewed as an archetype for this sort of event, where an incapable force, made up of priests and other civilians, bravely defended against the invading Scots. Indeed, a reader of Higden's *Polychronicon* added a marginal note next to the narrative of the battle of Neville's Cross that labels it as 'The White Battaile'.[41]

English writers were keenly aware of the problems of depicting combatants killing others who were not capable of fighting back effectively. Indeed, it is hard to imagine how it might be praiseworthy to kill somebody who did not, or could not, offer any real resistance. In most cases English writers attempt to portray their victims, when they are mentioned at all, as if they were capable combatants, regardless of what might have happened in reality. This allowed them to side-step the ethical problem of attacking and killing people who by all accounts should not be targetted in war, but were frequently forced to take up arms to defend their cities or homes. When the English were the victims in these situations, which was rare in this period, they sometimes happily complain about the immorality of the enemy for attacking them and celebrate the slain as akin to martyrs, just as Jean Froissart does in his account of Limoges.

2. DOING VIOLENCE

Writers often praise English victories through more abstract and stylised portrayals of military action. Violent acts, the constituent activities that make up these victories in reality, are rarely detailed or mentioned at all in an explicit sense. The few writers that do praise these acts do so in often colourful and elaborated descriptions. These do not signify any sort of eyewitness testimony as an original source, as is commonly believed.[42] They are instead carefully written to brush aside or ignore any possible immoral aspects of these actions. I argue that this type of

---

[40] *Long ANPB*, ch. 192 (pp. 237–38): 'ils leuerent comunement tous qe poaient trauailer, sibien moignes, prestres, freres [et] chanoun come seculers [...] allas, quelle colour [et] quelle damage, qar les Engleis housbonde qe rien ne sauoient de guerre illoeqes furent tuez et noiez en vne bras du meer [...] allas, qar illoeqes furent tuez plusours gentz de religion, prestres, clerks [et] seculers'.

[41] Higden, *Polychronicon*, MS 98, fol. 364^{v}.

[42] See pp. 26–27 above.

careful description is intentional and allows writers to praise violent acts as extreme manifestations of hard-won victory.

English writers praise violent acts but often minimise the victims and their suffering that resulted. Geoffrey le Baker describes Edward of Woodstock's attack on the French at the battle of Poitiers with care: 'then the eager prince of Wales roars, hews them with his biting longsword, trims lances, beats back blows, renders nought their efforts, lifts up fallen, and teaches enemies how furious is the desperation under the cloak of Mars'.[43] Woodstock here is described doing violent acts, but his victims are almost entirely abstracted. The writer mentions only actions and minimises the resulting effects on enemy combatants, either generally or individually. There is no hint of any weapon striking people and causing wounds, or any sort of suffering that might result from Woodstock's violence. These actions are instead praised for supporting a campaign and battle that are seen as acts of justice and righteousness.

In contrast to these restrained depictions of English violence, writers commonly describe and emphasise the painful consequences of enemy combatants' actions against the English. Shortly after the above-quoted description of Edward of Woodstock at the battle of Poitiers, Geoffrey le Baker describes the actions of Jean II: 'these [combatants] he bashes the brains from, others he runs through, with these he cuts off mouths or shatters faces, those he disembowels, and some he beheads'.[44] Superficially, these descriptions of Woodstock and Jean appear to be straightforwardly narrated violent acts of combatants. However, it is clear that Le Baker portrays the French leader in a less flattering light by showing him as ruled by his own anger and, consequently, having bloodthirsty desires that affect his conduct. He shows how Jean's violence has explicit consequences, unlike Woodstock's. The gruesome injuries are highlighted here rather than abstracted and imply that he caused people to suffer rather than harmlessly do combat with the enemy.

Writers prefer to praise military action in their narratives but typically abstract the victims so that violent acts might be praised without criticisms of the violent actions. In some cases writers deliberately downplay the harm caused by archery, an indiscriminate weapon. The *French Chronicle of London* describes a variety of English missiles used to suppress the enemy so that the English can move in and fight hand-to-hand at the naval battle of Sluys:

---

[43] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 151: 'tunc fremit instans Wallie princeps, Gallos mutilans mordaci spata, lanceas truncat, ictus reverberat, nisus adnihilat, lapsos sublevat, et docet hostes quam furiosa sit desperacio sub toga Martis'.

[44] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, pp. 152–53: 'hos excerebrans, alios confodiens, hiis ora rescindit aut facies contundit, illos eviscerat, quosdam detruncat'.

> Our archers and our crossbowmen began to loose [missiles] as thickly as hail falls in winter, and our engineers hurled so harshly that the French did not have the power to look around or to hold up their heads. And while this assault lasted, our English people with great force entered their galleys and fought with the French hand to hand, and then ejected from their ships and galleys.[45]

William Dene similarly states that 'the English archers thus surrounded the Scots so that they [the Scots] were not able to lift their heads', in his description of the battle of Neville's Cross.[46] The *Lanercost Chronicle* describes the English archers being used for tactical purposes, rather than to kill or severely wound enemy combatants, at Dupplin Moor 'the Scots were defeated mainly by the archers of the English, who so blinded and wounded in the face the first group of Scots by their continuous blows of arrows that they [the Scots] could not help themselves'.[47] Shortly thereafter he similarly asserts that at the battle of Halidon Hill:

> The Scots arriving in the first group are wounded and were so wounded in the face and blinded by a multitude of archers of England in this battle, just as earlier at Gledenmore [Dupplin Moor], that they could not help themselves, and therefore quickly began to avert their faces from blows of arrows and to fall.[48]

These accounts by *Lanercost* use only the generic term 'wounded' and show the enemy hiding their vulnerable faces from the incoming arrows to suggest that English archery was not necessarily overly brutal or violent, but merely other blows common to battle, as is especially clear when contrasted with Le Baker's description of Jean II at Poitiers.[49] These descriptions try to sidestep the violence and suffering that was surely caused by the English archers, and portray these events in more abstracted terms of weapon and action only, so that they might be seen as more morally palatable.

Many English sources focus on alternative uses of archery, rather than the direct violent results. The *Short Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* (in the Leeds manuscript only) expresses the power

---

[45] *London French*, p. 77: 'nos archers et nos arblasters comenserent à trere si espessement come grisil chiet en yver, et nos enginours getterent si durement, qe les Fraunceis n'avoyent poer de regarder ne lour testes sustener. Et endementers qe cele assaut durra, nos gentz Engleisse ove graunt force entrerent en lour galeyes et ove les Fraunceis meyn à meyn combaterent, et hors de lour niefs et galeyes engetterent'.

[46] Dene, *Rochester*, fol. 94^{r}: 'sagittarii Anglici Scotos ita circumdederunt: quod capita leuare non valerent'.

[47] *Lanercost*, p. 268: 'victi sunt Scotti maxime per sagittarios Anglicorum, qui primam aciem Scottorum ita exeaecaverunt [*sic*] et vulneraverunt in facie continuis ictibus sagittarum quod non poterant se juvare'.

[48] *Lanercost*, pp. 273–74: 'Scotti in prima acie venientes ita fuerunt a multitudine sagittariorum Angliae vulnerati in facie et excaecati in hoc bello, sicut in priori apud Gledenmore, quod se ipsos adjuvare non poterant, et ideo cito faciem sagittarum ictibus avertere et cadere inceperunt'.

[49] See, however, the literal acceptance of the 'rain of arrows' of massed longbowmen: C. J. Rogers, 'Edward III', p. 89; C. J. Rogers, *War, Cruel and Sharp*, p. 268.

of archers rather than simply their missiles at the battle of Halidon Hill: 'the archers of England destroyed and harmed them, so that in a short time they were choked and blinded, and were soon in distress'.[50] The *Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* also uses indirect language, mixed with some direct descriptions of killing, when it describes how at the same battle the English archers 'loosed arrows as thickly as are the rays of the sun, and so attacked the Scots that they laid them low by many thousands and they began to flee from the English to save their lives'.[51] Both writers here use allusive language rather than direct description of violence and killing.

Few chroniclers present the actions of archers and their victims more directly. Geoffrey le Baker describes the English archers at the battle of Poitiers making a more direct and discriminate attack:

> [The archers] shoot arrows at the rear of the [mounted French men-at-arms'] horses. For which reason the wounded destriers kicked and threw their riders, and, turned back against their men, brought no small amount of havoc, not restraint, to their lords.[52]

The writer suggests that archers might simply disrupt and disorganise the enemy, and encourage their flight, rather than kill or maim them outright. It also shows the horses revolting against the French to further suggest the unjust governance of their king. This sort of allusive and non-fatal description allows writers to focus on movements and abstracted notions of achievement, rather than focus on the suffering that results from violent acts in battle.

Writers sometimes describe the violence of archery directly but are mostly sure to remove their agents, the archers, from doing it. Instead of mentioning the English or their archers, they simply mention the violent results, with a slight suggestion of suffering. Geoffrey le Baker indicates the strength of English missiles at the naval battle of Sluys when he describes them as 'an iron rain of bolts from crossbows and arrows from bows drew thousands of people down into death'.[53] Although he shows the injuries endured by the victims of this attack, his description carefully omits any mention of the archers who employ these missiles and focuses on the weaponry and resulting injury instead. Le Baker's mention of only the agency of weapons and

---

[50] *Short ANPB*, p. 166: 'les archers Dengleterre les desbaretta et greva, ainsi qils estoient en petite hure auxi come estuffez et envoegles, et tost perdirent lour contenance'.

[51] *Long ANPB*, ch. 223 (p. 316): 'treerent seetz si espessement come sount rays en la solail, [et] ensi ferrerent ils les Escotz qe ils lour mistrent avale par plusours millers et ils comencerent de fuier de les Engleis pur saluer lour viez'.

[52] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 148: 'ad equorum posteriora sagittare. Quo facto, saucii dextrarii calcitrarunt, insidentes eiis proruerunt, et, contra suos reversi, stragem non modicam intulerunt eorum dominis'.

[53] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 68: 'ferreus imber quarellorum de balisitis atque sagittarum de arcubus in necem milia populi detraxit'. See also p. 158 below.

missiles, rather than the English combatants who wielded them, allows him to highlight the power of English capabilities in war and also avoid any suggestion that the English were directly to blame for the injuries that result.

Other writers prefer to give only vague, formulaic summaries of the violent results of battles and other military action. The *Lanercost Chronicle* only once in its narrative on the battle of Neville's Cross, at the very end, directly describes violence, but only for stylistic purposes in a formulaic fashion, which is not intended to praise the actual acts of battle. The text abstractly describes 'trumpets sounding, shields clashing, arrows flying, spears piercing, struck men calling out, and troops yelling, with armour penetrated, heads shattered, and more, alas! strewn on the field'.[54] None of these descriptions, nor others that are equally allusive and indirect, are linked to specific victims, in their narratives of war. This allows the writers to avoid celebrating any victor, as only victims are listed. *Lanercost* follows this brief formulaic statement with a casualty list of only two killed and five captured. This contrasts with the *Anonimalle Chronicle*'s far more chivalric and less violent description of events based on the *Minorite Chronicle*, a shared source, that begins with a list of some prominent persons and the organisation of the armies, as *Lanercost* does. The chronicle then declares that the combatants 'clashed strongly and fiercely for a long time and two times or three times they rested by agreement, and then fought [again]. In this conflict lances were shattered, swords broken, coats of mail broken, helms and bascinets knocked off and shields split'.[55] It is followed by several other direct descriptions of individual achievements, and ends with a casualty list of twenty-two killed and fifteen captured. *Anonimalle* adds these many details on the conventions agreed between armies to make the event appear less hostile, and simultaneously omits the formulaic violence's victims by mentioning only equipment damaged instead of people injured or killed. *Lanercost* provides far less praise than *Anonimalle* and focuses instead on the lamentable aspects of battle and its victims in a style that is meant to present a panorama of the event, including many audible and violent elements.[56]

It seems that it was difficult if not impossible for English writers to celebrate the results of violence when they also praise combatants for explicitly performing these actions. Some

---

[54] *Lanercost*, p. 351: 'tubis clangentibus, scutis concurrentibus, sagittis volantibus, hastis perforantibus, percussis proclamantibus, et turmis ululantibus, armis penetratis, capitibus conquassatis, pluribis, proh dolor! in campo prostratis'.

[55] *Anonimalle*, p. 27: 'fortement et egrement par long temps entreferrerent et deux foitz ou trois foitz par assent reposerent et puis combaterent. En quele conflykte launces furrent frussez, espeis debrisez, haubergeouns desmaillez, helmes et bacynetz availlez et escues desquarterez'. *Durham LPB* lacks these formulaic and general details.

[56] See also Allmand, 'Some Writers', p. 169.

writers, rarely, use violence and downplay impact for symbolic purposes so that they can better praise the military action. In such cases injuries are only mentioned when inflicted on prominent persons, such as kings. Such incidents were rare in reality and when they are mentioned in narratives they are used for particular purposes. Several English sources on the battle of Neville's Cross describe David II's arrow wounds to the head and associate them with his attempt to flee. A contemporary letter from John Fossor to Thomas Hatfield states with a vindictive tone that 'David, who calls himself king of the Scots, was captured, gravely wounded with an arrow in the face: many, truly, of the more valiant men of all Scotland were killed and lie upon the moor of Bearpark, miserably stripped'.[57] The *Prophetic Latin Prose 'Brut'*, which might have been informed by Fossor's letter, states that 'the Scots turned to leave, because of which many escaped, but many more were killed' and many 'were captured who afterwards were sent to the tower of London. But because David Bruce was wounded in the face by two arrows' he had to remain in the north for treatment.[58]

English narratives sometimes connect flight and injury more explicitly. Adam Murimuth states that 'in which flight was captured David the Bruce, who calls himself the king of the Scots', and then the English prepared to send him to the Tower of London for incarceration, but 'because of two wounds which he had in the head, when he was struck by two arrows' he had to wait and receive medical treatment.[59] 'Tractatus belli apud Crucem', a popular Latin poem on the battle, makes a similar connection and states that David II attempts to flee, but is stopped and captured by the English squire John Copeland (d. 1363). 'But', the poet jokingly asserts, David 'is not thus sound, because archers / with iron arrows visited [his] teeth'.[60] English texts written after 1377 associate injury with flight in a more explicit fashion, such as the *Middle English Prose Brut* (Peculiar Version to 1436, Group A), which summarises the action as: 'þere were slayne the chiualry of Scottelond. And there was Dauid, the Kyng of Scottes, taken fleying,

---

[57] Fossor, 'Letter to Hatfield, October 1346', p. 388: 'David, se dicens regem Scotiae, captus est, cum sagitta in facie graviter vulneratus: multis vero de valentioribus totius terrae Scotiae interfectis et jacentibus super moram de Bello-Redditu miserabiliter denudatis'.

[58] *Prophetic LPB*, fol. 38^{r}: 'Scoti terga v[er]terunt ex quibus pl[u]res euaserunt. S[et] multi pl[u]res occubuerunt [...] capti fuerunt qui postea ad Turrum Londonia[rum] mittebant[ur]. S[et] q[uia] Dauid Brus vulnerabat[ur] in facie de duabis sagittis'; borrowed in both *Short ANPB Continuation*, fol. 177^{v}: 'les enemis p[ri]strent le fuyte des queux les vns eschaperent, mes pluso[ur]s furent morts [...] furent p[ri]s [et] enuoiez al Tour de Loundres mes p[ur] ceo q[e] Dauid Bruz fust naufre en sa vise de deus seetis'; and *Long ANPB Continuation*, fol. 197^{r}: 'les Escotz furent descounfitz [et] Dauid Roi Descoce pris [...] qi furent pris de guerre maundetz a la Tour de Loundres, et David, p[ur] ceo qil fuist naufre en la face de deux setes'.

[59] Murimuth, *Continuatio*, pp. 218, 219: 'in qua fuga capti fuerunt David le Bruys, qui se dicit regem Scociae', 'dominus David le Bruys mitti non potuit, propter duas plagas quas habuit in capite, cum duabus sagittis percussus'.

[60] 'Tractatus belli apud Crucem', lines 217–18: 'set non ita sanus est, quin architenentes / cum sagittis ferreis visitabant dentes'.

smytte thrughe þe nose with an Arowe', and Henry Knighton, who states that David 'fled from the battle and was wounded by an arrow in the head, and captured'.[61] In contrast to contemporary sources, which are slightly more ambiguous on the order of events, both of these later sources assert that David was injured while fleeing, like Murimuth, to imply it is a sort of corporeal punishment for his cowardice.

English sources often depict similar injuries that are inflicted on Philippe VI at the battle of Crécy. These probably all derive from two contemporary and supposedly-eyewitness newsletters that circulated widely after the battle. The letter of Richard Wynkeley, Edward III's confessor, interpolated in Adam Murimuth's *Continuatio chronicarum*, states that Philippe 'was struck in the face with an arrow and barely escaped', while Michael Northburgh's newsletter, interpolated in Robert of Avesbury's *De gestis mirabilibus Edwardi III*, states that he was wounded, but without giving any details.[62] The *Peterborough Chronicle* picks up on this and states that 'Philippe, king of France, was vehemently wounded by an arrow and fled'.[63] Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon* adds more details: 'Philippe, king of France, had arrows shot in the thigh and throat, and twice by the king of the English subdued, and fled', and its *St Albans A Continuation* more clearly states that 'the king of France was wounded in the throat and twice in the thigh by the king of the English, and fled on his horse'.[64] The *Eulogium historiarum* gives a similar account, but exaggerates Philippe's injuries by claiming that he 'was twice dehorsed and wounded in the thigh and in the throat, in his jaw carrying one arrow, thus he barely escaped'.[65] These accounts, like those of David II's injury, clearly associate Philippe's injury with his flight, but some make it more explicit that one was the cause of the other.

English descriptions of enemy kings receiving injuries in battle were not merely attempts to recount what happened in reality. These details provide additional symbolic meaning in their

---

[61] *The Brut*, p. 543 (London, British Library, MS Harley 53); Knighton, *Chronicle*, p. 72: 'fugit de prelio et uulneratus est de una sagitta in capite, et captus'; similarly in Thomas de Burton, *Chronica monasterii de Melsa, a fundatione usque ad annum 1396*, ed. by Edward A. Bond, RS, 43, 3 vols (London: Longman, 1866–68), III, 62: 'ipse David de Bruyz, rex Scotiae, in facie sagitta vulneratus, a certamine declinavit, et fugiens captus est'. On this version of the *Brut* see Matheson, *Prose 'Brut'*, pp. 296–301.

[62] Wynkeley's 1346 letter to the Prior and Convent of the Blackfriars in London, interpolated in Murimuth, *Continuatio*, pp. 215–17 (here 216): 'percussus in facie cum sagitta, vix evasit'; a fragment which does not extend as far as Crécy is also interpolated in Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus*, pp. 362–63; Northburgh's 1346 newsletter, interpolated in Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus*, pp. 367–69 (here 369): 'Phelip de Valoise [...] eschaperent naufrez'.

[63] *Peterborough*, p. 168: 'rex Franciae Philippus vehementer vulneratus a sagittariis, fugam fecit'.

[64] Higden, *Polychronicon*, 7.44 (VIII, 342): 'Philippus rex Franciae in femore et gutture sagittatus, bisque per regem Angliae debellatus, aufugit'; *Osney*, p. 353: 'Philippus rex Franciae in femore et in gutture vulneratus'; Higden, *Polychronicon SAA Continuation*, MS 1, fol. 294^{r}: 'rex Francie vulneratus e[t] in gutt[ur]e et femore [et] bis p[er] rege[m] Anglie equs suo derettus'.

[65] *Eulogium*, 5.182 (III, 210–11): 'bis decaballatus et in femore et in gutture vulneratus, portans in maxilla sua unam sagittam, sic vix evasit'.

narratives. Indeed, Philippe VI was not actually injured at the battle of Crécy. Richard Wynkeley and Michael Northburgh express their doubts in their first-hand accounts by including the caveat of 'as it is said' in their reports.[66] Contemporary and later readers also understood this injury to be untrue, as the passage is crossed out from a manuscript of a variant of Adam Murimuth's *Continuatio chronicarum* that integrates Wynkeley's letter into its narrative, as well as from the *Lanercost Chronicle*, which Stevenson fails to note in his edition and, consequently, butchers the remaining half of the sentence to make it join up with the preceding text.[67] The few other words crossed out in these two manuscripts are obviously scribal errors, rather than details that readers found untrue.[68] Additionally, no French sources mention Philippe's injury at Crécy at all.[69] Despite the clear evidence against it occurring in reality, some later English sources still repeat this spurious account.[70] On the other hand, contemporary records indicate that David II, while en route to London for his long incarceration by the English, had one arrow removed from his head at Bamburgh castle because his injury was too serious to ignore.[71] Another supposed eyewitness newsletter from the battle fails to mention David's injury at the battle, but this is probably because it focuses on other sorts of details.[72]

Writers explicitly describe particular injuries for rhetorical purposes, regardless of whether they happened in reality. Thigh wounds, mentioned in a few of the above sources and others, are often meant to symbolise emasculation.[73] The choice of the head as the place to be injured was not merely a coincidence, nor did it suggest that the victim was meant to be shown as more seriously injured. Head injuries were not always fatal and were treated successfully if

---

66 Murimuth, *Continuatio*, pp. 215–17 (here 216): 'ut dicitur'; Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus*, pp. 367–69 (here 369): 'a ceo qe homme dist'. See also Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, pp. 8–9.

67 Italic text crossed out: Murimuth, *Continuatio*, p. 247 and n. 2 (MS 4, fol. 136^{v}): 'rex v[ero] Franc[ie] *ut dicebatur p[er]cussus in facie cu[m] sagitta*'; Stevenson edits the passage in *Lanercost*, p. 344: 'similiter rex Philippus in ejus armis fugiendo', however, the MS at fol. 243^{v} reads 'si[militer] rex Ph[ilippu]s in suis ei[us] armis fugiendo *qua[ttuor] saggitas ha[bu]it bu[cca] fixas*'.

68 Murimuth, *Continuatio*, MS 4, fols 115^{r}, 132^{v}, 133^{v}, 135^{v}; *Lanercost*, fols 231^{r}, 232^{r}, 237^{v} (all in rubric).

69 DeVries briefly mentions this but does not consider the rhetorical implications, and Rogers and Prestwich ignore the disparity and accept these accounts: DeVries, *Infantry Warfare*, p. 172; C. J. Rogers, *War, Cruel and Sharp*, p. 269; Michael Prestwich, 'The Battle of Crécy', in *The Battle of Crécy, 1346*, ed. by Andrew Ayton and Philip Preston Bart (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005), pp. 139–57 (here 154).

70 See for example Burton, *Melsa*, III, 58: 'Philippus quidem sic jam tertio confusus et vulneratus'; Knighton, *Chronicle*, p. 62: 'percussus est in facie cum una sagitta, dextrariusque eius occisus est, ascenditque alium competem et fugit'.

71 'Woodhouse's Roll', in John E. Morris, 'Mounted Infantry in Mediaeval Warfare', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 8 (1914), 101–02. See also Walter Bower, *Scotichronicon*, ed. by Donald E. R. Watt, 9 vols (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1987–98), VII, 464 n. 35.

72 Samson, 'Lettre aux amys, 1346'.

73 Jed Chandler, 'Eunuchs of the Grail', in *Castration and Culture in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Larissa Tracy (Woodbridge: Brewer, 2013), pp. 229–54 (here 238–44). See also David Green, 'Masculinity and Medicine: Thomas Walsingham and the Death of the Black Prince', *Journal of Medieval History*, 35 (2009), 34–51.

they were not too extreme.[74] Instead it seems that these injuries were meant to show the kings as incapable of governing themselves or thinking rationally, as contemporary medical theorists advocate, such as Guy de Chauliac in his *Chirurgia magna* (1363).[75] Descriptions of rulers being injured in the head had symbolism for the body politic, in which the head represents the ruler, as the leading part of the whole country and its people.[76] As a result of this injury the king is shown to be unable to fulfil his leadership role and thus the whole country suffers.[77] The inclusion of these symbolic details by English writers, in often similar language, meant to show Philippe VI and David II as unsuitable to rule their kingdoms, let alone conduct war against the English. They also paint the enemy leaders as cowards for attempting to leave the battles in which they are injured, especially in contrast to the depictions of their men fighting to the death in their stead. English writers clearly contrasted these images with the sound and calculated decisions of English military leaders. These deliberately partisan descriptions show the English as the superior rulers in every way.

English writers were careful in their descriptions of violent actions in war. They mostly present the acts in an abstracted sense, or remove the English as agents from violence. When they do mention violence they use it for very particular ends, mostly to criticise the enemy through literary tropes, but never to revel in killing. This suggests an anxiety over the common events of war and their moral value, rather than any blind acceptance of them as praiseworthy. The few direct mentions of violence stand out from the rest of the narrative that they are found in, partly due to their rarity. Writers did not use them to revel in violent acts done against their

---

[74] Michael McVaugh, *The Rational Surgery of the Middle Ages* (Tavarnuzze: SISMEL, Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2006), pp. 126–31; Michael Livingston, '"The depth of six inches": Prince Hal's Head-Wound at the Battle of Shrewsbury', in *Wounds and Wound Repair in Medieval Culture*, ed. by Larissa Tracy and Kelly DeVries (Leiden: Brill, 2015), pp. 215–30. See also Jon Clasper, 'The Management of Military Wounds in the Middle Ages', in *Wounds in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Anne Kirkham and Cordelia Warr (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), pp. 17–39.

[75] Guy de Chauliac, *Inventarium sive Chirurgia magna*, ed. by Michael McVaugh, 2 vols (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 1.2.1 (I, 31–34). Chauliac's text was popular in its Latin form and also survives in 14 MSS in two complete and two partial translations into Middle English, as well as another 3 MSS in Middle French: George R. Reiser, 'Works of Science and Information', in *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050–1500*, ed. by Burke J. Severs, Albert E. Hartung, and Peter G. Beidler, 11 vols so far (New Haven: Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1967–), X, 3593–3952 (here 3646–48, 3831–32); Galderisi, ed., *Translations*, no. 297 (II, 540–41).

[76] See for example John of Salisbury, *Policratici*, ed. by Clement Charles Julian Webb, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909), 5.2 (I, 282–84); Anton-Hermann Chroust, 'The Corporate Idea and the Body Politic in the Middle Ages', *Review of Politics*, 9 (1947), 423–52.

[77] Larissa Tracy, '"Into the hede, throw the helme and creste": Head Wounds and a Question of Kingship in the Stanzaic *Morte Arthur*', in *Wounds and Wound Repair in Medieval Culture*, ed. by Larissa Tracy and Kelly DeVries (Leiden: Brill, 2015), pp. 496–518. See also Esther Cohen, 'The Meaning of the Head in High Medieval Literature', in *Disembodied Heads in Medieval and Early Modern Culture*, ed. by Catrien Santing, Barbara Baert, and Traninger Anita (Leiden: Brill, 2013), pp. 59–76.

enemies, but instead for other symbolic meanings, most notably to praise English combatants for participating in such challenging encounters or to criticise enemy leaders.

3. ENDURING SUFFERING

English historical literature consistently minimises the suffering of enemy combatants in their descriptions of warfare. As shown above, this can be easily achieved through removal of English agency for these acts or to omit the victims of violent acts. Writers are careful in their narratives because suffering in war was typically and deliberately linked to asceticism so that it could be made commendable. It is consequently difficult for English writers to show the enemy suffering from the violence of their men in battle and elsewhere.

English writers only very rarely link violence directly to the suffering that results, but not to revel in the enemy's pain as a sort of justice.[78] Geoffrey le Baker includes descriptions of violence at the naval battle of Sluys, but focuses on the missiles and their results and ignores those who loosed them, as examined above.[79] However, he also states that 'stones thrown from mast towers bashed the brains from many'.[80] He includes similarly allusive descriptions of violence at the battle of Poitiers in a few instances. When describing the English movement through enemy lines to better attack the enemy leaders, in the height of battle, he provides a visceral description of the effects of English attacks on the French:

> [Their] flags tottered, flag-bearers fell down, these trampled on their poured out entrails, others vomited out teeth, many were fixed to the ground, a few standing lost arms that had been cut off. These dying men rolled themselves around in the blood of others, lamented fallen weights, and the proud souls departing from the slack body, they uttered dire groans. The servile blood and royal blood run in one stream, and the nearby streams empurpled the fishes fed on luxurious nectar.[81]

---

[78] See also Esther Cohen, *The Modulated Scream: Pain in Late Medieval Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009), pp. 44–47.

[79] See pp. 152–53 above.

[80] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 68: 'lapides a turribus malorum proiecti multos excerebrarunt'.

[81] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 152: 'vexilla titubarunt, vexillarii corruerunt, hii sua viscera fusa calcarunt, alii dentes evomuerunt, multi terre fixi fuerunt, nonnulli stantes brachia precisa perdiderunt. Hii morientes alieno cruore se volutarunt, pondera lapsa gemuerunt, et anime superbe, corpus ignavum deserentes, diros gemitus emiserunt. Cruor servilis et sanguis regalis uno gurgite cucurrerunt, et vicina fluenta purpurantes pisces delicato nectare paverunt'.

Le Baker does not explicitly or directly link the violent actions of Edward of Woodstock or any of his named leaders, as described above, with this resulting suffering or brutality. Instead, he gives a more general and vague sense of the action, even though the enemy are shown to suffer.

The portion of Le Baker's description that is the most violent, which describes the above bloodshed, disembowelment, and loss of limbs, is not based on eyewitness testimony and therefore 'real', as is commonly argued to be the case when writers provide these sorts of seemingly realistic descriptions.[82] In my research I have identified the source of the chronicler's imagery here as the Roman poet Marcus Annaeus Lucanus' *De bello civili* (62–65 CE), which stylistically describes the violence and killing at Pharsalia in similar language, by asking

> Through whose entrails does the deadly wound
> pass? What sort of man tramples on his vitals poured on the ground?
> What sort of man faced the adversary and, falling, the sword in his throat
> expelled with his dying spirit? What sort of man collapses stricken?
> What sort of man stands while his limbs fall? What sort of man to the breast
> sends darts? Or what man did the spear affix to the plain?[83]

Le Baker uses classical vocabulary, if not always classical turns of phrase, throughout his chronicle.[84] Although Thompson and Barber note several instances of more direct quotation, they fail to note this particular appropriation of colourful language from Lucan and other descriptions of extreme violence at the battle of Poitiers.[85] The use of Lucan's epic poem here seems inappropriate, given the very different objectives of the two writers. Lucan does not present war favourably or optimistically as a solution to some disputes, but rather lamentably describes the Civil War as the worst tragedy to befall the Roman people.[86] Le Baker, in contrast, aims to present a morally straightforward and explicit praise of English conduct of war, fought to regain their unjustly usurped rights in France. One might argue, given Le Baker's use of such a source, that he sought to present a subversive narrative of Edward III's wars, especially as the conflict

---

[82] See pp. 26–27 above.

[83] Marcus Annaeus Lucanus, *De bello civili, libri .x.*, ed. by David R. Shackleton Bailey, BT (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1988), 7.619–7.624 (pp. 185–86): 'letiferum per cuius viscera vulnus / exierit, quis fusa solo vitalia calcet / ore quis adverso demissum faucibus ensem / expulerit moriens anima, quis corruat ictus, / quis steterit dum membra cadunt, qui pectore tela / transmittant aut quos campis affixerit hasta'. For reception see Reynolds, ed., *Texts and Transmission*, pp. 215–18; Walde and Egger, eds, *Reception of Classical Literature*, pp. 204–15; Galderisi, ed., *Translations*, no. 70 (II, 199–201).

[84] Richard Barber, ed., *The Life and Campaigns of the Black Prince*, rev. edn (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1986), p. 41.

[85] Identified classical references or quotations are marked throughout the edition and also Geoffrey le Baker, *Chronicle*, trans. by David Preest, notes by Richard Barber (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2012).

[86] See also Catherine A. M. Clarke, 'Crossing the Rubicon: History, Authority and Civil War in Twelfth-Century England', in *War and Literature*, ed. by Laura Ashe and Ian Patterson (Cambridge: Brewer, 2014), pp. 61–83.

with France could be seen as a civil war between rival claimants to the French throne. However, given Le Baker's constant praise of English actions and failure to capitalise on many other opportunities in his narrative, it seems unlikely that this is the case.

Le Baker, unlike other chroniclers, sometimes appears to explicitly revel in the killing of the enemy. He includes an episode in his narrative of the battle of Crécy in which the French 'protecting themselves, retreated behind a heap of corpses', after fighting with Edward of Woodstock, who then rests 'upon long mountains of corpses'.[87] As with his violent imagery of the battle of Poitiers borrowed from Lucan, I have also discovered that Le Baker here borrows from Gaius Julius Caesar's imagery of heaps of corpses in battle: 'when the first of them had fallen, the nearest stood upon them lying down, and from their bodies fought'.[88] The closest other chroniclers get to this is to imply the scale of killing through their casualty lists. However, these receive little comment and often simply act as authoritative records of the events rather than any sort of celebration in large-scale killing. Le Baker's presentation of the heap of dead bodies is presented more as part of a tactical manoeuvre, with grisly imagery, than an explicit praise of violence and its results.

Writers of historical literature mostly provide little detail on the conduct of military events, especially on how the killed endure their violent deaths. Instead they simply state that after the encounter has finished that they are dead. Jean le Bel describes the battle of Crécy in such generalised terms and states that the English 'waited until the French came, and were so prudent and performed so well that Fortune provided for them'.[89] He then details the immediate aftermath of the battle, how the English were ordered to stay in place without disturbing the dead, and then, with only a little detail, mentions a few small skirmishes the following day. At the end of his narrative of Crécy, Le Bel lists the prominent persons killed and tersely narrates the death of Jean l'Aveugle:

> So I will begin with the most noble and the most gentlemanly, this was the valiant king of Bohemia who, entirely blind, wanted to be part of the front rank of

---

87 Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 84: 'aggere mortuorum muniti se ipsos retraxere', 'super montes mortuorum longos'.

88 Gaius Julius Caesar, *Bellum gallicum*, ed. by Wolfgang Hering, BT (Leipzig: Teubner, 1987), 3.27 (p. 36): 'cum primi eorum cecidissent, proximi iacentibus insisterent atque ex eorum corporibus pugnarent'. For reception see Kristeller and others, eds, *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum*, III, 87–139; Reynolds, ed., *Texts and Transmission*, pp. 35–36; Walde and Egger, eds, *Reception of Classical Literature*, pp. 79–85; Galderisi, ed., *Translations*, no. 50 (II, 161–62). See also a similar description in a later chronicle and Rogers' lengthy examination of the real-life possibility of mounds of bodies: *Gesta Henrici Quinti*, ch. 13 (p. 90); C. J. Rogers, 'Battle of Agincourt', pp. 94–99.

89 Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 72 (II, 106): 'attendirent tant que les Françoys vinrent, et firent si sagement et sy à point que la fortune fourna pour eulx'.

> the battle, and commanded his knights, on pain of beheading, to lead him forward come what may, so that he could deliver a blow of the sword upon some of the enemy.[90]

Le Bel fails to describe this famous death at all, and focuses instead only on his selfless desire to contribute to the battle.[91] The emphasis on his handicap and how his men had to lead him forward to fight serves to increase the praise he earns in these descriptions.

Le Bel describes the battle of Poitiers in much the same sort of non-violent terms. He describes how the English 'boldly and quickly began again to loose and throw [missiles]', that turns back a French advance, which was 'immediately defeated and turned in flight', and states that the English 'came to do battle' against the French again.[92] Le Bel concludes his narrative of Poitiers by only suggesting what had happened: 'there remained a great abundance of the dead, and especially Sir Geoffroi de Charny, who carried the Oriflamme of France, was killed there, and several other banneret knights and squires without number'.[93] However, nowhere does he directly show how violence affects its victims or how combatants die. Le Bel's descriptions are focused more on general movements, bravery, and who the dead are, rather than violent action.

Writers sometimes made considerable efforts to negate the problems of depicting direct violence. The *Lanercost Chronicle* replaces traditional descriptions of feats of arms and prowess with allusive language whenever possible.[94] At the battle of Neville's Cross, the only military encounter in the 1327–47 portion of the chronicle that is given at length, nine English and five Scottish leaders are named and described in some detail, but none are shown to perform any explicitly violent acts.[95] Instead the writer gives only indirect descriptions of their conduct, such as Thomas Rokeby (d. 1357), sheriff of Yorkshire, who 'gave such a drink to the Scots, that after they tasted it once, they did not desire a second sip, and thus he emerged as an exemplar, to all watching, of fighting strongly for the upright cause of the fatherland'.[96] The writer opts to

---

[90] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 72 (II, 108): 'si commenceray au plus noble et au plus gentil, ce fut le vaillant roy de Boheme qui tout aveugle voult estre des premiers à la bataille, et commanda sur la teste à coper, à ses chevaliers qu'ilz le menassent si avant comment que ce fust, qu'il poeut ferir ung cop d'espée sur aucun des anemis'.

[91] See also C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, pp. 133–34.

[92] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 94 (II, 234): 'les rechurent baudement au traire et au lancier', 'qui tantost fut desconfite et tourna en fuite', 'vinrent à la bataille'.

[93] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 94 (II, 235): 'demourerent grand foison de mors, et mesmement messire Godeffroy de Charny, qui portoit l'Oriflambe de France, y fut tué, et pluseurs aultres chevaliers bannerès et escuiers sans nombre'.

[94] These descriptions are treated as straightforward exemplars of prowess by MacInnes, *Scotland's Second War*, p. 201.

[95] *Lanercost*, pp. 349–51.

[96] *Lanercost*, p. 351: 'talem poculum Scottis propinavit, quod postquam semel senserint non desiderabant iterum degustare, et sic exemplar exstitit omnibus videntibus pro pia causa patriae fortiter pugnare'. See similar imagery used for the Scots enduring defeat in Minot, *Poems*, 9.44: 'for first þai drank of þe swete | and seþin of þe sowre'.

describe actions as moral qualities, rather than focus on their violent nature or the suffering that they cause. He describes an anonymous English Minorite Friar at the battle who,

> For his benediction, ordered the English to fight with manly vigour, and when he met the enemy, he did not give them indulgence of days from penalty or from fault, but presented to them, by a certain great stick, contrition and good absolution. He had such power at that time that, without any confession, with the aforesaid stick he could absolve the Scots of every legitimate act.[97]

In this case it is clearer that the combatant is meant to be engaged in combat, but the use of allusive language and avoidance of traditionally heroic language downplays any sort of celebration of killing. These descriptions, and many others, show participants who attempt to avoid injuring or killing their opponents. Instead *Lanercost* focuses on demonstrating the exemplary nature of these combatants through moral superiority and other virtues abstracted from what were surely violent actions in reality. They serve as exemplars for the English at Neville's Cross and act as pious contrasts to the invading Scots and their treatment of English civilians. The *Anonimalle Chronicle* and the *Durham Latin Prose 'Brut'*, which share the *Minorite Chronicle* as a source with *Lanercost*, lack these stylistic flourishes in their more prosaic, yet traditional, narratives.[98]

English writers, on the other hand, frequently revel in the suffering that their own combatants endure while campaigning. Jean le Bel's supposedly eyewitness account of Edward III's 1327 Weardale campaign goes into elaborate detail about the suffering endured by the English in their pursuit of the Scottish invasion force. The English soon realise that they are making no progress catching up to the Scots and decide to leave their wagons and supplies behind so that they can hasten to their enemy and do battle.[99] However, they travel through extremely inhospitable terrain in near constant rain and soon get lost. They decide to make camp but:

> Thus exhausted, both men and horses, we had to lie all night in full armour on the riverside, each one holding his horse by the reins, for one did not know where to tie them up for lack of daylight and of our wagons, which we had not

---

[97] *Lanercost*, pp. 350–51: 'pro sua benedictione viriliter pugnare praecepit Anglicis [...] et quando hostibus obviabat nec a poena nec a culpa sed cum quodam baculo dierum indulgentiam, magnam poenitentiam et bonam absolutionem illis tribuit. Talem potestatem tunc temporis habebat quod sine confessione aliqua cum praedicto baculo ab omni actu legitimo Scottos absolvabat'.

[98] *Anonimalle*, pp. 27–28; *Durham LPB*, MS 2 fols 34^{r}–34^{v}.

[99] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 11 (1, 53–56, here 55): 'chascun preist sans plus ung pain et le troussast derriere luy à guise de bracquonnier, et laissast on là tous harnas et charroys et toute aultre pourveance, car on se combateroit l'endemain'.

> been able to bring through such terrain, as I have told you. And so all this night they ate nothing, neither hay nor oats nor forage, and we likewise ate no other victuals, all day or all night, but each individual's own bread, which he had trussed up behind him so that, as I have told you, that it was all defiled by the sweat of his horse, and we drank no other drink but that from the running river, except for some lords who had bottles. And so each one can well imagine that we had a terrible thirst on account of the heat and the great exertions that we had endured that day [...] in such hardship we passed that night.[100]

Le Bel continues his narrative and again describes their suffering from lack of food, clean water, wine, bedding, and protection from the harsh elements. He later emphasises how dreadful the weather was by showing its effect on their horses, which suffered greatly from not being properly maintained after riding, lost shoes, and even had their tack rot and fall apart.[101] His description praises the English for their extreme non-violent suffering in pursuit of the enemy, to defend their country, but also acts as a subtle indication of his authority to speak on military matters, as he claims to have been there himself with the English.[102]

Geoffrey le Baker highlights the hardships endured during Edward of Woodstock's 1355 Gascony campaign in similar terms. The English cross difficult terrain and have difficulty finding potable water:

> [They went] through the long and bad journey, but it was especially harmful for the horses because of the rocky terrain, and they were without waters, or even other victuals, the horses drank wine instead of water, and, with the food cooked in wine, no liquid except wine or oil was found.[103]

---

[100] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 12 (I, 58): 'ainsy traveilliez, hommes et chevaulx, nous convint toute la nuit gesir tous armez sur celle riviere, chascun son cheval en sa main par le frain, car on ne sçavoit ou les atachier par defaulte de jour et de nos charroys que nos n'avions poeu mener par tel pays, ainsy que dit vous ay. Ainsy ne gousterrent toute celle nuit ne de fain ne d'avaine ne de fourrage, et nous mesmes ne goustasmes d'aultre viande, tout le jour ne toute la nuit, que chascun son pain qu'il avoit derriere luy troussé, ainsy que dit vous ay, qui estoit de la sueur de cheval tout enordi, ne ne busmes d'aultre bruvage que de la riviere courant, exceptez aucuns siegneurs qui avoient boutailles. Et si poeut bien chascun penser que nous eusmes moult grand soif pour le chault et pour le grand traveil que nous avions enduré le jour [...] en tel meschief passasmes celle nuit'.

[101] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 12 (I, 60–61).

[102] See also Marie-Thérèse de Medeiros, 'De l'Ourthe a la Tyne: Jean le Bel, un précurseur de la destruction des mythes?', in *Et c'est la fin pour quoy sommes ensemble: Hommage à Jean Dufournet*, ed. by Jean-Claude Aubailly, 3 vols (Paris: Champion, 1993), II, 949–53; Chareyron, *Jean le Bel*, pp. 21–25.

[103] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 134: 'per longum iter et malum, set equis precipue nocivum quia petrosum, et sine aquis, aliis eciam victualibus, equi pro aquis potarunt vinum, et, in vino cibis coctis, nihil liquidum nisi vinum aut oleum reperiebatur'.

Several days later the situation and its consequences for the men and horses become more severe: 'after a long journey, they camped in the open, where, with a lack of water, the horses drank wine, but on the next day they were drunk and could not walk with a straight step and many of them died'.[104] Although these texts seem to paint the suffering as terrible and lamentable, they are not meant to criticise their leaders for failing to provision them or direct them through more welcoming terrain.[105] Le Baker instead portrays the English as praiseworthy for enduring these situations to support their king and subtly parallels the Israelites' journey through the wilderness to the promised land.[106] Geoffroi de Charny similarly stresses how important it is for knights to live a rough life so that they will not go soft, and praises their non-violent suffering as meritorious, especially in comparison to priests.[107]

English writers sometimes portray battles and other military encounters as extreme and dangerous to show their men as heroic for enduring them. Geoffrey le Baker describes the battle of Poitiers as a brutal encounter through visceral descriptions of violence, such as the passage on Frenchmen tripping on their own spilled intestines, quoted above. The English are severely outnumbered and on the verge of defeat: 'there were not any who were not wounded or fatigued by the extreme labour [of the day]'.[108] They have to resort to seemingly unsavoury practices to survive, such as when the archers expend all their arrows and then 'hastened to extract arrows from the half-alive most-miserable men'.[109] The English knight Maurice Berkeley (1330–68) 'took no notice' of the English being close to defeat, however:

> Just as his usual custom he was among the first attacking the enemy, he struck like thunder against the French acts worthy of eternal praise. Here, mixed in the satraps [i.e. nobles] of the Dauphin and among them rages with his armed hand, he did not think to flee the French as long as he saw them upright, and wholly intent on what was before him, not at all looking back at his men from the rear

---

[104] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 137: 'post longum iter, in campis ospitati, quo, defectu aquarum, potarunt equos [*sic* in edn and MSS] vino, unde in crastino debriati non poterant recto passu incedere et multi ex eiis perierunt'.

[105] During the 1327 Weardale campaign Le Bel states that the men began to suspect that a traitor in the English force had misdirected Edward III, rather than blame the king himself: Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 12 (I, 61): 'grand rumeur commencha entre les Anglès, car aucuns vouloient mettre sus aux altres qui avoient donné le conseil de là venir, qu'ilz l'avoient fait pour trahir le roy et ses gens'.

[106] *Bible*, Exodus 16–18.

[107] Charny, *Book of Chivalry*, § 19, 21–22, 38–40, 42 (pp. 108–18, 122–26, 172–76, 180–90). See also how monks presented themselves as spiritual warriors in similar language: K. A. Smith, *War and Medieval Monastic Culture*, pp. 156–76.

[108] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 150: 'non erat aliquis non [vu]lneratus aut eximio labore fessus'.

[109] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 150: 'extraere sagittas a miserrimis semivivis festinarunt', also see, p. 110: 'de [vu]lneribus mortuorum sagittarios sagittas colligentes' (Winchelsea).

> nor looking for signs in the sky, he alone pursued the confident military of the great Dauphin, against whom lance and then sword and other attacking arms were broken by his strength, finally he was surrounded alone by a multitude [of Frenchmen].[110]

Despite his severe wounds, Berkeley survives and is later captured and held for ransom by the French. Le Baker praises him in the highest terms because of his selflessly brave conduct. Everything in Le Baker's narrative builds towards Poitiers, his intended conclusion, so it is fitting that it stands apart as an extreme battle.[111]

English writers similarly portray naval battles as extremely difficult so that they can better praise the combatants who fight in them.[112] In some cases they simply mention that the encounters were particularly difficult.[113] Geoffrey le Baker describes the extreme circumstances similarly to those of the battle of Poitiers when the English at the battle of Winchelsea in 1350 prepare to resist another expected attack by the enemy and must act without pity: 'they care for the helpless wounded, throw the dead and dying Spanish down into the sea, restore themselves with food and slumber', and set an armed guard throughout the night.[114] He addresses his audience and states that 'there you could have seen ships painted with blood and brains'.[115] He provides a similar summary of the battle of Sluys: 'a horrible uproar ascended to heaven above the wooden horses, like the prophecy of Merlin'.[116] Several writers mention that archers fought alongside men-at-arms and do not name any particular knights fighting in battle, and thereby

---

[110] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, pp. 149–50: 'solito more cum primoribus hostes invadens, dignos eternis laudibus actus contra Gallos fulminavit. Hic, Delfini satrapis mixtus et in eos seviens armata manu, non putabat fugere Francos quamdiu vidit illos erectos, et ad anteriora totus intentus, suos nequaquam respiciens a tergo nec contemplans in aere signa, solus persequebatur securam miliciam magni Delfini, contra quam lancea deindeque gladio et ceteris armis invasivis virilitate seve confractis, tandem multitudine solus stipatus'.

[111] See his extensive use of foreshadowing throughout, mostly alluding to Poitiers: Le Baker, *Chronicle*, pp. 6, 20, 35, 38, 39, 48, 54, 58, 76, 76–77, 79, 84, 97, 103, 116.

[112] The danger and brutality of naval battles was recognised by classical writers as well, such as in Vegetius, *Epitoma*, 4.4 (p. 156): 'quid enim crudelius congressione navali, ubi et aquis homines perimuntur et flammis?'

[113] Such as at Sluys: Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 36 (1, 178–79); Gray, *Scalacronica*, p. 130; *London French*, p. 77.

[114] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 110: '[vu]lneratos curantes inopes, Ispanos mortuos et languidos in mari proicientes, cibo et sopori se recreantes'.

[115] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 110: 'ibi vidisses sanguine et cerebro naves pictas'.

[116] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 68: 'horridus clamor ad ethera conscendit super equos ligneos, iuxta Merlini propheciam'. The editor makes no attempt to identify which of Merlin's prophecies is alluded to here. None of the major prophecies of Merlin include any statement approaching that of Le Baker: *Long ANPB*, ch. 75 (pp. 92–98); *Kirkstall*, short extracts ascribed to Merlin given at many points, such as fols 80^{r}, 80^{v} (two times), 81^{r}, 81^{v} (two times), 83^{r}; 'Merlin's Prophecy of the Six Kings'; Monmouth, *De gestis Britonum*, bk 7 (pp. 145–59). Some elements of the supposed prophecy are found, however, in Bridlington, 'Versus propheciales', 1.4 (p. 51): 'quidam ballivus armis iam nominativus, / voce vocativus tauri tauroque dativus / sternet equos ligni, medio latitat leo signi', p. 54 (explained by Ergome): '"sternet equos ligni," id est, naves, et hic utitur tercia occultacione. "Medio latitat leo signi," id est, leo scuti Scocie latitabat in medio navium quem secum assumpit tanquam verus heres, et hic utitur secunda occultacione'.

suggest the encounters were fought with less restraint, and were thus more brutal, than land battles.[117]

Writers revel in the suffering that their men endured in military encounters. Geoffrey le Baker, using stylistic language (polyptoton) that cannot easily be conveyed in translation, praises James Audley for his selfless conduct when, after the victory at the battle of Poitiers, he is carried back: 'by the most loving arms of his comrades, fatigued, wounded, and bleeding, he was carried, fatigued, wounded, and bloodless, to the lodging of the prince [Edward of Woodstock]'.[118] He shows the English combatants injured at the battle of Winchelsea to be similarly pleased with their own suffering:

> They brought back namely wounded heads wrapped in linen to hold them together, arms and legs perforated by bolts and spears, as well as teeth torn out, noses also cut off, lips cleaved, eyes plucked. Cheerful at the insignia of the glorious triumph and escape, they mixed laughter with painful sorrows, and these people equally took pleasure in showing their cloaks stained by enemy blood.[119]

His description of combatants revelling in their own permanent injuries and suffering is in entirely positive terms. This sort of praise in explicitly violent suffering, with imagery of spilled blood and missing body parts, is meant to emulate Christ's suffering.[120] Writers in many genres frequently employed descriptions of ascetic knights in a positive sense.[121] Le Baker's description similarly serves as an extreme praise of the English because they had endured such encounters, and it also sidesteps any moral issues involved in killing others.

---

[117] See for example Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus*, pp. 312 (Sluys), 412 (Winchelsea): 'hominum armorum et sagittariorum', 'multis nobilibus aliisque hominibus armorum et sagittariis'; Tynemouth, *Historia*, not in MSS, edn p. 355 (Sluys): 'armatorum copiam, et arcitenentes'.

[118] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 153: 'piissimis brachiis commilitonum fessis fessus, sauciis saucius, cruentis exanguis, ad ospicium principis fertur'.

[119] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 111: 'reportarunt enim sui capita saucia commissuris lineis involuta, brachia et tibias quarellis et telis terebrata, atque dentes evulsos, nasos quoque decisos, labra fissa, et oculos erutos. Leti de insigniis gloriosi triumfi et evasione, risus doloribus egris miscuerunt quibus erat iocundum ex equo inimico sanguine togas maculatas ostendere'. See also the published translation of this passage that butchers the original text: Le Baker, *Chronicle*, trans. by Preest, p. 96: '[they] brought home with them wounded heads, bound in bandages to hold them together, arms and legs pierced by bolts and weapons, torn out teeth and cut off noses, split lips and gouged out eyes. They rejoiced in these insignia of a glorious triumph and in their escape. Men who in the past had found pleasure in showing their cloaks stained with the blood of an enemy horse could raise a laugh in their present pain and weakness'.

[120] Kaeuper, *Holy Warriors*, esp. 116–30.

[121] K. A. Smith, *War and Medieval Monastic Culture*, pp. 79–89, 187–96. See also E. Cohen, *Modulated Scream*, esp. pp. 25–51; E. Cohen, 'The Expression of Pain in the Later Middle Ages: Deliverance, Acceptance and Infamy', in *Bodily Extremities: Preoccupations with the Human Body in Early Modern European Culture*, ed. by Florike Egmond and Robert Zwijnenberg (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2013), pp. 195–219; Giulia Morosini, 'The Body of the Condottiero: A Link between Physical Pain and Military Virtue as It Was Interpreted in Renaissance Italy', in *Killing and Being Killed: Bodies in Battle. Perspectives on Fighters in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Jörg Rogge (Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2017), pp. 165–97.

Although English writers emphasise the suffering endured by their own combatants, they struggle with the suffering inflicted on the enemy. This is clear in the allusive descriptions of violence and attempts to remove English agency from injuries inflicted in combat. The problem is especially evident in descriptions of suffering from famine in lengthy sieges. The *London French Chronicle* describes in detail the suffering of the defenders and citizens of Tournai in 1340:

> The water running in a fine river, which used to pass through the city, was dammed up and barred from them, so that neither horse nor any living beast remained alive in all the said city. For so constrained were they in the said city, and the famine was so great, that a quarter of wheat was worth four pounds sterling, the quarter of oats [was sold] for two marks, a hen's egg [for] six pence, [and] two onions for one penny.[122]

The English could not have known these details that the writer uses to demonstrate hardship, however, as the siege was later aborted.[123] These details are drawn from classic tropes on the price of goods to express their scarcity, most famously the Bible's list of steep food prices during the siege of Samaria: 'there were sold the head of an ass for eighty pieces of silver and a fourth of a cabe of pigeons' dung for five pieces of silver'.[124] The Romano-Jewish scholar Titus Flavius Josephus (*c.* 37–100 CE), in his paraphrase of this passage, attempts to make sense of the pigeon dung and claims it was used as salt.[125] The Roman historian Titus Livius provides a similar account of the siege of Casilinum by Hannibal in which the besieged are forced to eat the hide from their

---

[122] *London French*, p. 79: 'l'eawe currant par une bele river, qe parmi la cyté soleit passer, lour fust fors barré detenu, si qe chival ne autre vif beste ne fust remys en vye en tot la dite cyté. Kar ils estoyent si estreitement tenuz en la dite cyté, et la famyne fust si graunt, kar le quarter de furment valust .iiii. liveres d'esterlings, le quarter d'aveyne pur deus mars, un oef de gelyne sis deners, deus oygnouns pur un dener'.

[123] These types of details of costs and hardship are generally accepted as accurately reported, such as by Bradbury, *Medieval Siege*, p. 169 (for Page's *Siege of Rouen*); Kelly DeVries, 'Contemporary Views of Edward III's Failure at the Siege of Tournai, 1340', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 39 (1995), 70–105 (here 82 for similar use of trope by Le Muisit, and also 87–88). Nall quotes a passage on the siege of Harfleur (1415) that uses this trope but does not consider its deeper significance: Nall, *Reading and War*, p. 58.

[124] *Bible*, IV Kings 6.25: 'venundaretur caput asini octoginta argenteis et quarta pars cabi stercoris columbarum quinque argenteis'.

[125] Josephus, 'Antiquitatis', 9.4 (p. 261): 'octoginta argenteis numismatis caput asini uenderetur, quinq[ue] argenteis numismatis sextarium fimi columbarum pro sale compararent Hebraei'. Marvin does not identify the supposed use of pigeon dung as salt because she looks only at the biblical episode, commentary, and translations, which offer no reasonable explanations. She claims that pigeon dung is 'not only unpalatable but poisonous': Julia Marvin, 'Cannibalism as an Aspect of Famine in Two English Chronicles', in *Food and Eating in Medieval Europe*, ed. by Martha Carlin and Joel T. Rosenthal (London: Hambledon, 1998), pp. 73–86 (here 80–82, quote at 81 n. 27). See also the mention of the citizens of Jerusalem, starving during siege, who eat dung: Josephus 'De bello iudaico', in *Opera*, ed. by Johann Froben (Basel: Froben, 1524), pp. 593–852 (here 6.16, p. 804): 'ad hoc necessitatis quosdam fuisse compulsos, ut cloacas rimarentur, boumq[ue] ueterem simum alimentum haberent. Stercus inde collectu[m], [et] quod nec uisui quidem tolerabile fuerat, cibus erat', which Marvin also mentions but does not consider fully and adds additional meaning to.

shields and also rats.[126] Valerius Maximus greatly elaborates Livy's account and includes a moralistic story of a miser selling a mouse for a princely sum, which is briefly paraphrased by Gaius Plinius Secundus (Pliny the Elder) and Frontinus.[127] This account, and others like it, are not meant to criticise the English for making the enemy suffer, as the classical accounts do. The narrative trope is commonly used to express famine and dearth of supplies in non-military settings as well, such as the 1315–18 famine in England.[128] Jean le Bel uses it to show how the English combatants are starving during the 1327 Weardale campaign when they buy food from local merchants at inflated prices.[129] Marvin argues that this trope is meant to signal 'God's justice and mercy', as other chroniclers seem to do for large-scale famine.[130] However, English writers who use it during sieges always combine it with mentions of abundance of food and drink amongst the besieging forces, which suggests that the defenders needed only to surrender and obtain food from them to alleviate their suffering.[131] Accordingly, they always shift blame onto the enemy forces for failing to relieve the besieged city by attacking the English forces around it.

In other cases, especially for the eleven-month siege of Calais, writers directly blame the enemy, rather than the English besieging force, for the starvation inflicted on its inhabitants. Many accounts of the siege mention the famine suffered by the people and defenders.[132]

---

[126] Titus Livius, *Ab urbe condita*, ed. by John Briscoe, 1 vol. so far, OCT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2016–), 23.19.11 (III, 186): 'postremo ad id uentum inopiae est ut lora detractasque scutis pelles, ubi feruida mollissent aqua, mandere conarentur nec muribus alioue animali abstinerent et omne herbarum ardicumque genus aggeribus infimis muri eruerent'. For reception see Kristeller and others, eds, *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum*, II, 331–48, III, 445–49; Reynolds, ed., *Texts and Transmission*, pp. 205–14; Walde and Egger, eds, *Reception of Classical Literature*, pp. 195–203; Galderisi, ed., *Translations*, no. 93 (II, 250–53). See also Nicholas Trevet's commentary on Books 1–10 and 21–30 of Livy's *Ab urbe condita* (*c.* 1316–19): Lisboa, Biblioteca nacional de Portugal, MSS ilum. 134–135, esp. MS ilum. 135, fols 54^{r}–79^{r} (commentary on Book 23); Ruth J. Dean, 'The Earliest Known Commentary on Livy Is by Nicholas Trevet', *Medievalia et Humanistica*, 3, 4 (1945, 1946), 86–98, 110.

[127] Valerius Maximus, *Factorum*, 7.6.2–7.6.3 (pp., 479–81); Gaius Plinius Secundus, *Naturalis historia*, ed. by Ludwig von Jan and Karl Friedrich Theodor Mayhoff, BT, 6 vols (Leipzig: Teubner, 1875–1906), 8.57 (II, 111–11); Frontinus, *Strategemata*, 4.5.20 (pp. 105–06). For reception of Pliny the Elder see Kristeller and others, eds, *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum*, IV, 297–422; Reynolds, ed., *Texts and Transmission*, pp. 307–16; Walde and Egger, eds, *Reception of Classical Literature*, pp. 327–41.

[128] J. Marvin, 'Cannibalism'.

[129] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 12 (I, 60): 'et si fusmes nous ung jour et deux nuits sejournans sur celle riviere sans pain, sans vin et sans avaine et sans pourveance nulle. Et aprez, par l'espace de .iiii. jours, qu'il nous convint acheter ung pain mal cuit six estrelins ou sept, qui ne debvoit valoir que un parisy, et nous convenoit acheter ung galet de vin .xxiiii. ou .xxvi. estrelins, qui ne debvoit valoir que .iiii.'

[130] J. Marvin, 'Cannibalism', p. 79.

[131] *London French*, p. 79. Similarly reversed descriptions are found in *Bible*, IV Kings 7.1, 7.16, 7.18.

[132] *Anonimalle*, pp. 23, 29; Le Baker, *Chronicle*, pp. 90–91; Dene, *Rochester*, fols 92^{v}, 94^{r}–95^{r}; *Durham LPB*, MS 2 fol. 34^{r}; Gray, *Scalacronica*, p. 137 (via Leland's abstract); Higden, *Polychronicon SAA Continuation*, MS 1 fol. 294^{v}; *Kirkstall*, fol. 83^{v}; *Parallel Chronicle*, MS 1 fol. 129^{v}; *Prophetic LPB*, fol. 36^{v}; Reading, *Chronicle*, pp. 104–05; Tynemouth, *Historia*, MS 2.3 fol. 247^{r}, edn breaks off early. See also Jean de Vienne's 1347 letter from Calais asking for relief and complaining about famine, interpolated in Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus*, pp. 385–86 (here 386): 'la ville est a graunt defaute des blees, vines, et chares. Car sachietz qe ly naad riens qe ne soit tout maunge, et lez cheens et lez chates et lez chevals, si qe de viver nous ne poions plus trover en la ville, si nous ne mangeons chares dez gentz'; Tynemouth, *Historia*, MS 3 p. 582, edn breaks off early.

However, many of these defend the English siege because the city had acted as a haven for pirates who had earlier attacked England.[133] Jean le Bel uses a different strategy and describes the city ejecting many poor citizens to allow the food to be better allocated to the defenders, and then praises the English for their charity: 'when the noble king saw these poor people thus put out of their city, he made them all come before him in his great hall and had them all given drink and food in abundance'.[134] He clearly blames the defenders for not surrendering earlier, as he shows Edward III's mercy and willingness to feed those suffering. This account goes against the tradition of showing the defenders ejecting the poor who are then stuck between both sides to starve to death that is perhaps used to condemn the siege as immoral.[135]

English writers provide careful accounts of sieges and other military encounters that in every case sidestep the ethical problems of inflicting suffering on both combatants and civilians. References to the suffering of enemy combatants or civilians in besieged cities are not automatically meant to suggest a revelling in pain or suffering inflicted. Explicit mentions of starvation are equally not meant to draw a parallel to the siege of Jerusalem, of which so many accounts celebrate the suffering of the Jews as revenge for their treatment of Christ, which would then have indicated a celebration of enemy suffering.[136] Several accounts in the later Middle Ages demonstrate a marked sympathy for the besieged Jews as innocent civilians, and when compared against each other and the accounts critical of the Jews it is obvious that context and particular language are required, in every case, to signal positive revelling or negative lament over the victims of war, especially when they were civilians.[137] Since there was a conscious attempt to paint

---

[133] *Durham LPB*, MS 2 fol. 34[r]; *Eulogium*, 5.182 (III, 211); Higden, *Polychronicon*, 7.44 (VIII, 342); *Lanercost*, p. 344; *Osney*, p. 352. See also p. 64 above.

[134] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 73 (II, 113): 'quant le noble roy vit ainsy ces povres gens mises dehors de leur ville, ilz les fist venir tous devant luy en sa grande sale et leur fist à tous donner à boyre et à menger planteureusement'. See, however, Knighton's later added detail that the people were so starved that they died from overeating: Knighton, *Chronicle*, p. 84.

[135] This type of suffering is famously described, but with attempts at justification, in Page's 1419–20 poem as well as several earlier texts, such as Le Breton's chronicle: John Page, *The Siege of Rouen, from London, British Library, MS Egerton 1995*, ed. by Joanna Bellis (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2015), esp. lines 468–526, 997–1010, 1017–22 (pp. 13–15, 26); Guillaume le Breton, 'Gesta Philippi Augusti', in *Oeuvres de historiens de Philippe-Auguste*, ed. by Henri-François Delaborde, ShF, 210, 224, 2 vols (Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1882–85), I, 168–333 (here 217); Bellis, 'I was enforced', pp. 142–45. Bellis mistakenly states that the French chronicler Venette includes such a story at Calais: Bellis, 'Reader myghte lamente', pp. 90–91; Jean de Venette, *Chronique*, ed. by Colette Beaune (Paris: Le Livre de poche, 2011), pp. 102–04.

[136] The critical accounts of the Jews in these episodes are discussed throughout Elisa Narin van Court, 'The *Siege of Jerusalem* and Augustinian Historians: Writing about Jews in Fourteenth-Century England', *Chaucer Review*, 29 (1995), 227–48. However, see also Andrew Lynch, 'Emotion and "Violence": The Alliterative *Morte Arthure* and *The Siege of Jerusalem*', in *Writing War in Britain and France, 1370–1854: An Emotional History*, ed. by Stephanie Downes, Andrew Lynch, and Katrina O'Loughlin (London: Routledge, 2019 forthcoming).

[137] Van Court, '*Siege of Jerusalem*'. The story is altered to great emotional effect in the 1370–89 poem: *The Siege of Jerusalem*, ed. by Ralph Hanna and David Lawton, EETSos, 320 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), esp. lines 1067–1100 (pp. 72–75).

the English as the New Israelites, especially in texts describing its wars with France and Scotland, it should not be unexpected that English writers might take issue with employing this trope in its more critical sense. When English writers do narrate suffering it is almost exclusively reserved for English combatants to praise them for their achievements in difficult situations.

* * *

Most English writers avoid any description, let alone discussion, of violence and suffering in their narratives of war. It was important for their writings to show both sides as equally capable, or, ideally, the English outnumbered, to sidestep any criticism of the English preying on incapable combatants. In every case these encounters are shown to be fought between only willing combatants. Occasionally writers seem to wrestle with how they might portray these events in a way that would allow them to celebrate violence as an act, but not its effects on the enemy. Throughout their writings, however, they cheerfully depict their own men suffering non-violent and violent pain in an ascetic fashion that parallels Christ's suffering. English writers do not directly comment on these issues, but imply their positions through their careful descriptions, mostly skewed in favour of the English.

CHAPTER SIX:
DEFEAT AND VICTORY

The conventions of ending hostilities in military encounters, such as battles and sieges, are difficult to establish. They are not laid out in any sort of formal treatise or discussed by combatants in their few writings at length, although many other aspects of war are. Keen suggests that we can know how these events happened from the many narrative sources that seemingly agree on these customs.[1] It is assumed that these conventions demanded leniency, but also encouraged combatants to pursue an extreme courage so that they would be reluctant to surrender. Many sources disagree on questions of when a defeated force should surrender, whether a knight's surrender should be accepted, and how captives should be treated when captured. These were key issues in the ethics of war, as the many sources that claim the objective of war was to regain peace demonstrate, and military leaders sought to be viewed as exemplars of chivalry, the international martial culture that called for fair conduct between knights and men-at-arms.[2]

1. COURAGE

Combatants' eagerness to fight was crucial for success in war. However, issues of fear and bravery, which are most important here, are almost never discussed explicitly in medieval historical literature.[3] Whether combatants performed as they were expected to, fled in the face of danger, or carelessly got themselves killed, all affected the prospects of any military leader in battle. The classical Greek philosopher Aristotle defines courage as the mean between cowardice and rashness in his *Nicomachean Ethics* (350 BCE).[4] This notion spread through medieval Europe when

---

1 Keen, *Laws of War*, p. 122 n. 3; similarly in Strickland, *War and Chivalry*, pp. 222–24. See also pp. 17–19, 23–36 above.

2 See pp. 133–36 above.

3 Verbruggen, *Art of Warfare*, pp. 37–49; Andrew Taylor, 'Chivalric Conversation and the Denial of Male Fear', in *Conflicted Identities and Multiple Masculinities: Men in the Medieval West*, ed. by Jacqueline Murray (New York: Garland, 1999), pp. 169–88; Contamine, *Guerre au Moyen Âge*, pp. 406–18; Stephen Morillo, 'Expecting Cowardice: Medieval Battle Tactics Reconsidered', *Journal of Medieval Military History*, 4 (2006), 65–73; T. R. Smith, 'Warfare in Froissart's *Chroniques*', pp. 29–43; C. Taylor, 'Military Courage'; MacInnes, *Scotland's Second War*, pp. 215–19. Lynch, however, argues that ideas of courage, cowardice, and fear are employed in a nuanced fashion in romance: Andrew Lynch, 'Beyond Shame: Chivalric Cowardice and Arthurian Narrative', *Arthurian Literature*, 23 (2006), 1–17.

4 Aristotle, *Ethica nicomachea*, trans. by Robert Grosseteste, ed. by René Antonin Gauthier, Aristoteles latinus, 26.1–26.3, 5 vols (Leiden: Brill, 1972–74), 15a6–17b21 (pp. 190–96), and revised text (pp. 421–26). See also Aristotle's influence on French writings on courage and cowardice during the Hundred Years War: C. Taylor, 'Military Courage', pp. 138–46.

his *Ethics* was fully translated into Latin in the thirteenth century by the English theologian Robert Grosseteste (d. 1253), and was copied in a large number of manuscripts.[5] Other widely read writers, such as John of Salisbury (*c.* 1120–80) and Giles of Rome (*c.* 1243–1316), were influenced by Aristotle in their own works on war.[6] Although medieval chroniclers seldom quote or reference Aristotle's works directly they discuss issues of courage, cowardice, and rashness, in much the same terms and ideas. Aristotle argues that a combatant is brave for overcoming the very reasonable fears of the dangers inherent to fighting in war. Equally, one could be brave by learning how to succeed in such peril through experience and knowledge of war. It was therefore brave and laudable to endure the terrible conditions of war, so long as the situation was not excessively dangerous or, conversely, risk-free. Cowardice and rashness are merely improper levels of courage, as a deficiency or excess of the mean, in relation to risk. Consequently, how combatants endure fear determines whether they are shown as brave and praised, or condemned for cowardice, in narratives of their exploits.

In most instances English victories are attributed to military leaders or the courage and prowess of their men, but not to the extreme that they needed to fight to the death. The *Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* describes Edward Balliol's speech to his men before the battle of Kinghorn in 1332 and emphasises the importance of courage. Balliol states that they are outnumbered and their only recourse is brave action:

> On this account I ask you, for the love of God, that courage inspire us and that we mount a strong assault on the Scots all this night, and should they be exhausted by our bravery so that other Scots who come to their aid against us dare raise their hands to fight us we will then fight vigorously against them so that, by the grace of God, everybody will speak of our chivalry.[7]

Balliol and his forces do not seem to be so outnumbered that they are bound to be defeated, as the text narrates, although it is suggested that if they are captured they will be killed. After

---

[5] 280 MSS by the latest count, and many others in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century French translations: Aristotle, *Ethica nicomachea*, pp. clii–clxviii, also see xvi–cli (on earlier partial translations into Latin); Galderisi, ed., *Translations*, no. 3 (II, 61–63).

[6] Salisbury, *Policratici*; Giles of Rome, *De regimine principum*, ed. by Hieronymus Samaritanius (Roma: Zannettus, 1607). See also Hosler, *John of Salisbury*, pp. 119, 138 n. 134, 144; Charles F. Briggs, *Giles of Rome's 'De regimine principum': Reading and Writing Politics at Court and University, c. 1275–c. 1525* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 11–13.

[7] *Long ANPB*, ch. 223 (p. 305): 'par quoi ie vous pry pur lamour de Dieu qe hardines nous aspre et qe nous moueoms fort estoure a les Escotez tout ceste noet [et] sils soit trauailes par nostre hardines qe autres Escotz qe lour viegnent en aide encontre nous oisereunt mains sur nous conbatre [et] nous combateroms lors vigerousement as eux issint qe par la grace de Dieux, tout le mounde parlera de nostre chiualrie'.

Balliol's speech the battle begins and the writer asserts that: 'and so much [Balliol and his men] did by their courage that the Scots became completely tired and greatly exerted, and they did such great anguish by their assault that they could help only a few of them'.[8] The battle continues for some time and is greatly elaborated in the text, and English courage is shown to be the deciding factor.[9]

Narrative context allows a writer to assess whether an act was cowardly, courageous, or rash. Writers rarely show any of the violent effects of war, and are therefore able to portray war as less dangerous and risky, and condemn all surrender or retreat. As part of this sort of sanitised depiction of war they sometimes also portray, and praise, knights who fight until the end, even to the point of death, rather than give up. These seemingly rash actions are rarely condemned when they result in success.[10] Jean le Bel describes four men under Adolphe de La Marck (1288–1344), bishop of Liège, in 1340 who oppose a force of Hainaulters and dismount 'to make a stand and since they loved more death than flight', and then 'defended themselves so courageously that they had great honour, and also endured all the blows of combat until the end'.[11] This inspires some of their allies to join them, and they all fight so well that, despite the odds, they encourage the enemy to retreat and thereby win the battle. Le Bel praises this desire to fight to the death as it might encourage combatants to fight harder and be more successful, but only so long as it did not lead to defeat or death.

Writers sometimes endorse combatants taking a selfless attitude in war, even if it leads to their death. Geoffrey le Baker describes the 1335 Scotland campaign of the English-allied Scottish leader David of Strathbogie (1309–35), styled earl of Atholl. However, Strathbogie, when he happened to be riding with only a few men 'fell upon enemies of greater numbers, due to him refusing to surrender himself but [electing to] resist he was killed along with thirteen recruits'.[12] Le Baker similarly condemns the Scots who flee and explicitly praises those who stay by their king's side to fight to the death at the battle of Neville's Cross: 'the others faithfully persist with

---

[8] *Long ANPB*, ch. 223 (p. 305): 'tant firent par lour hardinesse qe les Escotz deviendrent tout lassez [et] graundement trauailee, si lour firent ils graunt anguisshe de lour assaut si qe ils ne poaient pur poy eux aider'.

[9] Compare the above descriptions with the somewhat similar, but far less detailed description, with little attention to the importance of courage, in *Short ANPB*, pp. 148–50.

[10] See also C. Taylor, 'Military Courage', p. 145: 'Winning a great victory might well wipe away any potential charge of rashness in engaging in a battle against the odds, as frequently happened when the English fought the French'.

[11] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 38 (I, 200): 'pour rendre estail et pour tant qu'il amoit mielx morir que fuir', 'se deffendirent si vassaument qu'ilz en eurent grand honneur et qu'ilz soustinrent tout le faiz du pongnys jusques au derrain', for similar cases of this attitude not resulting in death see chs 8, 46 (I, 45–46, 251–52).

[12] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 57: 'incidit in hostes quam plures, quibus nolens se reddere set resistere, cum .xiii. tironibus est occisus', also see pp. 13, 76–77, 82, 89, 115–16, 149–50, 150, 154.

their king, [because] they preferred a sweet death to a shameful life'.[13] He also describes how, at the battle of Mauron (1352), Guy II de Nesle, marshal of France, intentionally places his Franco-Breton army into position for battle against their English supported enemies: 'at the rear surrounded by the slope of a mountain, because of which it could not take flight, and so without hope of flight might grow audacity for fighting, just as [that of] one accustomed to being courageous'.[14] The chronicler here shows Nesle's tactical intentions and also his clever method to encourage bravery and prevent retreat, in an echo of Vegetius' advice.[15] However, by the battle's end Nesle and all his men are defeated and killed. Le Baker does not criticise them for rashly ensuring their own deaths, but praises their actions as an example of collectively extreme bravery.

The ideal of fighting to the death, despite its ultra-heroic nature, as the pinnacle of knighthood, along with its possible parallels to Christ's sacrifice, is only occasionally criticised by writers.[16] Jean le Bel condemns the French behaviour at the battle of Mauron, in direct contrast to Le Baker's account, because it had no purpose but death. He dedicates an entire chapter of his chronicle to the Company of the Star. Le Bel begins with the Company's foundation and concludes with its massacre at Mauron, although other members not present, such as Geoffroi de Charny, survive to later be killed at the battle of Poitiers. He summarises the chivalric order's oaths, with particular attention to members' requirement to never retreat from battle and, most importantly, that they 'would either die or give themselves as prisoners', but with no commentary on whether he agreed with these ideals.[17] Charny, author of three surviving chivalric treatises that were probably written for the Company, wrote in his *Livre de chevalerie* on the heroic but also pragmatically important nature of this, that

> There are many who retreat, who, had they stayed and done what they could, could have defeated of their enemies, and there are others who are too easily captured, who, had they done what they were well capable of, may have roundly defeated their enemies.[18]

---

[13] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 88: 'ceteri fideliter cum suo rege persistentes pulcram mortem turpi vite [*sic*] pretulerunt'.

[14] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 120: 'a tergo declivo cuiusdam montis vallatus, quod non poterat fugam inire, ut ex fuge desperacione cresceret eiis audacia pugnandi, sicud solet animosis'. See also C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, pp. 198–99.

[15] Vegetius, *Epitoma*, 3.21 (p. 108): 'clausis ex desperatione crescit audacia, et cum spei nihil est sumit arma formido. Libenter cupit commori qui sine dubio scit se esse moriturum'.

[16] See Prestwich for the common use of this ideal in literature and Taylor for the problems of shame, flight, and surrender: Prestwich, *Armies and Warfare*, p. 230; C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, pp. 180–83.

[17] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 89 (II, 206): 'et leur convenoit jurer que jamais ilz ne fuiroient en bataille plus hault de .iiii. arpens, à leur advis, ainchoys morroient et se rendroient pris'. See also D'Arcy Jonathan Dacre Boulton, *The Knights of the Crown: The Monarchical Orders of Knighthood in Later Medieval Europe, 1325–1520* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1987), pp. 174–88.

[18] Charny, *Book of Chivalry*, § 23 (pp. 130): 'moult en y a qui se retraient, que s'il demourassent et en feissent ce qu'il

He argues that if combatants were only to fight a bit harder, with more dedication and disregard for risk, then they might succeed. Le Bel, however, condemns Nesle and the Company: 'there were killed no fewer than eighty-nine knights of the Star, because they had sworn to never flee, for had they not vowed it themselves, they could have easily withdrawn'.[19] He states the loss was a waste of men because they had accomplished nothing, and it would have been reasonable for them to withdraw or surrender, given their defeat. Although the Company ostensibly had the option to surrender, no accounts mention that they attempted or were unable to do so.

Writers understand victory and defeat as distinct events, with different causes. During Edward III's reign English writers rarely had to consider the problems of representing their men suffering defeats, as historically these were rare. Sometimes English writers depict their defeats as if they were victories. Geoffrey le Baker twists the failed 1351 English relief of Saint-Jean-d'Angély as if it were a victorious skirmish and ignores the fact that the city was later taken by the French: 'many also were killed, they seized the above-said marshal and many other nobles of the French, more than four hundred men of military status were put to flight'.[20] Similarly, Laurence Minot dedicates an entire celebratory poem to portraying the siege of Tournai as if it is about to be won, when in reality it was unsuccessful and abandoned.[21]

Defeats are sometimes explained as resulting from men being overconfident or insufficiently pious before battle.[22] The English poet Robert Baston (d. before 1348) was supposedly brought along on Edward II's 1314 Scotland campaign that ended in the English defeat at the battle of Bannockburn, captured by the Scots, and then forced to write a poem commemorating the event.[23] He addresses the Scots and criticises the English:

---

peussent, ce pourroit estre a la desconfiture de leurs ennemis, et d'aucuns qui sont pris assez legierement que, se il feissent ce qu'il peussent bien faire, que ce fust a la grant perde de leurs ennemis'. See his other two treatises: Charny, 'A Critical Edition of the *Livre Charny* and the *Demandes pour la joute, les tournois et la guerre*', ed. by Michael A. Taylor (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1977).

19 Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 89 (II, 206–07): 'y furent bien tuez .iiii^{xx}. et .ix. chevaliers de l'Estoille, pour ce qu'ilz avoient juré que jamais ne fuiroient, car se le serment ne fut, ilz se fussent bien retrais arriere'. For a similarly critical account of the Company of the Star see *Kirkstall*, fols 84^{v}–85^{r}.

20 Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 115: 'multis quoque occisis, ceperunt predictum marescallum et multos alios nobiles Francorum, fugatis amplius quam .cccc^{tis}. viris status militaris', also see pp. 2, 76–77, 87.

21 Minot, *Poems*, 6.

22 On the importance of prayer and confession during English campaigns see Graham St John, 'War, the Church, and English Men-at-Arms', in *Fourteenth-Century England VI*, ed. by Chris Given-Wilson (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000), pp. 73–93.

23 Although no complete version of Baston's text survives, Bower includes a version in both the short and long versions of his *Scotichronicon*. Noted by Macray, a fragment of the text found in a book binding contains the first 10 lines as found in the *Scotichronicon*, but with another 43 lines afterwards. There were possibly originally more lines of the text, but the rest of the text remains undiscovered, or, probably destroyed. Watt inserts these extra 43 lines (in brackets) into Baston's text. Gransden suggests that Le Baker might have seen a copy of Baston's poem from the Carmelite house in Oxford: William D. Macray, 'Robert Baston's Poem on the Battle of Bannockburn', *English Historical Review*, 19 (1904), 507–08; Gransden, *Historical Writing*, II, 38.

> While they thus boast to themselves, jesting all night with Bacchus,
> Scotland, they honour you, with vain words condemning.
> They doze, they snore, transforming them by irritable dreams,
> they believe themselves strong, they alter the bounds of their fatherland.
> The army unfolds its splendid banners over the fields,
> already they have been dispersed, their strength is too little.[24]

In his poem Baston blames the English pride and lack of piety for their defeat, rather than any sort of cowardice or inefficiency. Geoffrey le Baker, who bases the 1303–41 section of his narrative on Adam Murimuth's chronicle, defers to Baston's poem for an authoritative explanation.[25] His narrative makes the connection between pride and defeat more explicit, and also refers to the famous saying, summarised from Bede, that the English were 'not Angles, but angels', when he addresses his readers:

> You would have seen that night the nation of Englishmen, living not with customs of Angels but moist with wine, belching drunkenness, thundering 'Wassail' and 'Drinkhail' more than usual. And on the other side silent Scots honouring the holy watch by fasting.[26]

He also adds a more pragmatic explanation for why the English are defeated on the following day:

> From the west comes forth the army of the English, the rising sun reflects into golden shields and polished helmets, its gleaming, repelling rays repelling the glances of the men-at-arms, which would provoke Alexander the Great in such a place and time to suspend the battle for at least an hour of daylight, and the sun of midday, which would be to the right, awaiting judgment.[27]

---

[24] Robert Baston, 'De striuelinensi obsidione', in Walter Bower, *Scotichronicon*, ed. by Donald E. R. Watt, 9 vols (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1987–98), VI, 366–75, 458–60 (here lines 67–71, and note that line numbers start at the chapter's prose opening and the first line of the poem is therefore line 14): 'dum se sic jactant cum Bacho nocte jocando, / Scocia, te mactant, verbis vanis reprobando. / Dormitant, stertunt, quos irrita sompnia mutant, / fortes se putant, patrie confinia vertunt. / Explicat exercitus splendencia signa per arva, / iam sunt dispersi, nimis est virtus sua parva'.

[25] Murimuth offers only bare details on the event: Murimuth, *Continuatio*, pp. 20–21: 'fuit magnum proelium prope Strivelyn inter regem Angliae et exercitum suum et Scotos, in qui fuit occisus comes Gloucestriae, Gilbertus, et multi alii de parte regis, et comes Herefordiae captus, et multi alii nobiles, et rex Angliae et alii vix evaserunt'.

[26] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 7: 'vidisses illa nocte gentem Anglorum, non angelorum more vivencium set vino madencium, crapulam eructancium, "Wassayl" et "Drinkhail" plus solito intonancium. Econtra Scotos silentes sanctam vigiliam ieiunio celebrantes'; Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, 2.1 (pp. 132–34).

[27] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 8: 'ex adverso progredientis ab occidente exercitus Anglorum refulsit sol oriens in scutos aureos et galeas politas, cuius radii micantes aspectus armatorum reverberantes movissent magnanimum Alexandrum ut illis loco et die vel saltim hora diei congressum suspendisset, et solis meridiani, que fuisset illis dexter, iudicium exspectasset'.

His mention of the shining armour draws on Baston's passing mention that 'the Angles begin to shine with splendour as if angels'.[28] Morris argues that Le Baker misunderstands Baston here by thinking that the sun shines in their eyes.[29] However, Le Baker's passing reference to Alexander instead provides a negative contrast with Edward II's poor leadership.[30] His careful use of Baston also shows how poetry circulated on both sides of the Anglo-Scottish border and was used for different rhetorical ends by English and Scottish writers, but often in an authoritative sense.[31]

English writers reverse the situation, although only very rarely, to show that piety and humility can contribute to their own victory, rather than a lack thereof might cause defeat. Geoffrey le Baker casually shows the English as devout and pious before the battle of Crécy, and perhaps means to suggest that they had learned from their earlier mistakes under Edward II at the battle of Bannockburn.[32] The *Gesta Henrici Quinti* similarly presents the English as devout and silent and the French as overconfident before the battle of Agincourt.[33] The association of defeat with over-confidence and revelling the night before battle, as used by Robert Baston and Le Baker to moralise and explain defeat, all draw upon the Roman writer Gaius Sallustius Crispus' *De bello Iugurthino* (41–40 BCE).[34] These medieval texts add elements of Christian piety to the pagan writer's ideas to strengthen the moral element.[35] It is commonly asserted by scholars that this sort of rationalisation was equally applied to defeat of both friendly and enemy forces by English writers.[36] However, English defeat was uncommon during Edward III's reign and

---

[28] Baston, 'Striuelinensi obsidione', line 137: 'Anglicole quasi celicole splendore nitescunt'. Classical writers sometimes describe bright armour as somehow deterring the enemy, such as Vegetius, *Epitoma*, 2.14 (pp. 47–48).

[29] John E. Morris, *Bannockburn* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914), pp. 54, 82.

[30] This does not seem to be based on any of the many Alexander stories that circulated throughout the Middle Ages. Quintus Curtius mentions that Alexander waits for the Persians so that the Macedonians are not defeated by their own weariness, although he does not mention the sun: Quintus Curtius Rufus, *Historia*, ed. by Carlo M. Lucarini, BT (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009), 3.7.8–3.7.10 (p. 19). See also George Cary, *The Medieval Alexander*, ed. by David J. A. Ross (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956).

[31] See also Andrew Galloway, 'The Borderlands of Satire: Linked, Opposed, and Exchanged Political Poetry during the Scottish and English Wars of the Early Fourteenth Century', in *The Anglo-Scottish Border and the Shaping of Identity, 1300–1600*, ed. by Mark P. Bruce and Katherine H. Terrell (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), pp. 15–31.

[32] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 83.

[33] *Gesta Henrici Quinti*, ch. 12 (pp. 78, 84–86, quotes at 80): 'rex indixit silencium per totum excercitum [...] tam securos se reputabant de nobis, quod regem nostrum et nobiles suos nocte illa sub iactu alee posuerunt'.

[34] Gaius Sallustius Crispus, 'De bello iugurthino', in *Catilina; Iugurtha; Historiarum fragmenta selecta; Appendix sallustiana*, ed. by Leighton D. Reynolds, OCT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), pp. 54–149 (here 98.6–99.1, p. 137). For reception see Kristeller and others, eds, *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum*, VIII, 183–326, X, 375–91; Reynolds, ed., *Texts and Transmission*, pp. 341–47; Walde and Egger, eds, *Reception of Classical Literature*, pp. 370–78.

[35] See pp. 37–50 above.

[36] Christopher Allmand, 'The *De re militari* of Vegetius in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance', in *Writing War: Medieval Literary Responses to Warfare*, ed. by Corinne J. Saunders, Françoise Le Saux, and Neil Thomas (Cambridge: Brewer, 2004), pp. 15–28 (here 25); Andrea Ruddick, 'National Sentiment and Religious Vocabulary in Fourteenth-Century England', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 60 (2009), 1–18 (esp. 17–18); Ruddick, *English Identity*, pp. 138–39, 150–51, 263, 271–74, 278, 281 (although not always in a military sense); Bellis, 'Reader myghte lamente', pp. 88–89.

English writers only attribute pride or sin as the cause of defeat to enemy forces.[37] The notion of a divine scourge is a common feature of the French writers who needed to rationalise decades of defeat at the hands of the English, but can also be seen in earlier English descriptions of defeats, such as Bannockburn.[38]

Immoral action is sometimes said to be the cause of self-defeat, but in a different sense than lack of piety. English writers only use this idea for descriptions of enemy defeat, however. At the end of the battle of Neville's Cross the *Lanercost Chronicle* declares that 'by prayers of the blessed Virgin Mary and Saint Cuthbert, confessor of Christ, David [II] and the flower of Scotland, by the just judgement of God, fell into the pit, which they themselves had made'.[39] William Dene similarly describes the French defeat at the battle of Crécy: 'the French miserably fell into, just as the Psalmist says, they fell into the pit, which they prepared'.[40] Dene hints at the source of this trope, Psalm 7, which describes how God will make King David's enemies suffer in the very manner in which they seek to harm their victims: 'he uncovered a hole and dug it and will fall into the pit, which he made'.[41]

Writers sometimes condemn the enemy for overconfidence in their own strength rather than piety. The *Lanercost Chronicle* asserts that the English at the battle of Neville's Cross were 'totally confident not in swords, helmets, lances, and mail, or in other gilded arms, but in the name of Christ, not for invading, but for resisting the invaders'.[42] The Scots at the battle of Halidon Hill, conversely, are described as: 'trusting in their multitude, because they were twice as many as those of the English, hardened their hearts and were unwilling to return' to Scotland,

---

[37] English writers occasionally claim that the Black Death results from sin: Reading, *Chronicle*, pp. 106–10 (here 110): 'proh dolor! quamcito gentes vindictae Dei oblitae, quoniam propter peccata hominum, ut creditur, praedicta pestilentia genus humanum infici ac interire adeo permisit'. See also Le Baker, *Chronicle*, pp. 98–100.

[38] See for example Françoise Autrand, 'La Déconfiture: La Bataille de Poitiers (1356) à travers quelques textes français des XIV^e^ et XV^e^ siècles', in *Guerre et société en France, en Angleterre et en Bourgogne, XIV^e^–XV^e^ siècles*, ed. by Philippe Contamine, Charles Giry-Deloison, and Maurice Keen (Villeneuve d'Ascq: Centre d'histoire de la région du nord et de l'Europe du nord-ouest, Université Charles de Gaulle-Lille III, 1991), pp. 93–121; Anne Curry, 'Snatching Defeat from the Jaws of Victory: French Responses to Agincourt', *Proceedings of the Western Society for French History*, 28 (2002), 177–87 (esp. 179); Christina Normore, 'Depicting Defeat in the *Grandes Chroniques de France*', in *Representing War and Violence, 1250–1600*, ed. by Joanna Bellis and Laura Slater (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2016), pp. 39–55.

[39] *Lanercost*, p. 351: 'precibus beatae virginis Mariae sanctique Cuthberti, Christi confessoris, David et flos Scotiae justo Dei judicio cadebant in foveam quam ipsimet fecerunt'. St Cuthbert is also the patron saint of Northumbria and is buried in Durham, near where Neville's Cross was fought.

[40] Dene, *Rochester*, fol. 92^v^: 'Franci miserabiliter inciderunt sicut dicit psalmista inciderunt in fouea[m] qui parau[er]unt'.

[41] *Bible*, Psalm 7.16: 'lacum aperuit et effodit eum et incidet in foveam quam fecit', also see Psalm 56.7: 'rete paraverunt gressibus meis ad incurvandam animum meam / foderunt ante me foveam ceciderunt in medium eius'.

[42] *Lanercost*, p. 348: 'non in gladiis, galeis, lanceis, et loricis, vel aliis aureis armis, sed in Christi nomine, totaliter confidentes, nec ad invadendum sed ad resistendum contra invasores'.

and cease their aggression.[43] In the short continuation of the *Canterbury Chronicle* the writer declares that Edward of Woodstock puts his men at risk in his 1367 Iberian campaign 'because it is not in the multitude of an army but in the fortitude of God that victory of war stands, he placed himself and his men in the hand of God alone'.[44] William Dene, likewise, ascribes the English victory at the battle of Sluys to 'God and not the strength of men, because it is not in the multitude of strength but of virtue that battles are won'.[45] These writers draw this idea from Maccabees, which states that 'there is no difference in view of God of heaven to liberate [those] in many or in few because victory of war is not in the multitude of an army but [in the] strength from heaven', and similarly when Judas Machabeus contrasts his enemies with his people: 'they, indeed, are confident in arms and also boldness, and we, however, [are confident] in the all-powerful Lord'.[46] This idea was widely employed in historical literature to demonstrate the piety of military leaders, and thus suggest that they were supported by God.[47]

English writers have different views on how combatants should respond to defeat, and even what the causes of victory and defeat might be. The variety of attitudes towards victory and defeat show that writers had difficulty rationalising one side, especially their own, being defeated in battle and suffering large numbers of deaths. They carefully present accounts to better praise their own men or criticise the enemy as a whole, or even particular combatants, around certain moral subjects related to ending hostilities.

2. SURRENDER

Ransom earned from captives acted as a strong motivation for combatants to participate in war.[48] It was also important to maintain the 'international chivalry' and fair treatment of opponents when hostilities ended, to allow the nobility to survive war and to not encourage a more

---

[43] *Lanercost*, p. 274: 'in sua multitudine confidentes, quia erant duplo plures quam Anglici, induraverunt corda sua et noluerunt reverti'.

[44] *Canterbury Chronicle*, pp. 148–50: 'quod non in multitudine exercitus sed in Dei fortitudine uictoria belli consistit, posuit se et suos in manum solius Dei'.

[45] Dene, *Rochester*, fol. 85^{r}: 'Deus [et] non vis humana, quia no[n] in multitudine viru[m] s[ed] virtutu[m] bella vincunt[ur]'.

[46] *Bible*, I Maccabees 3.18–3.19, II Maccabees 8.18: 'non est differentia in conspectu Dei caeli liberare in multis et in paucis quia non in multitudine exercitus victoria belli sed de caelo fortitudo est', 'illi quidem armis confidunt ait simul et audacia nos autem in omnipotente Domino'.

[47] See also Allmand, *Hundred Years War*, pp. 39, 55; Ruddick, *English Identity*, pp. 151, 278, 283.

[48] For profit, including from ransomed prisoners, as an incentive to participate in campaigns, see Hewitt, *Organization of War*, pp. 93–110; Keen, *Laws of War*, pp. 137–55; John Gillingham, 'Surrender in Medieval Europe: An Indirect Approach', in *How Fighting Ends: A History of Surrender*, ed. by Holger Afflerbach and Hew Strachan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 55–72 (here 59); Rémy Ambühl, *Prisoners of War in the Hundred Years War: Ransom Culture in the Late Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 98–102; Barber, *Edward III*, pp. 396–98.

'total' form of war.[49] Indeed, the English were able to secure profitable treaties when they captured enemy kings, such as David II after the battle of Neville's Cross and Jean II after the battle of Poitiers.[50] There would therefore be little reason to kill the enemy outright in every situation. It has recently been argued that writers did not claim that refusing surrender was against the laws of war, but this position requires one to ignore the nuance of writers' rhetorical strategies.[51] I argue that the idea of mercy is widely understood by writers of historical literature, despite the many instances in which it is not followed in narrative sources. In these instances writers attempt to justify these violent transgressions as either beyond the control of military leaders or as pragmatic necessities, given the particular circumstances of the encounters.

English narratives suggest leaders and their men should accept the enemy's request to surrender in most situations. Most of the combatants who are shown to surrender are prominent or wealthy leaders, but sometimes also lesser knights.[52] The *Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* always depicts the English as accepting the surrender of enemy combatants.[53] Jean le Bel shows how it might be more praiseworthy to take captives than kill the enemy outright in battle. He describes a small skirmish that develops into a more serious encounter in 1342 outside Vannes:

> There was a great battle, and there was a great number of dead and of wounded. At this battle Sir Olivier de Clisson [*c.* 1300–43] and Sir Hervé de Léon [d. 1344] drove forward to such an extent that they were captured and so brought as prisoners to King Edward [III].[54]

These combatants had fought in the vanguard, the most dangerous part of the battle, but survived and were eagerly taken captive. John of Reading summarises Edward of Woodstock's 1356 Gascony campaign as if it consisted solely of capturing enemy combatants: 'and he captured, travelling through countries, more than six thousand men of arms'.[55] In his brief summary he

---

[49] Maurice Keen, 'Brotherhood in Arms', *History*, 47 (1962), 1–17; John Gillingham, '1066 and the Introduction of Chivalry into England', in *Law and Government in Medieval England and Normandy: Essays in Honour of Sir James Holt*, ed. by George Garnett and John Hudson (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 31–55; Matthew Strickland, 'Killing or Clemency? Ransom, Chivalry and Changing Attitudes to Defeated Opponents in Britain and Northern France, 7–12th Centuries', in *Krieg im Mittelalter*, ed. by Hans-Henning Kortüm (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2001), pp. 93–122.

[50] C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, p. 189.

[51] Andy King, '"Then a great misfortune befell them": The Laws of War on Surrender and the Killing of Prisoners on the Battlefield in the Hundred Years War', *Journal of Medieval History*, 43 (2017), 106–17 (here 113).

[52] See for example *London St Paul's*, p. 350; *Long ANPB*, chs 162 (pp. 206, 207), 168 (215, 216), 172 (221), 181 (227), 223 (301, 308); Reading, *Chronicle*, p. 104; or most of the other descriptions of battles in historical literature.

[53] *Long ANPB*, chs 162 (pp. 206, 207), 168 (215, 216), 172 (221), 181 (227), 223 (301, 308).

[54] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 63 (II, 24): 'y eut grande bataille, et de mors et de navrez grande foison. A celle bataille s'embatirent si avant messire Olivier de Clichon et messire Henry de Lyon qu'ilz furent pris et menez prisonniers au roy Edowart'.

[55] Reading, *Chronicle*, p. 124: 'captivavitque, itinerando per patrias, plures quam sex milia hominum armatorum'.

occasionally mentions devastation, tersely, but his descriptions of military encounters in the campaign, before its elaborate climax at the battle of Poitiers, is almost entirely focused on how the English take large numbers of captives.

English combatants are often shown to have explicitly non-violent desires. The *Lanercost Chronicle* states that the English take up arms to defend against the 1346 Scottish invasion of England, and adds: 'but these were overcome without envy, such as when Cain is killing Abel'.[56] The text shows that the English are reluctant to do the violent acts that make up war and battle, as it does in its narration of battle itself.[57] *Lanercost*'s mention of Cain suggests that the Scots' deeds will not be the customary actions that make up warfare, as fought by all sides, but will instead be unjustified murder.[58] The chronicle also associates the English with the Jewish leader Judas Machabeus, as do many other English texts, such as the *Kirkstall Abbey Long Chronicle*, which repeatedly describes Edward of Woodstock as 'our Judas Machabeus'.[59] *Lanercost* directly contrasts the motives of the Scots and English immediately before the battle of Neville's Cross:

> [Amongst the Scots were many prominent leaders] and many other strong earls and barons, men-at-arms and squires, furiously furious, not restrained by reason, all of one mind against the English, and proceeding forward, not wishing to cease, firmly trusting in their own power, surging from too much pride, like Satan, they all thought they would fly up to the stars.[60]

The writer begins this seemingly formulaic description of notable Scottish participants with a chivalrous description of knights and their strength but quickly shifts into a critique of their pride and glory seeking, in the most critical terms.[61] The English, in contrast, are shown to only do battle to defend against the unwarranted invasion, without any desire for profit, glory, or to kill the enemy.

---

[56] *Lanercost*, p. 348: 'hi autem nulla victi invidia ut Chaim Abel occidens'.

[57] See pp. 102–06, 133–36, 161–62 above.

[58] *Bible*, Genesis 4.3–4.15.

[59] See for example *Kirkstall*, fol. 82^{v}: 'n[oste]r Judas Machabe[us] p[ri]nceps videl[icet] Wallie', similarly on fols 83^{r}, 83^{v}. See also Ruddick, *English Identity*, p. 151.

[60] *Lanercost*, p. 349: 'et multi alii valentes comites et barones, milites et armigeri, furiose furibundi, mente effraenati, omnes uno animo contra Anglicos, et proni procedentes nolebant cessare, in potestate propria firmiter consisi, prae nimis superbia furgentes (ut) Sathana, omnes putabant ad stellas evolare'. See also the motivation ascribed to Lucifer in *Bible*, Isaiah 14.13–14.14: 'in caelum conscendam super astra Dei exaltabo solium meum sedebo in monte testamenti in lateribus aquilonis / ascendam super altitudinem nubium ero similis Altissimo'.

[61] See Middle English writings on sin, especially pride: Robert R. Raymo, 'Works of Religious and Philosophical Instruction', in *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050–1500*, ed. by Burke J. Severs, Albert E. Hartung, and Ludwig Bieler, 11 vols so far (New Haven: Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1967–), VII, 2255–2378, 2467–2582 (here 2304–11, 2526–31).

French and Scottish combatants are depicted with overly violent motivations and a desire to mistreat English combatants who attempt to surrender. The *Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* shows that the Scots often ignore any common Christian identity that might have otherwise encouraged mercy. At the battle of Dupplin Moor an argument breaks out between two Scottish knights shortly before battle. Donald (1293–1332), earl of Mar, says to Robert Bruce (d. 1332, illegitimate son of Robert I, king of the Scots), lord of Liddesdale:

> It weighs greatly on my heart that these people whom Balliol has brought with him will be killed by the blows of swords of the people of Scotland, because they are Christian men just as we are, because of which it seems to me that it would be a great kindness to send [word] to them that they should want to surrender to our mercy, and that they will be ransomed.[62]

Bruce, however, accuses Donald of being a traitor and that he intends 'to save those who are our mortal enemies, who have done to us so much evil and shame'.[63] Donald is quick to reassert his allegiance and declares his intent to fight the enemy with more zeal than his peers, although he shies away from describing his intentions in terms of violence or refusing to take captives. The text's description of Bruce's condemnation of Donald serves as a stern criticism of the Scots for ignoring conventions of surrender and disregarding the tenets of Christianity.

Battles and other military encounters were confusing, especially when the defeated began to flee, which made it particularly difficult to take captives.[64] English writers often excuse these situations when their own men are to blame, rather than condemn them. Sometimes they blame this on noble disdain for lesser combatants. Jean le Bel warns that Guy II (1312–36), count of Namur, and his men at the battle of Boroughmuir (1335) 'would have never taken by mercy the [enemy] men on foot, if they had arrived'.[65] However, writers typically attribute these killings to cultural animosity or a lack of 'chivalric' culture amongst lesser combatants.[66] He similarly describes how John Copeland captures David II at the battle of Neville's Cross, but had to take

---

[62] *Long ANPB*, ch. 223 (p. 306): 'graundement il me paise a coer qe cestez gentz queux le Baillol ad oue luy amesnez murrerunt de coupe despee de gentz Descoce depuis qe ils sount Cristiens hommes sibien come nous, par quoi il me semble qe graunt charite serroit de enuoir as eux qe ils lour voulsissent rendre a nostre grace et qe ils fuissent ransounez'.

[63] *Long ANPB*, ch. 223 (p. 307): 'vous sauer voillez ceux qe sount noz enemyes mortels queux nous ount faitz tant de male [et] hounte'.

[64] Barber, *Edward III*, pp. 398–99; C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, pp. 195–96; King, 'Then a great misfortune', pp. 107–08.

[65] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 24 (I, 116): 'ne les eussent jamaiz pris à mercy les gens de pyé, s'ilz y fussent parvenu'.

[66] See also Maurice Keen, 'Chivalry, Nobility, and the Man-At-Arms', in *War, Literature and Politics in the Late Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of G. W. Coopland*, ed. by Christopher Allmand (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1976), pp. 32–45.

'great pains to guard him from being killed by men of the land', who had suffered greatly from the invasion, and others before it, at the hands of the Scots.[67] Geoffrey le Baker shows the grim reality of these encounters during the 1339 sack of Southampton.[68] The pirates, encouraged to raid by Philippe VI, are attacked by locals the morning after the sack. As they fall back to their ships their well born leader

> Was knocked down by some country rustic, shouting 'ransom' [to his assailant], he [then] lay dead, slaughtered by cudgels by the same rustic shouting back, 'I know that you are a Frenchman', for [the rustic] did not understand his speech [French language] nor was he taught to preserve noble captives for ransom.[69]

Le Baker shows the problems of trying to take captives during intense combat, especially when people are defending their homes. He also employs humour to lessen the grim reality of this execution, as *rancoun*, the word customarily used to signal surrender, and *frauncoun* are pronounced similarly.[70] These texts show that not all combatants cared about taking captives despite the commonly discussed conventions. They do not explicitly condemn these actions because they understand that lesser combatants were not compelled by chivalric culture, but baser concerns like vengeance.

Writers typically narrate sieges, storms, and their bloody results only briefly, and often suggest that the 'right of storm' was in effect. Despite the focus on assault and storm in many scholarly works on siege warfare, such eventualities, exciting as they may be, are uncommon in narratives.[71] Jean le Bel describes how French brigands in 1359 'besieged Sissonne, which was taken by assault on the third day, and all those who were inside, were killed or captured'.[72] The threat of storm, killing, and loss of property, along with the inevitable and drawn-out process of starvation, is shown by chroniclers to encourage cities and castles to surrender before this final, costly stage.[73]

---

[67] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 76 (II, 128): 'mit grande peine à le garder d'estre tué des gens du pays'.

[68] See also Michael Hughes, 'The Fourteenth-Century French Raids on Hampshire and the Isle of Wight', in *Arms, Armies and Fortifications in the Hundred Years War*, ed. by Anne Curry and Michael Hughes (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1994), pp. 121–44; Rose, *Medieval Naval Warfare*, pp. 68–76.

[69] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 55: 'a quodam rustico terre prostratus, clamans: "Rancoun," occubuit fustibus mactatus ab eodem rustico reclamante: "Scio quod tu es Frauncoun", non enim intellexit nec eius idioma nec erat doctus captos generosos redempcioni conservare'.

[70] Ambühl, *Prisoners of War*, pp. 106–09.

[71] See pp. 17–19 above.

[72] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 103 (II, 280): 'ceulx de Cormessy et de la conté de Rethés et de la ville de Rains assiegierrent Sissonne, laquelle fut prise d'assault au tiers jour, et tous ceulx qui estoient dedens, mors et pris furent'.

[73] See for example the depiction of Edward III's 1333 siege of Berwick by Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 24 (I, 117–18): 'le noble roy Edowart demoura longtemps devant celle noble cité de Berwick, que oncques ne s'en voult partir, ains le fist assaillir par pluseurs fois. Maiz il y avoit dedens de si bonnes gens d'armes que cil assault les grevoit moult poy, et ne

Writers sometimes, but only rarely, describe the killing of combatants who attempt to surrender during sieges without excuse, in possibly critical terms. Jean le Bel narrates the 1346 English attack on Caen and tells how the French attempt to flee when defeated, but offers none of the praise or chivalric gloss that he normally adds to battles. He focuses instead on the sack and massacre of the defenders. Some French combatants hide in a gatehouse and eventually recognise the English knight Thomas Holland (*c.* 1315–60), with whom they had campaigned in Prussia and Granada earlier, and beg him: 'protect us from the men without pity who will kill us if they get hold of us, just as they did to the others'.[74] Holland cannot simply assure their safety, but 'pained himself to protect them, and then placed loyal guards around them to stop any from doing harm to them', and then continues through Caen so that he can try to 'to resist and impede the great slaughter that was there happening'.[75] The *Acta bellicosa* provides a similarly bleak description of the mass killing of defeated combatants at Caen:

> Everywhere [the English] killed by the sword all those caught. But those who had taken refuge in houses, the strong and powerful, having discerned so many of their people dead, and nothing except death for them to be imminent, surrendered themselves captive to their pursuers, but the footmen of the English army did not accept any for ransom, neither from nobles nor common men, and cut them down for no reason.[76]

These texts imply that non-knightly combatants were difficult to restrain, even if they are aware of the conventions of surrender, as they surely must be. Writers do not criticise military leaders who clearly failed in their duty, but instead show the brutality of lesser combatants, and perhaps suggest that restraint was sometimes impossible.

---

rendissent jamaiz la ville s'ilz eussent assez (de) vitaille. Maiz, quant vitaille fault, on ne poeut plus longuement durer, si vault mielx estendre que rompre. Cil noble roy ne se fust jamais parti de ce siege jusques à tant qu'il eust sa voulenté, si y tint champ si longuement que vitaille failli à la ville, et ne pouoient encores aviser engin par quoy vitaille leur peust de nulle part venir. Sy endurerent mainte mesaise, et au derrain quant plus ne peurent, ilz se rendirent à ce noble roy aprez moult de parlemens et de traictiez qui trop seroient longs à dire, et le noble roy les recheut tous à mercy, sauves leurs vyes et leurs biens'.

[74] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 71 (II, 82): 'nous deffendez des gens sans pitié qui nous tueront s'ilz nous tiennent ainsy que les aultres'. See also C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, pp. 196–97.

[75] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 71 (II, 83): 'se penerent de les garder, et puis mirent bonnes gardes entour eulx affin que on ne leur fist mal', 'deffendre et destourber la grande occision qu'on y faisoit'.

[76] *Acta bellicosa*, p. 166: 'omnes deprehensos undique gladio perimiebant. Sed qui domibus confugerant, valentes et majores, tantam cernentes mortalitatem sue nacionis, et nil aliud nisi mortem eisdem imminere, ipsos prosequentibus se captivos reddebant, sed pedestres Anglorum exercitus tam proceres quam mediocres, nulla admissa redempcione, in frustra concidebant'. See also the account of Richard Wynkeley, Edward III's confessor, in his 1346 letter to the Prior and Convent of the Blackfriars, London, interpolated in Murimuth, *Continuatio*, pp. 215–17 (here 215); the first part of which is also interpolated in Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus*, pp. 362–63 (here 362).

English writers sometimes take issue with the ethics of the 'right of storm', or even condemn it outright, but only when done by enemy forces. The *Lanercost Chronicle* suggests that David II's 1346 storm of the English-held Liddel peel was unjust. The text describes how, after the Scots break through the walls, their 'men-at-arms and squires entering the fortress slew all those whom they found, with few exceptions, and thus shamelessly obtained the fortress'.[77] Geoffrey le Baker takes a similarly critical view of the event, but does not clarify whether Liddel's governor surrenders or the Scots take the place by force:

> [The Scots] assaulted a certain manor house of Lord [Walter] de Wake, called Liddel. Lord Walter of Selby, a great man-at-arms of morals, defended the above-said place for some time against them, but finally he was compelled by the mass of Scots, to surrender himself for ransom to the victor, who took him into grace, by the usual custom of the victor according to the military law for battles with the Scots and French.[78]

Le Baker states that the rules of war still apply on the Anglo-Scottish border, an area often assumed to have endured far more brutal warfare than France, and that they ought to have been followed by both sides.[79] He then contrasts the well-understood convention of surrender with the Scottish king's cruel and unjust execution of its governor, as well as other Scottish atrocities, as does *Lanercost*.[80] Although the capture of Liddel seems to be only a routine event, it is heavily criticised by these English writers to support their greater narrative strategy, to portray David's invasion of northern England as unjust and cruel.

As a contrast to this brutality, English mercy and restraint during sieges is emphasised and depicted as morally righteous. These incidents of mercy are nearly always described in situations that the English have already won. In these cases the English are well placed to simply wait until the defenders accept terms that are harsh but profitable for the English. Accordingly, many English chronicles depict Edward III's seemingly benevolent treatment of the Scottish defenders of Berwick as exceptionally moral and praiseworthy. The most famous incident of this

---

[77] *Lanercost*, p. 345: 'milites et armigeri intrantes fortalitium illos quos invenerunt, paucis exceptis, omnes peremerunt, et sic fortalitium libere obtinuerunt'. See also the very similar account, based on the shared source, in *Anonimalle*, p. 24: 'yssint sur les Engleis entrerent et le peel a force conquerent et touz yceaux qe dedeinz troverent, horspris un qe pryvement eschapa, tuerent'.

[78] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 86: 'oppugnarunt quoddam manerium domini de Wake, vocatum Ludedew. Predictum locum per tempus aliquot contra ipsos defendebat dominus Gualterus de Seleby, miles magne probitatis, qui tandem, mole Scotorum coactus, victori se reddidit pro redemptione conservandus, qui eum in graciam, more victoris de iure militari bellis Scoticis atque Gallicis usitato, (cepit)'.

[79] See King, 'According to the custom'.

[80] See also pp. 196–99 below.

sort is Edward's mercy after his successful siege of Calais.[81] Geoffrey le Baker depicts the long siege, the unsuccessful French attempts at relief, and finally the leaders of the city humbly prostrating themselves before Edward in great detail:

> And so the captain [of Calais] presented a longsword of war to the king, as among all Christians the chief prince of battles and who against the greatest king of Christians had forcefully conquered that city with all military decency. Secondly he handed over the keys for the city to him. Thirdly, appealing to royal duty as well as pleading for mercy, he extended to the king the sword of peace, so that with it he might judge right sentences as well as spare the humble and castigate the proud.[82]

The English king receives these offerings and then, mercifully, accepts these leaders as captive, enriches them, and even feeds the starving citizens of Calais.

Few English sources present Edward III's actions at Calais in a critical light, and even then do so moderately and for other reasons. Jean le Bel depicts long negotiations with the angry English king over the terms of surrender and who will give up their lives in exchange for those of the other residents. The six burghers of Calais, famously, give themselves up to Edward, in much the same fashion as in Geoffrey le Baker's account above, with some elaboration.[83] Le Bel adds emotional detail, to his account, however. The burghers beg for mercy, but 'the king had then a heart so hardened by anger that he could not reply for a long time, then he commanded that their heads be taken immediately'.[84] The famous English knight Walter Mauny (*c.* 1310–72) complains that this is unfair, for a number of reasons, to which Edward replies and explains that 'those [people] of Calais have killed so many of my men that these too must also die'.[85] However, after much discussion, begging, and crying, Edward's wife, Philippa de Hainault (1314–69), convinces him to give the captives to her so that she can spare them.[86] Le Bel uses Philippa for rhetorical effect here and elsewhere, even going so far as to place her at the head of the English

---

[81] See also Viard, 'Siège de Calais'; DeVries, 'Hunger'; Lambert, 'Edward III's Siege of Calais'.

[82] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, pp. 91–92 (here 91): 'capitaneus itaque optulit regi spatam guerrariam, tamquam inter omnes Christianos preliorum principi precipuo et qui contra maximum regem Christianorum illam villam cum omni decencia militari conquisivit potenter. Secundo sibi tradidit claves ville. Tercio, appellans regiam pietatem atque poscens misericordiam, protulit regi gladium pacis, quo sentencias rectas adiudicaret atque parceret subiectis et superbos castigaret'.

[83] See also Jean-Marie Moeglin, 'Edouard III et les six bourgeois de Calais', *Revue historique*, 292 (1994), 230–67.

[84] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 81 (II, 166): 'le roy avoit adoncq le cuer si dur de couroux qu'il ne poeut à grand piece respondre, puis commanda que on leur copast les testes tantost'.

[85] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 81 (II, 166): 'ceulx de Calais ont fait morir tant de mes hommes qu'il fault aussy ceulx cy morir'.

[86] On the role of queens as peacemakers see Lisa Benz St John, *Three Medieval Queens: Queenship and the Crown in Fourteenth-Century England* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), pp. 51–54, 99–100, 194–95, 209–10.

army at the battle of Neville's Cross.[87] At the time Philippa was actually in Ypres, but Le Bel's narrative of both Calais and Neville's Cross are so convincing and seemingly realistic that they are believed and copied by Jean Froissart, whose account of these events is rarely questioned by scholars today.[88]

Writers do not take issue with the fact that combatants who were not wealthy were rarely kept alive as captives once defeated and often killed indifferently, as they narrate such grim events without any sort of rhetorical apparatus. The majority of late medieval armies were made up of such combatants, and therefore large numbers of men in defeated armies were often killed, but sources disagree on whether this was during combat or the rout that followed.[89] Jean le Bel suggests this is standard in his description of the French defeat at the battle of Poitiers. After his lengthy narrative he mentions several prominent persons captured and summarises the event:

> The English and the Gascons easily had two thousand valuable prisoners, and killed so many commoners and robbed wagons and carts and pack horses that it is unbelievable, and the chase and pursuit continued as far as the gates of Poitiers, and in the pursuit the greatest part of the prisoners were taken.[90]

The victorious English 'had returned there from their chase, and there was each of them leading his prisoners, one with two, another with three, another with four'.[91] Le Bel then makes it clear that these captives were wealthy: 'the honour and the gain to those who had prisoners was not small'.[92] It is thereby suggested that there would be no reason to take the poorer enemy combatants as captives.

Intentional refusal of surrender is dealt with carefully in narrative sources. It was sometimes more pragmatic to kill the enemy in battle than to take them captive.[93] Vegetius highlights

---

87 Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 76 (II, 127–31).

88 On the reality of Philippa's non-participation at Neville's Cross, see Prestwich, and for examples of Le Bel and Froissart being trusted or quoted uncritically, see for example DeVries, Nicholson (who, following the error in the edition of Le Bel, gives the year as 1347), and Gilbert: Michael Prestwich, 'The English at the Battle of Neville's Cross', in *The Battle of Neville's Cross, 1346*, ed. by David Rollason and Michael Prestwich (Stamford: Tyas, 1998), pp. 1–14 (here 8–9); DeVries, *Infantry Warfare*, p. 181; H. J. Nicholson, *Medieval Warfare*, p. 78; James E. Gilbert, 'A Medieval "Rosie the Riveter"? Women in France and Southern England during the Hundred Years War', in *The Hundred Years War: A Wider Focus*, ed. by L. J. Andrew Villalon and Donald J. Kagay (Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 333–63 (here 356).

89 See also King, 'According to the custom', pp. 269–70; Hans-Henning Kortüm, 'Surrender in Medieval Times', in *How Fighting Ends: A History of Surrender*, ed. by Holger Afflerbach and Hew Strachan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 41–54 (here 46); Ambühl, *Prisoners of War*, pp. 38–39.

90 Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 94 (II, 235): 'les Angloys et les Gascons eurent bien .ii^{m}. bons prisonniers, et tuerent tant de communes et desrobant chars et charrettes et sommiers qu'on ne le porroit croire, et dura la chasse et la poursuite jusques aux portes de Poittiers, et en chassant furent pris la plus grande partie des prisonniers'.

91 Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 94 (II, 235): 'furent revenus au lieu de leur chasse, et eut chascun amené ses prisonniers, l'ung deux, l'aultre .iii., l'aultre .iiii.'

92 Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 94 (II, 236): 'l'onneur et le gaing ne furent pas petis à ceulx qui prisonniers avoient'.

93 C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, pp. 191–92.

the dangers of allowing combatants to begin taking captives and looting while a battle was still undecided, and advocates attacking such looters to turn the tide of battle.[94] Nowhere in his manual does he suggest that this attitude might be considered immoral, but this is likely because the opponents he referred to were at the time he wrote outsider 'barbarians' who are treated with disdain in his text. Geoffroi de Charny also warns of the dangers of being too eager to loot or secure captives during battle, both for the individual combatant as well as his side in battle.[95]

Late medieval writers did not think refusing surrender was inherently acceptable, and found it necessary to sidestep the ethical problems associated with it.[96] Geoffrey le Baker states that Philippe VI forbids his men from taking captives for ransom at the battle of Crécy: 'fearing they would be too busy with capturing their nobles for ransom, and thus sluggish, gasp up to the common victory'.[97] Jean le Bel asserts that at Crécy it was Edward III, rather than the French king opposing him, who orders that none of his men 'should break from his rank, nor loot, nor despoil either the dead or the living without his permission, for if the battle were in their favour, each of them would have enough time to pillage'.[98] The unsavoury nature of killing all of the enemy is treated as if it were a pragmatic necessity by both Le Baker and Le Bel. Instead of highlighting how these acts might be cruel, and thereby criticise the leaders ordering them, as each writer had ample reason to do, these writers provide justifications that sidestep any ethical problems. In the process they also praise their leaders for being shrewd tacticians.[99]

These discussions of captive-taking are rare in narratives of land battles, with the cases above among the few exceptions. If this sort of brutal conduct is mentioned, rather than simply implied in a casualty list, it is typically accompanied by much commentary that seeks to explain it. These justifications suggest that writers thought these acts would be seen as immoral if decontextualised or not properly explained. Many chivalric writers, especially in France, expect generals to put themselves at a slight disadvantage to accept enemy captives, at least the prominent ones, in land battles.[100]

---

[94] Vegetius, *Epitoma*, 3.11 (p. 92): 'cum ad praedam aut ad redeundum converterint animum, cum ordines solverint, tunc illis stupentibus lectissimi quique prorumpant et conferti adgrediantur ignaros'.

[95] Charny, *Book of Chivalry*, § 15 (p. 98).

[96] C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, pp. 194–95; King, 'Then a great misfortune', pp. 108–12.

[97] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 82: 'timens ne circa capcionem nobilium redimendorum sui forent nimium ocupati, et proinde segnius ad communem victoriam hanelarent'.

[98] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 72 (II, 106): 'se desrochast de son rench, ne ne gaagnast, ne despoullast ne mort ne vif sans son congié, car se la besongne estoit pour eulx, chascun ve(n)rroit assez à temps au pillage'.

[99] The wide ownership of military writings that emphasise, and sometimes explicitly praise, trickery and clever tactics suggests that such behaviour was held in high regard by military men and writers alike: C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, p. 235.

[100] See C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, pp. 177–207.

Narratives of battles at sea nearly always engage with problems of surrender. The reality of naval encounters made the refusal of surrender less morally problematic, and even praiseworthy in some cases, due to the pragmatic difficulties. In such battles there were few facilities to incarcerate enemy combatants without putting the rest of a force's men at great risk.[101] The fighting was ship-to-ship and there were not enough men to properly restrain enemy captives and effectively fight the battle at the same time. Combatants, accordingly, often killed those who attempted to surrender, or simply cast them into the sea to drown. If this behaviour were abstracted from the conditions of naval battles it would easily be seen as unethical, just as it would be in land battles. English writers often describe this harsh reality but take care to present it in their texts with extra context and justification to mitigate any ethical problems. These are most often found in narratives of the two major English naval victories at Sluys and Winchelsea.

Some writers describe, with seeming indifference, how the English cast their defeated enemies into the sea. The *Lanercost Chronicle* states that a number of the enemy at the battle of Sluys are 'killed and submerged [drowned] and also captured'.[102] The *Parallel Chronicle* similarly describes how 'a great multitude were submerged and killed. [The English] subdued [them] and a few ships barely slipped away by flight'.[103] Jean le Bel also offers the same types of details: 'the French, Normans, Gascons, Bretons, and Genoese were at last killed, drowned and defeated, and few escaped'.[104] The only English source that explicitly states that the enemy were drowned by the English, rather than give an ambiguous summary in the passive voice like the others, is the *London French Chronicles*: '[the English] ejected them from their ships and galleys'.[105] These sources all take an ambivalent tone and avoid any explicit descriptions of what were surely horrible deaths, which allows them to sidestep the moral issues of refusing surrender.

The conditions that contribute to the seemingly high brutality and mortality in reality are sometimes hinted at by English writers. Narratives mention that ships were often chained

---

[101] Colin F. Richmond, 'The War at Sea', in *The Hundred Years War*, ed. by Kenneth Fowler (London: Macmillan, 1971), pp. 96–121; Prestwich, *Armies and Warfare*, pp. 276–80. See also Kelly DeVries, 'God, Leadership, Flemings, and Archery: Contemporary Perceptions of Victory and Defeat at the Battle of Sluys, 1340', *American Neptune*, 55 (1995), 223–42; Rose, *Medieval Naval Warfare*, pp. 3–4 (problems in using narrative sources to understand naval warfare), 61–68 and 74–75 (conduct in naval battles); H. J. Nicholson, *Medieval Warfare*, pp. 144–63, 209–13.

[102] *Lanercost*, p. 333: 'occisis et submersis ac captis'; which is nearly the same in the two other texts with the shared source: *Anonimalle*, p. 16: 'ascunes occirount, ascunes nyerount et ascunes eschaperount'; *Durham LPB*, MS 2 fol. 33^{r}: 'occisis [et] s[u]bm[er]sis ac captis'.

[103] *Parallel Chronicle*, MS 1 fol. 128^{v}: 'maxima multitudine subm[er]sa [et] occisa: deuicit [et] paucis [*sic*: 'nauibus' omitted] uix fuga dilapsis', MS 2 fol. 56^{r}: 'maxima multitudine s[u]bm[er]sa [et] occisa deuicit [et] paucis nauib[us] uix fuga dilapsis'.

[104] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 36 (I, 179): 'les françoys, normans, gascons, bretons, genevoys furent au desrain mors, noyez et desconfitz, et petit en eschappa'.

[105] *London French*, p. 77: 'hors de lour niefs et galeyes engetterent'.

together to allow combatants to move around to different areas of all the ships, as needed. This also prevented fleeing and, given the lack of resources to take captives, those who sought to surrender were often simply killed instead. John of Tynemouth describes the French ships as 'being bound by great iron chains and cords together'.[106] Reading similarly describes the battle of Winchelsea as 'a naval battle that was certainly harshest where, the ships being chained [together], it is necessary to either fight or drown' and, because of this, 'few who fought escaped [but were] wounded enormously' and 'an abundant multitude perished'.[107] These texts do not attempt to portray the French as unethical for employing strategem or trickery.[108] Descriptions of such acts reflect the wisdom of the military leaders who employ them, so long as oaths were not broken in the process.[109] Jean Froissart, who also mentions the ships chained together at Sluys, explains the nature of sea battles more succinctly than English writers:

> Battles and assaults [fought] on the sea are more harsh and more fierce than [those fought] on the land, for one cannot recoil nor flee, but must sell oneself and do combat, and await fortune, and each rightly show of himself his hardiness and his prowess.[110]

None of the sources that mention the ships being chained together criticises any combatants for their lack of mercy because of the conditions of sea battles.[111] These narratives instead aim to convey the heightened risk of such encounters.

---

[106] Tynemouth, *Historia*, not in MSS, edn p. 356: 'colligatis magnis catenis ferreis et cordis insimul navibus'.

[107] Reading, *Chronicle*, p. 111: 'bellum navale utique durissimum, ubi, cathenatis navibus, aut pugnare aut mergere oportet', 'pauci qui pugnabant evaserunt, enormiter laesi', 'multitudine copiosa perierunt ibidem'.

[108] Military historians treat strategem, deception, and trickery almost exclusively in terms of how they function, rather than their ethical qualities. See for example Michael I. Handel, *Masters of War: Classical Strategic Thought*, 3rd edn (London: Cass, 2001), esp. pp. 215–53; Barton Whaley, *Stratagem: Deception and Surprise in War* (London: Artech House, 2007). However, see also John Mark Mattox, 'The Moral Limits of Military Deception', *Journal of Military Ethics*, 1 (2002), 4–15.

[109] The ethics of strategem, deception, taking advantage, and other related terms are complicated and beyond the scope of this thesis. On these subjects see: Whetham, *Just Wars*; C. Taylor, 'Review of: Whetham, *Just Wars*'; C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, pp. 231–75; James Titterton, 'Deception and Trickery in Medieval Warfare, 1050–1320' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Leeds, 2019 forthcoming).

[110] Froissart, *Chronicles, 'B'*, § 115 (II, 37): 'batailles et assaus sus mer sont plus dur et plus fort que sus terre, car là ne poet on reculer ne fuir, mais se fault vendre et combatre, et attendre l'aventure, et cescun endroit de lui moustrer son hardement et se proèce'. See also Froissart, *Chronicles, 'A'*, fol. 60^{r}; *Chronicles, 'Amiens'*, § 274 (II, 38); *Chronicles, 'C'*, fol. 45^{r}; *Chronicles, 'N'* omits this passage; *Chronicles, 'Rome'*, § 111 (p. 406).

[111] See also descriptions of the English use of feigned flight to break up the French formation: *London French*, p. 76: 'la flote des niefs de Fraunce estoient si fortement entre lyez de grosses cheines, chatelez, bretaxez, et barrez [...] lors nos mariners treyerent les sigles à demi mast, et treierent sus lour ankres en manere come ils voleient fuir, et quaunt la navie de Fraunce çeo virent ils se deslierent de lour grosses cheines pur nous pursuer. Et meintenaunt nous niefs retournerent sure eux, et la medlé comensa'; Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus*, p. 312: 'cum catenis ferreis in una acie adeo colligatum quod non potuit penetrari, retro paululum navigarunt. Francigenae vero, per hoc decepti, suum navigium dissolverunt, et Anglicos, ut credebant fugientes, insequi nitebantur. Sed Anglici, ventum habentes dono Dei prosperum, illico redierunt, et confligentes cum Francigenis'. The feigned flight tactic is rare in late medieval sources, but commonly described and praised in Roman texts, such as Frontinus, *Strategemata*, 2.5.1–2.5.8, 2.5.12–2.5.14,

The grim spectacle of throwing great numbers of dying or even defeated enemy combatants into the sea to die, and then wash up on shore, is typically avoided by writers. A few curiously mention this brutal reality in their narratives. Edward III states that: 'so lay the dead bodies and all openly in place upon the coast of Flanders' in his letter to Edward of Woodstock, his son.[112] In contrast, the other surviving English newsletter that describes this event requests a public thanksgiving in the midst of much religious commentary, but fails to mention or even allude to these macabre details.[113] Jean le Bel is the only chronicler writing for an English audience to describe the dead seen in the water or washing up on the coast. He mentions some of the prominent men killed, numbers the dead and drowned at around 30,000, and reports that 'of which the sea ejected a great part on the shores of Sluys and of Cadzand, and there were found some all armed, just as they had fought'.[114] However, his uniquely explicit statement that some of the dead were found equipped as if still in combat suggests that they died fighting, rather than being thrown into the sea unceremoniously after they had been defeated and stripped of their equipment. Le Bel's account of the battle praises the action and its participants, but does not criticise the English for their harsh measures, probably because they were understood to be pragmatic.

Sometimes writers blame enemy combatants themselves for drowning. This allows them to make these brutal executions closer to suicide and thereby exonerate the English. Geoffrey le Baker states that the enemy willingly drown themselves rather than surrender at the battle of Sluys, without any reasonable justification: 'the French, with their ships abandoned, for the most part freely submerged themselves'.[115] Many others make light of the situation and claim that the

---

2.5.19–2.5.20, 2.5.23–2.5.24, 2.5.32–2.5.35, 3.11 (pp. 45–50, 53–54, 83–84); Valerius Maximus, *Factorum*, 7.4.1 (pp. 467–68); Vegetius, *Epitoma*, 4.26 (p. 142).

[112] Edward III, 'Letter to Edward of Woodstock, 24 June 1340', in *A Chronicle of London, from 1089 to 1483, Written in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. by Nicholas Harris Nicolas (London: Longman, 1827), pp. 199–201 (here 201): 'si gissent les corps mortz et tut pleyn de lieux s[ur] la costere de Flaundres'.

[113] Edward III, 'Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 18 June 1340', in *A Chronicle of London, from 1089 to 1483, Written in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. by Nicholas Harris Nicolas (London: Longman, 1827), pp. 198–99; as well as versions interpolated in *Long ANPB Continuation*, fols 192^{r}–193^{r}; Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus*, pp. 312–14; Tynemouth, *Historia*, not in MSS, edn pp. 357–59.

[114] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 36 (I, 179): 'a celle bataille fut mort ledit messire H(ue) Kyrès et pluseurs de son lignage, et bien .xxx^{m}. hommes, que morts que noyez, ainsy comme on disoit, desquelx la mer en jetta grand partie sur la rive de l'Escluse et de Cagant, et furent trouvez aucuns tous armez, ainsy que combastus s'estoient'.

[115] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 69: 'Gallici, navibus relictis, pro magna parte gratis se ipsos submerserunt'. See also *Short ANPB Continuation*, fol. 173^{r} (Sluys): 'pluros de eux noerunt lo[ur] mesmes en le meer'; Higden, *Polychronicon*, 7.44 (VIII, 336, Sluys): 'gratis submersi'; copied exactly in *Osney*, p. 350; with small changes elsewhere in the narrative in *Eulogium*, 5.78 (III, 205); Higden, *Polychronicon SAA Continuation*, MS 1 fol. 294^{v} (Winchelsea): 'se reddere noluerunt iussa regis E[dwardi] miserabil[ite]r p[er]ierunt alii ferro cesi alii aquis subm[er]si'; Murimuth, *Continuatio*, p. 107 (Sluys): 'multi se gratis submerserunt'; Reading, *Chronicle*, p. 111 (Winchelsea): 'citius mori quam se reddere eligentes'; Tynemouth, *Historia*, MS 2.3 fol. 235^{v}: 'spo[n]te submersis', not in edn; similarly, but with slight additions to the narrative, in *Kirkstall*, fol. 81^{v}.

defeated combatants are not forced to drown or leap in voluntarily, but instead dance or somersault into the sea.[116] Some writers take this morbid humour even further. Laurence Minot, after condemning the enemy at the battle of Winchelsea for having earlier attacked English civilians and looted the country, describes how fish feed on the dead bodies as a just return for their earlier crimes.[117]

The rules and conventions established by civilian writers, far from the battlefield or campaign, were rarely considered in the heat of the moment.[118] English writers are accordingly careful to depict killing and attempts at surrender in a fashion so that their combatants do not appear to be immoral to those reading their texts. This allows them to carefully navigate the tensions between military (or chivalric) vengeance and Christian mercy, so prevalent in literature.[119] It is dangerous, therefore, to attribute all cases of killing the enemy in battle, rather than capturing them, to animosity between knights and lesser combatants, especially when there are so many other concerns affecting these narratives.[120]

3. TREATMENT OF CAPTIVES

The many and varied descriptions of surrender and captive-taking all suggest that captives should be treated well, regardless of the fact that they had earlier fought against their captors.[121] Good treatment of captives is implicitly established as normative conduct through passing descriptions of the English and their incarceration of enemy combatants, without any notions of vengeance. I argue that on the rare occasion that captives are shown to be mistreated the writers

---

[116] Dene, *Rochester*, fol. 85^{r} (Sluys): 'fugientes de nauib[us] in mare saltare vi armata [con]pulerunt'; Minot, *Poems*, 5.14, 5.56–5.58 (Sluys): 'þare lered Inglis men þam a new daunce', 'and in middes þe flode did þam to wade / to wade war þo wretches casten in þe brim / þe kaitefs come out of France at lere þam to swim'; *Prophetic LPB*, fol. 33^{r} (Sluys): 'no[n]nulli v[ero] in mar[e] saltauerunt'; Tynemouth, *Historia*, not in MSS, edn p. 357: 'in mari saltaverunt'. See also Burton, *Melsa*, III, 45.

[117] Minot, *Poems*, 10.5–10.6: 'fele fissches þai fede | for all þaire grete fare / it was in þe waniand | þat þai come þare'. See also Burton, *Melsa*, III, 45: 'tantaque fuit ibidem effusio sanguinis quod tota illa aqua de Swynn, et usque in mare, per .iii. dies sequentes magis apparuit sanguis quam aqua, tantique fuerunt ibidem Franci et Normanni interfecti et submersi quod de eis ridicule dicebatur, quod, si Deus piscibus maris loquelam dedisset, ex ipsorum mortuorum devoratione, ydioma Gallicum profecto in posterum habuissent'; Vegetius, *Epitoma*, 4.4 (p. 157): 'inter tanta tamen mortium genera qui acerrimus casus est, absumenda piscibus insepulta sunt corpora'.

[118] Barber, *Edward III*, p. 408.

[119] Richard W. Kaeuper, 'Vengeance and Mercy in Chivalric Mentalité', in *Peace and Protection in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Thomas B. Lambert and David Rollason (Durham: Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, Durham University, 2009), pp. 168–80.

[120] This is commonly cited as the cause for killing in battle. See for example C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, pp. 197–98, 207.

[121] See also John Gillingham, 'Killing and Mutilating Political Enemies in the British Isles from the Late Twelfth to the Early Fourteenth Century: A Comparative Study', in *Britain and Ireland, 900–1300: Insular Responses to Medieval European Change*, ed. by Brendan Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 114–34; Matthew Bennett, 'Warrior Narratives and Hostageship Ethos: Old French Literature and "Reality" in the Twelfth Century', in *Medieval Hostageship, c. 700–c. 1500: Hostage, Captive, Prisoner of War, Guarantee, Peacemaker*, ed. by Matthew Bennett and Katherine Weikert (New York: Routledge, 2017), pp. 79–91.

invariably attach context that designates the actions as either righteous acts of justice or as immoral crimes.

Captive combatants are mostly shown as treated well by the English so that such behaviour can be praised. The *Canterbury Chronicle* states briefly that, after Edward of Woodstock captures Jean II and many other French knights at the battle of Poitiers, 'the said prince held himself humanely to them'.[122] Le Bel describes Edward III's lavish treatment of Geoffroi de Charny and his men, instead of throwing them in a dungeon, for their attempt to take Calais by deceit in 1350: '[Edward III] made all these knights dine at his table beside him, and gave them all the feast and honour that he properly could'.[123] He shows Woodstock's humble and generous treatment of Jean and the French captives taken after Poitiers in a similar fashion: '[he seated them] at the high table, and always served [them], and all the other tables, the most humbly that he could, nor would he ever sit at the table of the king, despite the requests that the king made of him'.[124] Although this sort of treatment of captives is surely exemplary and exaggerated, it suggests that the ideal was good treatment. The expected treatment of captives is more commonly shown, however, through a contrast with the enemy abusing English captives, who are shown to not deserve such treatment.

The expectation of proper and sometimes generous treatment of captives is often shown to be broken by French and Scottish leaders so that they can be made cruel and immoral. Geoffrey le Baker describes the capture and mistreatment of William Montagu (1301–44), earl of Salisbury, and Robert Ufford (1298–1369), earl of Suffolk, at the hands of the French in 1340. The English leaders are captured because of their eagerness to fight the enemy: 'pursuing the fleeing French exceedingly close, certainly between the gates, the portcullis fell'.[125] They are incarcerated, brought into France, and then:

> Inhumanely handled by the proud indignation of the Frenchmen. They were bound with iron, truly, although they had pledged faith when surrendering, and rode not on horses but in a cart, as if robbers, and in the middle of whichever

[122] *Canterbury Chronicle*, ch. 34 (p. 28): 'eos idem princeps humaniter se habebat'.

[123] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 83 (II, 181): 'fit tous ces chevaliers souper à sa table encoste luy, et leur fit toute la feste et honneur qu'il poeut par raison'.

[124] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 94 (II, 236): 'assey le roy, le duc de Bourbon et le conte de Nassou et .iii. aultres vaillans chevaliers à haulte table, et servoit tousjours, et par toutes les aultres tables le plus humblement qu'il pooit, ne oncques ne se voult seoir à la table du roy pour priere que le roy luy feist'.

[125] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 67: 'nimis de prope, scilicet infra portas, Francos fugientes insecuti, pectine demisso'.

> small city or town the cart was ordered to halt, and by the shout of people they were cursed.[126]

The French do not allow the English some freedoms as captive knights who would keep their word and pay their ransom, but instead treat them as common criminals.[127] Le Baker's explicit mention that they are moved around in a cart is a mark of particularly cruel shame and abuse, and suggests that they were going to be executed. He draws upon the chivalric topoi of romance, most obviously found in the episodes of Yvain trapped inside Esclados' castle after his spurs are cut off by its falling portcullis, and Lancelot's shameful ride in a cart after his horse is killed, in Chretién de Troyes' *Yvain, ou le Chevalier au lion* and *Lancelot, ou le Chevalier de la charrette*.[128]

Geoffrey le Baker's description of the poor treatment of Montagu and Ufford culminates in Philippe VI's attempts to execute them unjustly. He writes: 'like this they were led to the presence of the [French] tyrant, who would have shamefully killed them, who were starved in a squalid prison'.[129] The French king is advised against giving in to his 'bloodthirsty desire' and cruel desires by Jean l'Aveugle, but only after much argument does he agree to spare them.[130] Jean le Bel's drawn out descriptions of this episode, and not so subtle commentary, clearly show that mistreatment and execution of captives who had fought in a licit, non-rebellious war, were viewed to be unethical. His use of chivalric imagery from romance also further contrasts the French desires with the proper behaviour of knights.

Writers sometimes provide more realistic and brutal accounts of the enemy's mistreatment of captives. Jean le Bel describes himself and the English, during the 1327 Weardale campaign against the Scots:

> We found five poor prisoners that the Scots had left in this wood, entirely naked, bound to the trees in shame, and two of them had their legs smashed. But we did not know what to say to them, and at once untied them and let them go.[131]

---

[126] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 67: 'inhumaniter tractavit superba indignatio Gallicorum. Ferro nempe vinctos, quamvis fide interposita redditos, non super equos set in biga vectos, quasi predones, in medio cuiuslibet civitatis parve seu ville, clamore popularium blasfemandos, biga stare iussa'.

[127] Ambühl, *Prisoners of War*, pp. 23–24, 29, 32–33, 39–45, 103, 106–09.

[128] Chrétien de Troyes, *Le Chevalier au lion*, ed. by William W. Kibler (New York: Garland, 1985), lines 913–53 (pp. 38–40); Troyes, *Le Chevalier de la charrete*, ed. by William W. Kibler (New York: Garland, 1981).

[129] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, pp. 67–68: 'ipsos duxerunt ad conspectus tirrani, qui squalore carcerali maceratos interfecisset turpiter'.

[130] It is unclear what happens afterwards, or what the fate of the prisoners might be. Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 68: 'cruenta libidine'.

[131] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 13 (I, 73): 'trouvasmes cinq povres prisonniers que les Escots avoient laissié en ce bos, tous nuds, lyez aux arbres par despit, et deux lesquelx avoient les jambes briséese. Maiz nous ne sçavions parler à eulx, et toutesfois

The writer implies the expected treatment of captives by showing the Scots so callously disregarding the suffering of the English combatants. No excuse or justifications are given for this cruelty. In contrast, throughout this campaign the English suffer greatly but do not try to exact any sort of revenge against the Scots.

The enemy are more often depicted as cruel because they execute English captives. These victims are explicitly shown to not deserve such harsh treatment, as they had merely fought in a legal war, and were thus innocent of the charges laid against them. English writers nearly always comment upon this behaviour and assert that it is unjust and immoral. Jean le Bel describes how Luis de le Cerda (Luis de España, 1291–1348) orders Charles de Blois (1319–64), duke of Brittany, to execute two English knights in 1342. Luis makes this seemingly harsh order because the two knights had earlier wounded and defeated him, but also killed his nephew. Le Bel suggests this killing had been done earlier in the normal course of war and was not murder or otherwise illicit. Charles does not want to kill the captives and pronounces that 'this would be of little honour to you and a great cruelty and [cause for] great censure of all of us' because 'we would be reproved for all time, and our enemies would have good reason to treat our men likewise when they capture them, as can happen from day-to-day'.[132] Luis is not moved, but again orders the execution to go forward, but Mauny later rescues the two condemned men in his characteristically heroic fashion. The *London French Chronicle* similarly describes Philippe VI's attempt to execute William Montagu and Robert Ufford, as described by Geoffrey le Baker above, and shows Jean l'Aveugle to dissuade him by arguing that 'for if it should happen that the king of England should on another occasion enter your realm of France and take any peer of your realm, one might go in exchange for another'.[133] These texts claim that mercy is a better choice because of the pragmatic benefits of not encouraging a harsher sort of war, but also imply that it is immoral to execute captives.

English writers nearly always comment upon David II's cruel execution of Walter Selby after the Scots capture Liddel to establish the expected convention of surrender and treatment

nous les deslyasmes et les laissasmes aler'.

[132] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 60 (I, 337): 'ce seroit poy d'onnour à vous et grande cruaulté et grand blasme à nous tous', 'nous seroit à tousjours reprouvé, et avroient nos anemis bonne occasion de faire ainsy des nostres quant ilz les prendront, et poeut avenir de jour en jour'.

[133] *London French*, pp. 73–74: 'kar si il avigne qe le roy d'Engletere entre autre foithe en vostre reaume de Fraunce et preigne ascun pere de vostre reaume, uncore put un aler en eschaunge pur un autre'.

of captives.[134] Geoffrey le Baker presents Selby's execution in colourfully critical language and describes how, once David receives news of Selby's capture, he

> He commanded that [the captive], eager for mercy and ransom from him, be killed. [Selby] entreated to be led alive to the presence of David. The first of his petitions was granted by promise, and kneeling before David he petitioned for his life by ransom. But again he was condemned to death.[135]

Selby then pleads with the Scottish king and claims that any requests for surrender should enjoy immunity, according to ancient laws.[136] David, however, is not swayed:

> The hardened malice of the tyrant twists the wicked rope, by which he [Selby] was dragged to the precipice, not remembering the oil, which bears the symbol of mercy, with which he [David] had once been anointed as king, as if he had been brought up by the milk of a lioness, he ordered the two sons of the miserable man-at-arms to have their throats slit in the presence of their father, and afterwards [ordered Selby], who was nearly insane from sorrow, to have his head cut off.[137]

Le Baker describes Selby's execution as immoral, both because it ignores the established conventions of surrender, but also because his innocent sons, ostensibly civilians, are cruelly killed in sight of their father. David is criticised for ignoring his kingly duty to grant mercy, which contrasts with Le Baker's constant praise of English kingship and mercy throughout his chronicle.

Other writers criticise David II's contravention of expected behaviour, but emotionally complain about the refusal to allow Selby to die in a manner befitting a Christian knight. The *Lanercost Chronicle* depicts Selby asking to be given the opportunity to die in combat because 'it was fitting to do so as a man-at-arms, that he might be able to end the final day of his life in the field, fighting with any of the enemy'.[138] The Scottish king, however, rejects this chivalrous request in a particularly cruel fashion:

---

[134] See also p. 185 above.

[135] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, pp. 86–87: 'iubetur occidi illius miserentem atque redempcionem affectantem. Deprecabatur ut ad David conspectum vivus duceretur. Petiti primi voti compos, genuflexus coram David petivit vitam pro redempcione. Set iterum morti condempnatur'.

[136] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 87: 'antiquo iure pietatis regie regnorum tam Scocie quam Anglie vel Francie, quilibet miser, eciam reus regie magestatis, foret gavisurus privilegio immunitatis'.

[137] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 87: 'indurata malicia tiranni torquens funem facinorosum, quo in precipicium traeretur, non recordatus quod oleo, misericordie typum gerente, fuerat quondam perunctus in regem, quasi lacte leene fuisset educatus, iussit duos filios miseri militis in conspectu patris iugulari, et postea pre dolore fere insanientis capud amputari'.

[138] *Lanercost*, p. 345: 'sicut decuit militem, cum aliquo animicorum posset proeliando ultimum diem vitae suae in campo finire'; similarly in *Anonimalle*, p. 24: 'come afert a chyvaler et issi sa vie fyner et nemie come laroun ou musarde estre

> O impious madness of the king who ought be condemned! alas! he [David] was unwilling to permit the man-at-arms to confess, but without delay ordered him to be beheaded. And he had hardly ceased speaking when the limbs of the Devil, tyrannical torturers, who stood near, fulfilled by act that which by word he had already ordered. And thus the sowers of blood, wicked men, wrongly and inhumanely poured human blood through the field.[139]

Lanercost adds appropriately reproachful commentary, but unlike Geoffrey le Baker, draws heavily upon biblical imagery, as he does throughout his narration of David's 1346 invasion, to clearly make this execution out to be extremely immoral.[140] The *Anonimalle Chronicle*, which otherwise provides a far less critical picture of Scottish behaviour than *Lanercost*, with which it shares the *Minorite Chronicle* as a source, writes: 'thus he [Selby] was without confession beheaded. And soon after, God took great vengeance on the said king and his own [people], because they took such great joy and had such elation in doing evil, and in the ruin of righteous people'.[141] *Anonimalle* and the *Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut Continuation* both cite the execution of Selby before he could confess as cruel and inspiration for God to punish the Scots at the battle of Neville's Cross, shortly thereafter.[142] These writers are able to condemn this behaviour on the highest level by showing that God, likewise, found it reprehensible.

Most English sources that describe the sack of Liddel and the killing of Walter Selby focus on it more as a general act of cruelty for going against the expected treatment of captives. Only two writers focus on Selby's execution alone as an act of cruelty, and fail to mention others being killed there as well.[143] Most of the other English writers, however, condemn David II not just because he executed Selby, but because he killed him along with the other English

---

mudre'.

139 *Lanercost*, pp. 345–46: 'o nefanda rabies regis reprobandi! heu! noluit promittere militem consiteri, sed illum indilate jussit decollari. Et vix loqui cessaverat quin membra diaboli, tortores tyrannici, qui juxta steterunt, quod verbo jam jusserat opere compleverunt, et sic satores sanguinum, viri scelarati, male et inhumaniter sanguinem humanum per campum fuderunt'.

140 See also pp. 94–99 above.

141 *Anonimalle*, p. 24: 'yssi fuist il saunz confessioun decole. Et tost apres Dieu myst graunt vengeaunce sur le dit roi et les soens, pur ceo qils avoint si graunt ioie et elacion de male faire et de ruyne de droiturele gentz'.

142 *Long ANPB Continuation*, fol. 196^{v}: 'fist tuwer vn noble chiualer mons[ir] Waut[ier] de Selby gardein de la dite pele despitousement deu[a]nt lui mesmes [et] ne voloit soeffrer estre confes dount dieux prist vengeaunce'. Le Baker also claims that the cruel treatment of Selby caused the later Scottish defeat, although he does not mention that Selby was not allowed confession: Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 87: 'cuius et filiorum crudelem et iniustam peremcionem credo fuisse magnam causam periclitacionis regis et magni exercitus Scotorum'.

143 Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus*, p. 376: 'dictum strenuum militem fecit tradi inhumaniter morti dirae, nemini de suis parcendo'; 'Tractatus belli apud Crucem', lines 23–24: 'proth dolor! set militem viuum quem videbat, / post visum interimit, licet non decebat', with 'Selbe' written between the two lines.

combatants captured at Liddel in something like a massacre.[144] John Fossor's letter to Thomas Hatfield after the battle complains of such Scottish behaviour: 'among evils of this type which [the Scots] atrociously committed, the fortress of Liddel, of which lord W[alter] of Selby had custodianship, [the Scots] captured, killed as many [people] as were found in there'.[145] Therefore, these writers condemn any execution of captives, but also suggest that there was not a universal acceptance of the 'right of storm'.

The lengthy and critical examples from both the *Lanercost Chronicle* and Geoffrey le Baker demonstrate that writers found the most important part of David II's capture of Liddel to be his execution of the captured English. They eagerly discuss it in detail and use it to support their lengthy narratives of the Scottish invasion. Le Baker, seemingly without reason, concludes his narrative of the event by asserting that 'as God is my witness, I have often asked, but I have not heard, concerning that man-at-arms [Walter Selby], that he ever perpetrated treason against the king of the Scots, or any Scot'.[146] However, in none of the above English descriptions, including Le Baker's, is there any indication that Selby might have been executed in the manner of a traitor, namely beheading and quartering, nor is David said to describe him as treasonous.[147] It is therefore curious that Le Baker stresses Selby's innocence, not merely in a general sense as a captured combatant who should not be executed, but explicitly as innocent of treason. Indeed, none of the other English accounts suggest that Selby had been accused of treason, even if just to correct them.

Walter Selby, however, was indeed a traitor to the Scottish crown at the time of his capture and execution by David II. He had historically served the Scots before governing Liddel for the English.[148] The Scottish king was therefore well within his rights to execute Selby once he

---

[144] *Durham LPB*, MS 2 fol. 34^{r}: 'militem anted[i]c[tu]m cu[m] pl[u]rimis viris fortissimis capitis obtru[n]ccacio[n]e p[er]emit'; *Pipewell*, fol. 15^{r}: 'occidens s[i]n[e] m[isericord]ia in eod[e]m p[ro]bu[m] milite[m] d[omin]um Walteru[m] de Selby [et] alios quos i[n]uenit in castro decapitari fecit ip[s]omet vidente'; Tynemouth, *Historia*, MS 2.3 fol. 247^{r}: 'Walteru[m] de Seleby milite[m] loci custode[m] cu[m] aliis quib[us]da[m] ibide[m] rep[er]tis crudelit[er] occidi iussit', not in edn; paraphrased in *Kirkstall*, fol. 84^{r}: 'loci custode[m] cu[m] aliis ibid[e]m cep[er]tis crudelit[er] occidi missit'.

[145] Fossor, 'Letter to Hatfield, October 1346', p. 387: 'inter mala hujusmodi quae atrociter comittebant, fortalitium de Lydel, cujus custodiam habuit dominus W[alterus] de Selby, ceperunt, interfectis omnibus quotquot in eodem fuerunt inventi'.

[146] Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 87: 'testis mihi Deus, pluries inquisivi, set non audivi de illo milite quod prodicionem contra regem Scotorum aut aliquem Scotum perpetravit unquam'.

[147] Prestwich, *Armies and Warfare*, p. 239. See also Simon H. Cuttler, *The Law of Treason and Treason Trials in Later Medieval France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), pp. 116–41; D. Matthews, *Writing to the King*, pp. 83–91.

[148] Michael Prestwich, 'England and Scotland during the Wars of Independence', in *England and her Neighbours, 1066–1453: Essays in Honour of Pierre Chaplais*, ed. by Michael C. E. Jones and Malcolm Vale (London: Hambledon, 1989), pp. 181–97 (here 196); King, 'According to the custom', pp. 282–83; MacInnes, *Scotland's Second War*, pp. 187–88.

captured him. English writers, who often sought out information and documents to make their accounts authoritative, or at least informed, ought to have known of Selby's earlier shifting loyalties. Northern chroniclers in particular received much information on events on the Anglo-Scottish borders, such as Thomas Gray and the anonymous writers of the *Anonimalle Chronicle*, the *Long* and *Short Anglo-Norman Prose Brut*, and the *Lanercost Chronicle*. Even southern writers, such as Geoffrey le Baker, drew upon texts written in the north so that they could include more accurate details and also some narrative colour.[149] Although some texts assert that David was a rebel, or was not truly a king, this sort of justification is not drawn upon here to dismiss Selby's treason. English writers carefully and intentionally omit any mention of Selby's betrayal of the Scots. They instead describe the execution in the cruellest of terms, not at all as if it were a legally sanctioned execution of a traitor. This allows them to present Selby, and sometimes his men with him, as innocent, and therefore David and his actions are also made cruel and immoral.

It is all the more interesting, then, that the execution of Scottish captives taken at the battle of Neville's Cross by the English is emphasised as justice. In every case these writers do not simply declare that these captives are killed, but instead make it clear that they are killed for acting as rebels or traitors. The *Lanercost Chronicle* describes the execution of the captured John Graham as that of a traitor: 'the earl of Menteith was drawn and hanged, quartered, and his members [quarters] were sent to diverse places in England and Scotland'.[150] Although the text does not explicitly label Graham as a traitor it shows this through the manner of his execution. It is notable that although the two chronicles that share the *Minorite Chronicle* as a source with *Lanercost* disagree greatly on how to describe Scottish conduct, they all narrate Graham's execution in exactly the same terms.[151] All of the other English sources that describe these executions show them as acts of justice, seemingly in revenge for the earlier Scottish attacks on northern England.[152] Other sources provide more context, such as the *Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut Continuation*, which elaborately describes the case against the Scots, perhaps drawing

---

[149] See for example Le Baker's use of four lines of verse ('Si valeas paleas') that circulated in the north, and were used in at least two poems: Le Baker, *Chronicle*, p. 65; 'On the Battle of Nevile's Cross', lines 1–4; Calais Anonymous, 'Crécy', lines 41–44. See also Rigg, *History*, pp. 260–61, 263–64, 381–82.

[150] *Lanercost*, p. 351: 'comes de Mentethe tractus fuit et suspensus, quarterizatus, et ejus membra ad diversa loca Angliae et Scotiae sunt transmissa'.

[151] *Anonimalle*, p. 28: 'le count de Mentest fuist trayne, pendu et quartre et les quartres furrent a dyvers cites Dengleterre envoiez'; and *Durham LPB*, MS 2 fol. 34^{r}: 'comes de Menteth tract[us] fuit [et] suspens[us], quarterizat[us] [et] ei[us] me[m]b[ra] ad diu[er]sa loca Anglie [et] Scocie s[un]t t[ra]nsmissa'.

[152] Murimuth, *Continuatio*, p. 253 (MS 5 variant); *Prophetic LPB*, fol. 38^{r}; translated into the *Short ANPB Continuation*, fol. 177^{v}; Tynemouth, *Historia*, MS 2.3 fol. 247^{r}, not in edn.

upon legal documents.[153] Indeed, Graham had earlier served the English but had betrayed them and fought for David II at Neville's Cross, where he was captured.[154] The English executed him for precisely the same reasons that Walter Selby was by the Scots, but the former act is praised and the latter act condemned by English writers. These descriptions show how executions were seen as licit if those killed were seen as traitors. If a man was simply a combatant, or no narrative context might suggest he was a traitor, then it was expected that he would be treated well, and certainly not executed.

* * *

Writers of historical literature do not faithfully represent the otherwise unspoken conventions of ending battle or war, but instead manipulate them to suit their rhetorical purposes. They are frequently variable what they judge to be the most important factor in victory and defeat, depending on the context. Some of their texts show combatants fighting to the death, while others argue that it is best to surrender to the enemy or retreat when there is no hope of success. Military leaders who are shown to refuse requests for surrender are often criticised, but in some cases praised, depending on the situation and the context given in the narrative. Writers confront the uncomfortable reality that surrender was not always accepted, even by their own rulers. They do not provide any consistent cause for these executions or other mistreatments of captives, but typically condemn them. These contentious events provide clear points for writers to comment on the ethics of mercy and justice. The partisan style of narrating English behaviour, especially when contrasted with enemy conduct, better allows writers to praise or condemn the behaviour that causes defeat and victory.

[153] *Long ANPB Continuation*, fol. 197^{v}.

[154] Prestwich notes these partisan distortions of reality but does not examine them further: Prestwich, 'England and Scotland', p. 196. See also Iain A. MacInnes, '"To be annexed forever to the English Crown": The English Occupation of Southern Scotland, *c.* 1334–37', in *England and Scotland at War: New Perspectives*, ed. by Andy King and David Simpkin (Leiden: Brill, 2012), pp. 183–201 (here 192–93); MacInnes, *Scotland's Second War*, pp. 122–23.

CONCLUSIONS

Ethical Sensitivity

Writers in late medieval England were keenly aware of the ethical problems of warfare. They did not view war as a single entity that should be judged or understood removed from its constituent acts. They did not believe that it could only be evaluated as either fully acceptable, with bellicose disregard for the human costs, or as wholly immoral, in something approaching modern pacifism. English writers were not dissuaded from considering the ethics of war, simply because Edward III's pursuit of war was mostly successful. They portrayed war carefully, with subtle and often implicit judgments, and were informed by a broad and deep reading of classical, biblical, and medieval texts. Writers employ a number of colourful tropes not simply for their own sake, but to better engage with the ethical problems that result from breaking the idealised or expected conduct of war, variable as it might be.

The supposed cases of writers flatly reporting, accepting, or even praising, the atrocities of war have been almost universally misunderstood. The French writer Jean Juvénal des Ursins (1388–1473) attributed to Henry V the now infamous declaration that 'war without fire is worth nothing, no more than sausages without mustard'.[1] This is not meant to suggest that devastation and attacks on civilians, as is implied by 'fire', were accepted by medieval combatants and writers alike. In the passage Juvénal des Ursins instead criticises the English king for having a taste for immoral acts that might be done during war, but which are certainly not necessary for success. The specific term used here for 'sausages', *andouilles*, refers to a particular variety of sausage made from chitterlings, bits of the small intestines of pigs and sometimes other animals, that would be revolting to some without the assistance of sauce. The writer shows Henry V to have a taste for the most unpalatable parts of war by using the term *andouilles*, made up of the most undesirable parts of the pig, but with their taste amplified by mustard, which adds a fiery and enhancing flavour.[2] Juvénal des Ursins thereby shows the English king to be akin to a butcher

---

1 Jean Juvénal des Ursins, 'Histoire de Charles VI, roy de France', in *Choix de chroniques et mémoires sur l'histoire de France*, ed. by Jean A. C. Buchon (Paris: Desrez, 1838), pp. 323–573 (here 565): 'guerre sans feu ne valoit rien, non plus que andouilles sans moustarde'. This passage is widely quoted to demonstrate indifference to the ethical problems of war. See for example Gillingham, 'Richard I', p. 85; Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence*, p. 176; C. J. Rogers, 'By Fire and Sword', p. 38; Lynn, *Battle*, p. 88. However, see also C. Taylor, *Chivalry*, pp. 212–13.

2 People in the Middle Ages often enjoyed sharp and spicy food: Terence Scully, *The Art of Cookery in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1995), pp. 51–53, 111–12.

for his grisly tastes in both meat and war, and thereby condemns him for exceeding the norms of military conduct.

Other sources seem to take a fatalistic perspective and accept the horrors of war. Jean le Bel, after describing the immoral acts of the sack of Caen, including looting, rape, and murder, states that 'there was done a great deal of damage that was of no benefit. But such [things] are part of the fortunes of war, so they must pass'.[3] This is often understood to suggest that such seemingly immoral actions much be accepted and not criticised, when in fact it simply means that these acts happen in war.[4] Le Bel also shows how a prominent English knight attempts to restrain the lesser combatants in the English army from their immoral acts, and implies, therefore, that these acts should not be accepted.[5] Through a careful, contextualised reading of Le Bel's description of the sack of Caen, as well as Jean Juvénal des Ursins' sausage speech, it is evident that these writers narrate acts they consider to be excessive and immoral, rather than acceptable or praiseworthy.

Accordingly, we should view the few explicit English lamentations of civilian suffering as genuine rather than peculiar or empty rhetoric. Edward III, in his 1328 pronouncement asking for peace with the Scots, complains about the suffering that results from war: 'the massacres, misfortunes, crimes, destruction of churches, and countless evils, which by misfortune of this manner of wars, have in many ways affected subjects of both kingdoms'.[6] The English knight John Clanvowe, who at the end of his career wrote *The Two Ways* (1391), a penitential treatise, also recognises civilian immunity. In a simple fashion devoid of any consideration of theological arguments or justifications, but rather cast in the style of a sermon, he declares his position to be:

> Þoo þat sleen any man in þou3t, in woord, or in deede, þei breken þe fifthe comaundement [...] alle þoo þat robben or stelen, taaken by maistrie, or be extorcoun, or by any gyle, or falsheede here nei3ebores goodis, þei breken þe seuenþe comaundement.[7]

---

[3] Le Bel, *Chronicle*, ch. 71 (II, 83): 'y furent faiz moult grands dommages qui ne firent nul proffit. Maiz ce sont fait d'aventure de guerre, si les convient passer'.

[4] See for example Kaeuper, 'Medieval Warfare', pp. 30–31.

[5] See p. 184 above.

[6] Edward III's 1328 pronouncement, interpolated in *Lanercost*, pp. 262–63 (here 262): 'caedes, occasiones, scelera, ecclesiarum destructiones et mala innumerabilia, quae hujusmodi occasione guerrarum regnicolis utriusque regni multipliciter contingebant'.

[7] John Clanvowe, 'The Two Ways', in *Works*, ed. by Vincent J. Scattergood (Cambridge: Brewer, 1975), pp. 57–80, 86–89 (here 74). See also Vincent J. Scattergood, 'The Date of Sir John Clanvowe's *The Two Ways* and the "Reinvention of Lollardy"', *Medium Ævum*, 79 (2010), 116–20.

Clanvowe is able to decontextualise and abstract the victimisation of civilians in war to the most egregious sorts of military acts and connect them to sin. He does this to better show that such people should not be attacked, regardless of any sort of pragmatic justifications that combatants might have. Another English knight, Thomas Gray, recognises the ethical problems of warfare. In his *Scalacronica* he rarely mentions the frequent devastation on both sides of the Anglo-Scottish border, likely because he is concerned primarily with narrating the activities of professional combatants like himself, not the commoners, churchmen, or other types of civilians who frequently appear in the narratives of monastic chroniclers. However, in his conclusion Gray states that 'the people bear the blows of the sins of kings', in a subtle recognition that many of the acts of war, otherwise unspoken in his chronicle, caused many people to suffer.[8] It should be clear that there was a very real concern for the plight of the civilian amongst English writers. This concern is most often demonstrated in depictions of combatants attacking civilians in a manner that is meant to be read as inherently unethical, but sometimes writers add explicit statements of their discontent.

How are we then to understand the late fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century writings on war, discussed in the Introduction, that are so often used to understand attitudes towards war in the later Middle Ages? These later writers are informed by the traditions continued during the reign of Edward III, the corpus investigated in this thesis, and describe aspects of war with language that carries the same moral value. The *Alliterative Morte Arthure* presents the reality of war, but without any of the details that would signify a negative moral evaluation, such as any list of civilian categories or emphasis of unjustly targetted victims. In another passage, in which the English knights Florent and Floridas take Como, categories of civilians-by-profession are mentioned but the writer is careful to say that the English kill only those who resist.[9] The text is more concerned with questioning Arthur's pursuit of a seemingly unjustified war, rather than how he waged his war. Indeed, other English texts demonstrate that the classic 'might makes right' dictum was not universally accepted, such as the brief continuation of an Anglo-Norman roll to 1340 that pronounces that Edward should not be called 'the third after the

---

[8] Gray, *Scalacronica*, ch. 54 (p. 194): 'le poeple port coup dez pecchez dez roys'. King, however, argues that this passage is part of a broader call for political unity: Andy King, 'War and Peace: A Knight's Tale. The Ethics of War in Sir Thomas Gray's *Scalacronica*', in *War, Government and Aristocracy in the British Isles, c. 1150–1500: Essays in Honour of Michael Prestwich*, ed. by Chris Given-Wilson, Ann Kettle, and Len Scales (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008), pp. 148–62 (here 160–62).

[9] *Alliterative Morte Arthure*, lines 3112–27 (pp. 124–25, here lines 3125–26): 'brayedez into þe burghe with baners displayede, / stekes and stabbis thorowe that them a3ayne-stondes'.

Conquest' because 'conquest by force never gives right'.[10] Geoffrey Chaucer's description of the Temple of Mars, however, clearly shows how the details of war that knights and others are expected to celebrate are unethical. He subverts the established ideals of both war and chivalry by depicting violence in the same inherently immoral terms that are used in historical literature. This does not easily resolve his attitudes towards chivalry, and the ideals he presents elsewhere might represent what he thought was done in reality, or should have been done.[11] More work must be done on his works to properly understand his attitudes, but his avoidance of writing about war suggests he was not overly interested in war.

To conclude, we can see that English writers throughout Edward III's reign were sensitive to the ethics of their countrymen's actions in war against their enemies. A comprehensive examination of historical literature written in different places, such as France, the Low Countries, and Scotland, across the whole of the high and late Middle Ages, would further demonstrate how different writers respond to military events in different situations with a degree of sensitivity. It is evident that writers did not simply accept the acts of war, but constantly questioned them in their writings on contemporary events. They often empathised with victims of war in other countries and were able to conceive them as civilians, not simply as 'the enemy'. Many writers sidestep the ethical problems of devastation and attacks on civilians when conducted by their own men, but emphasise them when done by enemy forces, to better praise Edward III and his men. Their careful representations of war often reproduce the official version of events promoted by English propagandistic newsletters. These partial texts have largely been accepted over the past two decades as best representing this period because they frequently discuss, with ostensible honesty, causation, motivation, numbers and other details that military historians need. As a result, our own understanding of English warfare has been distorted into something inherently ethical, and even praiseworthy, just as Edward III and other writers wished it to be viewed.

---

[10] 'MS Royal 14 B VI de la British Library (Londres)', in Olivier de Laborderie, '"Ligne de reis": Culture historique, représentation du pouvoir royal et construction de la mémoire nationale en Angleterre à travers les généalogies royales en rouleau du milieu du XIII^{e} siècle du début du XV^{e} siècle' (unpublished doctoral thesis, École des hautes études en sciences sociales, Paris, 2002), pp. 1299–1312 (here 1311–12): 'ceti Edward se fit apeler Edward le tierz aprés le conquest, c'est a dire aprés William Bastard, en se lettres et chartres, et fut avis a plusours que ceo ne fu mie a l'honur de ly ne de ses ancestres pur ceo que conquest par force ne done james droit, mes covendreit que il hust hu dreit devant le conquest, car autrement li et tuz ses successours huissent esté possessours de male foy et entrusours'. See also the discussion of the meaning of 'conquest' and its use in Edward III's name in Murimuth, *Continuatio*, p. 55.

[11] For the varied use and meaning of martial ideals see also Constance Brittain Bouchard, *'Strong of Body, Brave and Noble': Chivalry and Society in Medieval France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), pp. 113–14, 117, 142–43.

APPENDIX: HISTORICAL LITERATURE

On these sources see the standard reference works by Gransden, Taylor, Sharpe, Dean and Boulton, and Bak and Jurković.[1] See also introduction and apparatus to editions cited below the listed manuscripts. Only historical literature that was written during the reign of Edward III up to his death, as indicated by either what the text narrates or other evidence, is considered in the present study and list. Texts that include mention of Richard II's reign, even if their narratives end shortly after the coronation, including: *Cronica bona et compendiosa* (for Noah–1377),[2] Pseudo-Ranulf Higden, *Polychronicon* continuations (for 1340s–77),[3] *Historia de Bruto* (for Brutus–1377),[4] *Northern Annals* (for Lucius–1377),[5] *Short Annals* (for 1–1377),[6] *Summary Chronicle* (for 843–1377),[7] and *Worchester Annals* (for 1–1377)[8] are omitted from the present

---

1 Gransden, *Historical Writing*, II; J. Taylor, *English Historical Literature*; Sharpe, *Handlist of Latin Writers*; Ruth J. Dean and Maureen B. M. Boulton, *Anglo-Norman Literature: A Guide to Texts and Manuscripts*, Anglo-Norman Text Society, Occasional Publications Series, 3 (London: Anglo-Norman Text Society, 1999); R. Graeme Dunphy, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle* (Leiden: Brill, 2010–) <referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/encyclopedia-of-the-medieval-chronicle>; János M. Bak and Ivan Jurković, eds, *Chronicon: Medieval Narrative Sources* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013).

2 There is little scholarship on the text. J. Taylor lists five witnesses, all bound with Higden's *Polychronicon*, but many more survive in different types of compilations. Catalogue entries typically assume it is an uncritical abridgment of Higden's *Polychronicon*, but it appears to be independently written. Pronay and J. Taylor claim that the text was sometimes bound with the *Modus tenendi parliamentum* because it had information on English coronations that were useful for the uses of the other texts bound with it. J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, p. 184; Nicholas Pronay and John Taylor, *Parliamentary Texts of the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), p. 21. I have identified fourteen additional witnesses of the text in the course of my research, and all the extant witnesses are as follows: bound with Higden, *Polychronicon*, MS 43 fols 174^{r}–178^{v}, MS 61 fols 8^{r}–11^{v}, MS 72 fols 158^{r}–161^{r}, MS 142 pp. 1–10, MS 147 fols 155^{v}–160^{r}, MS 150 fols 1^{r}–5^{r}; bound with *Modus tenendi parliamentum* (B Version MSS only): London, British Library, MS Add. 32097, fols 26^{r}–33^{r} (*c.* 1450–1573); MS Cotton Nero D VI, fols 76^{r}–81^{r} (s. XIV 4/4); MS Cotton Tiberius E VIII, part 1 fols 220^{r}–229^{r} (frag. to 1300 only, s. XV 2); MS Cotton Vitellius C IV, fols 119^{r}–128^{r} (s. XV *med.*); MS Stowe 140, fols 125^{r}–135^{r} (s. XVI); Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 6049, fols 14^{r}–20^{r} (s. XV); expanded version bound with *Modus tenendi parliamentum* (B Version MS): Cambridge, Magdalene College, MS Pepys 2516, fols 5^{v}–12^{r} (to 1399, s. XVI); bound in miscellanies: *Bridlington Chronicle*, MS 1, fols 1^{r}–12^{r}; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 177, fols 129^{v}–134^{v} (s. XV); Higden, *Polychronicon*, MS 110, fols 183^{v}–187^{v}; London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius E XII, fols 73^{r}–76^{v} (frag., s. XV *med.*); expanded versions bound in miscellanies: Higden, *Polychronicon*, MS xi, fols 1^{r}–28^{r} (to 1410); London, British Library, MS Stowe 67, fols 1^{r}–71^{v} (to 1401, s. XV); Manchester, Rylands Library, MS Lat. 113 (roll, with genealogy to Henry VII, s. XV *ex.* 1485 or after).

3 See discussion and list of continuations at pp. 227–31 below.

4 An amalgamated chronicle based on Higden's *Polychronicon* to 1341 and then on the *St Albans B Continuation*. It is not merely excerpts of Higden's *Polychronicon* (equivalent to bks 6–7), as Edwards and Freeman claim: Anthony S. G. Edwards and James Freeman, 'Further Manuscripts of Higden's *Polychronicon*', *Notes and Queries*, 63 (2016), 522–24 (here 524). The British Library catalogue identifies the Cambridge witness and I have identified the Higden's *Polychronicon* witnesses in the course of my research: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 251, fols 16^{r}–100^{r} (s. XV); Higden, *Polychronicon*, MS 147 fols 167^{r}–207^{v}, MS x3, MS x5.

5 *Anonimalle*, fols 19^{r}–22^{v}. See also Tyson, 'Three Short Anglo-Norman Texts', p. 88.

6 Higden, *Polychronicon*, MS 110, fols 75^{r}–77^{v}.

7 Higden, *Polychronicon*, MS 94, fols 264^{v}–267^{r}.

8 'Annales prioratus de Wigornia, AD 1–1377', in *Annales monastici*, ed. by Henry Richards Luard, RS, 36, 5 vols (London: Longman, 1864–69), IV, 355–546.

study. The many London chronicles finished in their final form in the fifteenth century might contain sections of narrative that were written during the reign of Edward III, but they are omitted from this study because nobody has yet sorted the genuine earlier narratives from the retrospective ones, and it is beyond the scope of this thesis to do so.[9] Historical literature that does not discuss events related to the themes of this thesis are silently omitted. Poems and other short texts are typically found in a single surviving manuscript each, most of which are miscellanies, and are not included here due to space constraints. Additional contents of manuscripts are mentioned in footnotes when relevant. I silently correct extant lists and catalogue entries throughout to prevent an overly cumbersome apparatus.

Acta bellicosa

The text is written in Latin prose and covers Edward III's 1346 Normandy campaign. It appears to be a revised campaign journal, but ends early before Crécy. It provides many of the daily details of warfare but elaborates certain events in great detail, such as the sack of Caen.

Manuscript:

1. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 370, fols 98^{r}–105^{v} (s. XIV)[10]

Edition:

'Acta bellicosa', in *Le Prince Noir en Aquitaine (1355/56–1362/70)*, ed. by Joseph Moisant (Paris: Picard, 1894), pp. 157–74

Anonimalle Chronicle

The text is written in Anglo-Norman prose and covers 1333–81.[11] The 1333–56 portion of the text was written *c.* 1356–82 and the 1356–81 portion was written 1396–99. It is concerned with politics and war. The narrative for 1334–46 is translated and modified from the *Minorite Chronicle*. The first portion of the text ends with Poitiers on fol. 292^{v}. The text continues the *Short Anglo-Norman Prose Brut*, MS 29. It was written at St Mary's Abbey, York.

---

[9] For a cursory study of these chronicles see Mary-Rose McLaren, *The London Chronicles of the Fifteenth Century: A Revolution in English Writing* (Woodbridge: Brewer, 2002).

[10] Bound with historical literature, including texts on Alexander.

[11] Albert F. Pollard, 'The Authorship and Value of the *Anonimalle Chronicle*', *English Historical Review*, 53 (1938), 577–605.

Manuscript:

1. Leeds, University of Leeds Library, MS Brotherton 29, fols 271^{r}–353^{v} (s. XIV 2)[12]

Edition:

The Anonimalle Chronicle, 1333 to 1381, from a MS Written at St Mary's Abbey, York, ed. by Vivian H. Galbraith, rev. edn (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1970, first edn 1927)

Robert of Avesbury, *De gestis mirabilibus Edwardi III*

The text is written in Latin prose and covers 1321–56. It was written to 1356. It is concerned with war and other national events. It includes many interpolated documents. MSS 1–3 follow the abridged version of the *Short Anglo-Norman Prose Brut*, but it is not entirely certain whether Avesbury's text was meant to serve as a continuation. MS 4 was unknown to the editor and only briefly described in the introduction to the edition of John of Reading's *Chronicle*.

Manuscripts:

1. Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R V 32 (723), fols 59^{r}–105^{r} (continues *Short Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* MS 30, s. XV 1 or *c.* 1430)[13]
2. London, British Library, MS Harley 200, fols 79^{v}–140^{r} (continues *Short Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* MS 31, s. XV *in.*)[14]
3. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 128 (SC 21702), fols 163^{v}–252^{r} (continues *Short Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* MS 32, s. XV ¼)[15]

Abridged in the So-Called *Westminster Chronicle*:

4. London, British Library, MS Cotton Cleopatra A XVI, fols 150^{r}–154^{v} (for 1338–45, continues Adam Murimuth's *Continuatio chronicarum* MS 18, continued by John of Reading's *Chronicle* MS 1, 1356 or after)

[12] Bound with a collection of historical and political texts on fols 1^{r}–35^{v}, including genealogy with discussion on Edward III's claim to France on fols 2^{v}–3^{v} and *York Short Chronicle*, MS 1: Tyson, 'Three Short Anglo-Norman Texts'. See *Short ANPB*, MS 29.

[13] Bound with collection of documents on Edward III's reign on fols 105^{r}–106^{v}, including a genealogy on Edward III's claim to France on fol. 105^{r}.

[14] Bound with collection of documents on Edward III's reign on fols 141^{r}–147^{v}, including a genealogy on Edward III's claim to France on fol. 146^{v}.

[15] Bound with collection of documents on Edward III's reign on fols 252^{r}–258^{v}, including a genealogy on Edward III's claim to France on fol. 257^{v}.

Editions:

Robert of Avesbury, 'De gestis mirabilibus regis Edwardi Tertii', in *Adae Murimuth; Robertus de Avesbury*, ed. by Edward Maunde Thompson, RS, 93 (London: Eyre, 1889), pp. 279–471

Robert of Avesbury, *Historia de mirabilibus gestis Eduard III*, ed. by Thomas Hearne (Oxford: Sheldonian Theatre, 1720), pp. 256–66 [transcriptions of some of the documents included in the manuscripts]

Geoffrey le Baker, *Chronicle*

The text is written in Latin prose and covers 1303–56. It was written 1341–58 or perhaps 1347–60. The 1303–41 narrative is largely based on the second recension of Adam Murimuth's *Continuatio chronicarum*. The text is very much concerned with war, especially against France. MS 2 has the earliest text and also includes a revised 1327–29 narrative (written *c.* 1358–60) after the original narrative of this section. MS 1 begins with the revised version of this section and continues to 1355, with many omissions from damage inflicted by the Cotton Library fire. The differences between the two recensions of the text do not relate to national events, and therefore only the original recension is considered in this thesis. The writer was probably a clerk from Swinbrook, near Oxford.

Manuscripts:

1. London, British Library, MS Cotton Appendix LII, fols 1^{r}–22^{v} (revised text for 1327–55, damaged, s. XIV 2, perhaps 1370)
2. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 761 (SC 2535), fols 99^{r}–145^{v} (original text for 1303–56 and revised text for 1327–29, s. XIV 2, perhaps *c.* 1360)[16]

Edition:

Geoffrey le Baker, *Chronicon*, ed. by Edward Maunde Thompson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889)

[16] Bound with medical and prophetic texts throughout, a genealogy on Edward III's claim to France on fol. 157^{v}, and Le Baker's *Chroniculum*, MS 1, on fols 149^{r}–157^{r}.

Geoffrey le Baker, *Chroniculum*

The text is written in Latin prose and covers Creation–1338. It was written to 1347 for the English knight Thomas de la More. The narrative is often sparse and annalistic in style, but towards the later years it becomes more elaborate.

Manuscripts:

1. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 761 (SC 2535), fols 149^{r}–157^{r} (to 1338, s. XIV 2, perhaps *c*. 1360)[17]

Edition:

Geoffrey le Baker, 'Chroniculum', in *Chronicon*, ed. by Edward Maunde Thompson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889), pp. 156–74

Jean le Bel, *Chronicle*

The text is written in continental French prose and covers 1326–61. It was written 1352–70. The text is concerned with war and the stability of kingdoms. It is is particularly interesting for its supposedly eyewitness account of the 1327 Weardale campaign. The writer came from Liège but travelled to England and was often patronised by members of the English court. Jean Froissart later borrowed heavily from this text for the first book of his *Chronicles*.

Manuscript:

1. Châlons-en-Champagne, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 81, fols 1^{r}–224^{v} (table of contents on fols 225^{r}–230^{v}, s. XV 1)

Edition:

Jean le Bel, *Chronique*, ed. by Jules Viard and Eugène Déprez, ShF, 317, 324, 2 vols (Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1904–05)

St Benet at Holme Annals

The text is written in Latin prose and covers Nativity–1333.[18] It was probably written *c*. 1333. It focuses on events in Britain, France, and the Holy Land, especially English saints and kings

[17] See Le Baker, *Chronicon*, MS 1.

[18] Julian M. Luxford, 'A Forgotten Medieval Benedictine Manuscript: The Annals in British Library, Cotton MS Vitellius D IX', *Scriptorium*, 55 (2001), 298–306.

during 1100–1333. It was continued in the early fifteenth century to *c*. 1400 in the *Chronica minor Sancti Benedicti de Hulmo*. It is largely ignored by scholarship.

Manuscript:

1. London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius D IX, fols 5^{r}–22^{r} (s. XIV 2)

No edition.

Bridlington Chronicle Continuation to 1377

The text is written in Latin prose and covers 1327–77 until Richard II's coronation, with annalistic style entries that are both sporadic and short, from 1340 until the end. It was probably written *c*. 1340 with the additions to 1377 added annually. It continues the *Bridlington Chronicle*, which covers 1307–27, was written *c*. 1339, and is a continuation of Nicholas Trevet's *Annals*. The text is often concerned with war, especially the movement of forces and the supposed efficacy of archery. It has some similiarities with Thomas de Burton's later *Melsa Monastery Chronicle*. The continuation's text only survives in s. XVII transcripts, both of which have a blank folio between the original text and its continuation, which possibly reflects a strict division in the original MS.

Manuscripts:

1. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 101 (SC 1948), fols 18^{v}–32^{r} (*Bridlington Chronicle* for 1307–21, no continuation, *c*. 1400)[19]
2. Unknown MS (with continuation to 1377)[20]
    - 2a. Cambridge, Trinity College, MS O V 37 (1318), item 1 fols 140^{r}–192^{v} (continues *Bridlington Chronicle* on fols 83^{r}–138^{r}, 1681)
    - 2b. London, British Library, MS Harley 688, items 3–4 fols 311^{r}–362^{v} (continues *Bridlington Chronicle* on fols 252^{r}–310^{v} with blank unnumbered leaf following, 1681)[21]

Edition:

'Gesta Edwardi de Carnarvan, auctore canonico Bridlingtoniensi, cum continuatione ad AD 1377', in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, ed. by William Stubbs, RS, 76, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1882–83), II, 25–151 (continuation at 93–151)

---

[19] Bound with many historical and political texts from different source manuscripts, including *Cronica bona et compendiosa* on fols 1^{r}–12^{r} (see p. 205 n. 2 above), *Gesta regum Angli*, MS 2, *Gestis Anglorum*, MS 1, and *Parallel Chronicle*, MS 2.

[20] See MS 2b, flyleaf o^{v}, for some information on the now lost original.

[21] Bound with historical material.

The Brut

The text was first written in Anglo-Norman prose and covered Brutus–1272.[22] It uses Geoffrey of Monmouth, Wace, Geffrei Gaimar, clerical sources, an analogue of the *Barlings and Hagneby Chronicles*, hagiographic texts, and other texts on legendary material. It does not cite its sources but presents itself as objectively true through its short and exemplary stories. It is unknown how the *Long* and *Short Anglo-Norman Prose Brut*s developed. They share the earlier narrative and a continuation through 1307 that is based on the first redaction of Pierre de Langtoft's Anglo-Norman chronicle. However, no texts survive that end at this date and are also devoid of later changes which might suggest an initial continuation was used independently by the writers of the *Long* and *Short* texts. MS 1 of the *Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* is not an independent copy of the text through to only 1307, but an early abridged copy of the *Long* text.[23] I signify other texts intended to appear like the *Brut* texts, largely through their structure, by labelling them as '*Brut*'s.

Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut

The text is written in Anglo-Norman prose and covers Brutus–1333.[24] It was written 1333–35. Its *Oldest* text and continuation to 1307 are slightly reworked from the original versions. A prose translation of the prologue is included.[25] The text is much longer than the *Short Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* and often goes into far greater detail. Prophecies of Merlin are included after the reigns of later kings. This is the version of the text that was translated into Middle English to be the first version of the *Middle English Prose Brut* (to 1333). The text is very much concerned with northern and Anglo-Scottish affairs, especially those related to politics or war. Brie conducted only a cursory examination of fourteen of the manuscripts (he misidentified London, British

---

[22] Friedrich W. D. Brie, *Geschichte und Quellen der mittelenglischen Prosachronik 'The Brute of England' oder 'The Chronicles of England'* (Marburg: Friedrich, 1905); John Taylor, 'The French Prose *Brut*: Popular History in Fourteenth-Century England', in *England in the Fourteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1985 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. by W. Mark Ormrod (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1986), pp. 247–54; Diana B. Tyson, 'Handlist of Manuscripts Containing the French Prose *Brut* Chronicle', *Scriptorium*, 48 (1994), 333–44; Matheson, *Prose 'Brut'*; *The Oldest Anglo-Norman Prose 'Brut' Chronicle*, ed. by Julia Marvin (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2006).

[23] Brie, *Geschichte und Quellen der mittelenglischen Brute*, p. 28; Smallwood, 'Prophecy of the Six Kings', p. 579; 'Albine and Isabelle: Regicidal Queens and the Historical Imagination of the Anglo-Norman Prose *Brut* Chronicles with an Edition and Translation of the Prose Prologue to the Long Version of the Anglo-Norman Prose *Brut*', ed. by Julia Marvin, *Arthurian Literature*, 18 (2001), 143–91 (here 153 n. 28).

[24] Dean and Boulton, *Anglo-Norman Literature*, pp. 32–33; corrected by *Oldest Anglo-Norman Prose 'Brut'*, p. 51 n. 192.

[25] 'Albine and Isabelle', ed. by J. Marvin.

Library, MS Add. 10622 as a *Long* text).[26] More work needs to be done to definitively establish the relationship between the manuscripts, however. I have performed a more thorough and systematic examination of all sixteen manuscripts and group them below into provisional recensions, rather than just those that seem closely related as Brie did. The texts vary greatly in how they divide the text into chapters, but I provide chapter numbers according to those given in MS 7 to allow their contents to be compared.

Abridged (First Recension?) Manuscript:

1. Cambridge, University Library, MS Ee I 20 (909), fols 79^{v}–142^{r} (no prologue, abr. chs 1–186 to 1307, breaks off in the middle of Merlin's prohecy on Edward I, s. XIV ¼)[27]

First Recension Manuscripts:

2. Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, MS 5028C, fols 10^{r}–119^{v} (complete, divided into two texts at Conquest, table of contents on fols 2^{r}–8^{v}, prologue on fols 9^{r}–10^{r}, *olim* Bourdillon MS 28 and Deene Park MS, s. XV)[28]
3. Cambridge, University Library, MS Ii VI 8 (1887), fols 5^{r}–166^{v} (complete, prologue on fols 3^{r}–5^{r}, s. XIV/XV)[29]
4. Dublin, Trinity College, MS 501 (E V 5), fols 1^{r}–75^{r} (imperf. beg. due to lost leaves, chs 104–223, *olim* fols 51^{r}–125^{r}, s. XIV *ex.*)
5. London, British Library, MS Add. 18462, fols 16^{r}–101^{v} (complete, divided into two texts at Conquest, table of contents on fols 9^{r}–14^{v}, prologue on fols 15^{r}–16^{r}, s. XIV/XV)[30]
6. London, British Library, MS Royal 20 A III, fols 122^{v}–236^{r} (complete, last few lines of fol. 236^{r} are mutilated, prologue on fols 121^{r}–122^{v}, s. XIV *med.*)

Second Recension Manuscripts:

7. London, British Library, MS Cotton Cleopatra D III, fols 75^{r}–182^{v} (complete, prologue on fols 74^{r}–75^{r}, s. XIV *ex.*)[31]
8. London, British Library, MS Royal 20 A XVIII, fols 311^{r}–335^{v} (chs 187–220 with variants, such as a rumour of Edward II being alive, includes all the prophecies of Merlin at the end on fols 336^{r}–343^{v}, continues the earlier *Anonimalle* text that ends at 1307, s. XIV 2)
9. London, British Library, MS Royal Appendix 85, fols 15^{r}–22^{v} (frag. chs 80–111, s. XIV 2)[32]

---

[26] Brie, *Geschichte und Quellen der mittelenglischen Brute*, pp. 26–32.
[27] Bound with *Le Manuel peché*.
[28] Bound with a prose version of *Evangile de Nichodemus* on fols 120^{r}–133^{v} and *Romanz del ymage deu monde* on 134^{r}–183^{r}.
[29] Bound with fragment in Latin on fols 167^{r}–167^{v}.
[30] Bound with *Short ANPB*, MS 17.
[31] Bound with *Hailes*, MS 1 and a prophecy on fol. 183^{r}.
[32] Bound in a miscellany, including *Chronicle of Early English History* (s. XIV) on fols 23^{r}–24^{v}.

10. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 1804 (SC 25174), fols 49^{v}–104^{v} (complete with imperf. end, prologue on fols 49^{r}–49^{v}, XIV/XV)[33]
11. Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, MS 1860, fols 2^{v}–108^{r} (complete, prologue on fols 1^{r}–2^{v}, *olim* MS 1309, s. XV 1)

Second Recension Abridged Manuscripts:

12. London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius A VI, fols 168^{r}–184^{r} (chs 199–211 for 1307–27 with variations, no chapter headings, continued by *Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut Continuation* to 1347 on fols 184^{r}–199^{r}, s. XIV 2/XV 1)
13. London, Lincoln's Inn, MS Hale 88 (83), fols 9^{r}–76^{v} (chs 1–207 to 1326 with independent ending, s. XIV *med*.)[34]

Second Recension Continental Manuscripts:

14. London, British Library, MS Royal 19 C IX, fols 10^{r}–155^{r} (complete with imperf. end, table of contents on fols 1^{r}–7^{r}, prologue on fols 8^{r}–10^{r}, s. XV)
15. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 12155, fols 13^{v}–233^{v} (complete with imperf. end, table of contents on fols 2^{r}–9^{v}, prologue on fols 10^{r}–13^{v}, divided into two texts at Arthur, s. XV)
16. Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, MS 935, fols 12^{r}–208^{r} (complete with imperf. end, table of contents on fols 1^{r}–8^{r}, prologue on fols 9^{r}–11^{v}, s. XV)

Edition:

'The Anglo-Norman Prose *Brut*: An Edition of British Library, MS Cotton Cleopatra D III', ed. by Marcia Lusk Maxwell (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1995) [of MS 7, no comparison with other MSS]

Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut Continuation to 1347

The text is written in Anglo-Norman prose and covers 1327–47.[35] It was probably written shortly thereafter. John Leland and Brie erroneously ascribed the text to the English administrator William Packington (d. 1390), who served with Edward of Woodstock from 1364.[36] It is sometimes named the *Tiberius Chronicle*, especially when discussing the earlier Anglo-Norman texts in the manuscript. This continuation is the final section of an amalgamated chronicle in four parts: 1)

---

[33] Bound with John Mandeville's *Travels* and *Bridlington Prophecies*.

[34] Bound with prophetic texts on fols 1^{r}–8^{r}, as well as Aristotle's letter on fols 85^{r}–87^{v}, *Secretum Ypocratis* on fol. 87^{v}, and *Image de Monde* (poem on various aspects of the world) on fols 88^{r}–159^{r}.

[35] John Taylor, 'The French *Brut* and the Reign of Edward II', *English Historical Review*, 72 (1957), 423–37 (esp. 430–31).

[36] Friedrich W. D. Brie, 'Recovery of an Anglo-Norman Chronicle', *Notes and Queries,* 10th ser., 2 (1904), 41.

the *Oldest Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* with additions (for 1042–1272, on fols 121^{r}–142^{r}), Anglo-Norman translation and reworking of the *Flores historiarum* (for 1199–1306, on fols 142^{r}–168^{r}), and an abridged extract from the second recension of the *Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* (for 1307–27, on fols 168^{r}–184^{r}). The continuation, covering Edward III's reign, is largely made up of extracts from official documents in Anglo-Norman and Latin, many of which are also found interpolated in John of Tynemouth's *Historia aurea*. The accompanying narrative between these is sometimes terse but is unique and especially detailed for military events.

Manuscript:

1. London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius A VI, fols 184^{r}–199^{r} (s. XIV 2/XV 1)

No edition.

Short Anglo-Norman Prose Brut

The text is written in Anglo-Norman prose and covers 1307–33.[37] It was written probably shortly after 1333. The northern additions and short continuation to 1334 in MS 29 were written *c.* 1334–46. The abbreviated version covers Brutus–1332 and was written not long after 1332. The text retains the *Oldest* text and –1307 continuation with few changes. It focuses on political and military struggles, but does not offer much detail, except during Edward III's reign. The text is structured around hereditary succession and has a clear political agenda, especially in how it employs legal terminology.[38] Many of the manuscripts also include a verse prologue.[39] The text is thought to be intended for a general audience because of its content and style. Pagan suggests it might have been written originally in Lincoln, but no comprehensive work has been done on the manuscripts or their origins.[40] Due to the large number of manuscripts, and no consensus on which ones might be exemplars for different recensions, MS 29, edited by Childs and Taylor, is used throughout this thesis.[41]

A version of the *Short Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* is abbreviated to 1332 and is followed by Robert of Avesbury's *De gestis mirabilibus Edwardi III* in every manuscript immediately

---

[37] Dean and Boulton, *Anglo-Norman Literature*, pp. 24–27, 33–34, 31–32; *Short ANPB*, pp. 74–75. See corrections to list in *Oldest Anglo-Norman Prose 'Brut'*, p. 48 n. 179.

[38] For the intent and audience, see *Prose Brut to 1332*, ed. by Heather Pagan, Anglo-Norman Text Society, Annual Texts, 69 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), pp. 18–23, 28.

[39] *Des grantz geanz: An Anglo-Norman Poem*, ed. by Georgine E. Brereton (Oxford: Blackwell, 1937).

[40] *Prose Brut to 1332*, p. 23.

[41] See *Short ANPB*, pp. 17–24.

afterwards, in MSS 30–32. It makes some changes and additions to its source material, but a comprehensive study has not yet been performed.[42] The 1327–32 narrative does not engage with the themes of this thesis.

Manuscripts without *Des grantz geanz* Prologue:

1. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 98 (roll, s. XV *med.*)
2. Cambridge, Jesus College, MS Q G 10 (58), fols 1^{r}–70^{v} (imperf. beg.–1272, might have included the prologue, previously misidentified as Gray's *Scalacronica*, s. XIV *ex.*)[43]
3. Cambridge, University Library, MS Mm I 33 (2294), fols 1^{r}–62^{v} (to 1326, s. XIV 2)
4. London, British Library, MS Add. 35113, fols 2^{r}–92^{r} (to 1322, *olim* Phillipps MS 8141, s. XIV 2/4)
5. London, British Library, MS Cotton Cleopatra D VII, fols 80^{r}–178^{r} (Richard I on fols 144^{v}–148^{v} from *Le livere de reis de Engletere*, s. XIV *med.*, fols 140^{r}–178^{r}, XV *in.*)[44]
6. London, British Library, MS Cotton Domitian A X, fols 14^{r}–89^{v} (s. XIV *med.*)[45]
7. London, British Library, MS Cotton Julius A I, fols 51^{r}–53^{v} (damaged leaves, s. XIV *med.*)[46]
8. New Haven, Yale University Beinecke Library, MS 86, fols 1^{r}–12^{v} (discontinuous leaves, s. XIV/XV)[47]
9. New Haven, Yale University Beinecke Library, MS 405, fols 1^{r}–74^{v} (two fragments composited, s. XIV 2)
10. Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 78, fols 8^{r}–164^{v} (hybrid redaction to 1307, continued by *Short Anglo-Norman Prose Brut Continuation* MS 1 and further Anglo-Norman continuation for 1377–97 on fols 189^{r}–214^{r}, s. XIV 2)
11. Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 293A, fols 21^{r}–87^{v} (imperf. end, s. XIV ⅔)
12. Sankt-Peterburg, Rossiyskaya natsional'naya biblioteka, MS Fr. Q v IV 8, fols 1^{r}–118^{r} (previously misidentified as Fr. F v IV 8, s. XIV)[48]

---

[42] For a cursory study see *Prose Brut to 1332*, additions: pp. 208 (prose lines 161–63), 211 (811), 212 (910), 213 (1009, origin of the name 'Scot', 1044), 214 (1165), 215 (1305), 218 (1842), 224 (2810, 2822–23), 235 (5087–88), 236 (5333), 237 (5380), 241 (5952, account of 1324 siege of La Réole independent of the *Short ANPB*), omissions: 208 (132–36), 214 (1170), 215 (1318), 217 (1688, 1715), 218 (1799), 220 (2256–58), 222 (2499, several battles omitted, 2541–46), 238 (5548–50, omits details of war), changes: 219 (1952), 221 (2416–20), 228 (3573).

[43] Andy King and Julia Marvin, 'A Warning to the Incurious: M. R. James, the *Scalacronica* and the Anglo-Norman Prose *Brut* Chronicle', in *The Medieval Chronicle V*, ed. by Erik Kooper (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2008), pp. 129–45.

[44] Bound with literary texts.

[45] Bound with material relating to Scotland, such as *De heredibus Scocie* on fols 3^{r}–3^{v}, conventions between William I of the Scots and Henry II and Richard I on fols 3^{v}–5^{r}, award of Norham (1291) on fols 5^{r}–5^{v}, *Tres filii Noe diuiserunt orbem* on fol. 6^{r}, *De filiis Woden regis* on fol. 6^{r}, note on Anglo-Saxon kingdoms on fol. 6^{v}, chronicle of early British history on fols 7^{r}–10^{v}, and chronicle of English history for 854–1327 on fols 10^{v}–13^{r}.

[46] Bound with cartulary and historical material, such as a chronicle for Creation–1317 on fols 44^{r}–50^{v}, another earlier chronicle, as well as a collection of English royal documents on fols 54^{r}–63^{v} (s. XIV 1), and a genealogical tree of the kings of England to Edward I on fol. 71^{r} (s. XIII ¾).

[47] Bound with a list of kings for Brutus–Edward III on fol. 13^{v}, names of captured and killed at Poitiers in Anglo-Norman on fol. 14^{r}, terms of the treaty of Bretigny in Anglo-Norman on fols 14^{v}–19^{v}.

[48] Dean and Boulton first published the erroneous shelf mark, which has since been repeated by Marvin and Pagan: Dean and Boulton, *Anglo-Norman Literature*, p. 32; *Oldest Anglo-Norman Prose 'Brut'*, p. 48 n. 179; *Prose Brut to*

Manuscripts with *Des grantz geanz* Prologue:

13. Cambridge, Trinity College, R VII 14 (752), fols 6^{v}–147^{v} (to 1333 imperf. end, prologue on fols 1^{r}–6^{r}, s. XIV ⅔)
14. Cambridge, University Library, MS Gg I 15 (1410), fols 7^{r}–200^{v} (to 1333 imperf. end,, prologue on fols 1^{r}–6^{v}, s. XIV ⅔)
15. Dublin, Trinity College, MS 500 (E II 33), pp. 19–199 (prologue on pp. 13–19, s. XIV 2)[49]
16. Edinburgh, University of Edinburgh Library, MS 181 (Laing III 51), fols 53^{r}–201^{v} (to 1333 imperf. end, prologue on fols 47^{r}–52^{v}, s. XIV 2)[50]
17. London, British Library, MS Add. 18462, fols 106^{v}–204^{v} (to Edward II, prologue on fols 103^{r}–106^{v}, s. XIV/XV)[51]
18. London, British Library, MS Harley 6359, fols 4^{r}–85^{v} (to 1329, prologue on fols 1^{r}–4^{r}, s. XIV ⅔)
19. London, College of Arms, MS Arundel 31 (169), fols 6^{r}–186^{v} (imperf. beg.–1330, prologue on fols 1^{r}–5^{v}, s. XIV 2)
20. London, Inner Temple, MS Petyt 511.19, fols 13^{r}–147^{v} (prologue on fols 8^{r}–12^{v}, s. XIV ⅔, or XIV/XV)[52]
21. London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 504, fols 4^{v}–77^{v} (prologue on fols 1^{r}–4^{v}, mistakenly attributed to Robert of Avesbury, s. XIV 2)
22. London, Westminster Abbey, MS 25, fols 6^{v}–92^{v} (1329, prologue on fols 3^{r}–6^{v}, s. XIV 2)
23. New Haven, Yale University Beinecke Library, MS 593, fols 5^{r}–118^{v} (prologue on fols 1^{r}–4^{v}, continued by abridged Anglo-Norman version of Jean Froissart's *Chronicles* to 1377 on fols 119^{r}–202^{r}, *olim* Phillipps MS 3338, s. XIV *med.*)[53]
24. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS e Musaeo 108 (SC 3697), fols 5^{r}–119^{r} (to 1333 imperf. end, prologue on fols 1^{r}–4^{v}, s. XV 1)
25. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Lyell 17, fols 61^{v}–121^{v} (prologue on fols 58^{v}–61^{r}, *olim* Wrest Park MS 33, s. XIV ⅔)[54]
26. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson D 329 (SC 13117), fols 12^{r}–121^{v} (to 1333 imperf. end, Richard I narrative on fols 86^{v}–91^{v} from *Le livere de reis de Engletere*, prologue on fols 8^{r}–12^{r}, s. XIV ⅔)[55]
27. Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, MS 3346, fols 84^{r}–156^{v} (prologue on fols 84^{r}–87^{v}, continental manuscript, s. XV 2)[56]

1332, p. 5 n. 15 (who also questions how closely this MS relates to the *Short ANPB* tradition).

[49] Bound with *De humana miseria tractatus* on pp. 6–7.

[50] Bound with *Bridlington Prophecies* on fols 33^{r}–46^{r}.

[51] Bound with *Long ANPB*, MS 5.

[52] Bound with a short rhyming Latin text with genealogical table on William I–Edward III, fols 2^{r}–6^{r}.

[53] Bound with historical and geographical texts.

[54] Bound with historical and genealogical material, such as Martinus Polonus' *Chronicon Pontificum Imperatorumque ex diversis historiis compilatum* on fols 2^{r}–52^{v}.

[55] Bound with historical and genealogical material, such as a later redaction of *Le livere de reis de Engleterre* to 1296 on fols 123^{r}–130^{r}.

[56] Bound with *Le roman de Loherant Garin* on fols 1^{r}–76^{r}.

28. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 12156, fols 11^{r}–126^{v} (prologue on fols 3^{r}–10^{r}, s. XV 2)

Anonimalle Manuscript:

29. Leeds, University of Leeds Library, MS Brotherton 29, fols 229^{r}–271^{r} (ecclesiastic and York additions, follows an amalgamated Anglo-Norman chronicle for Noah–1307 on fols 36^{r}–229^{r}, continued by the *Anonimalle Chronicle* to 1381 on fols 271^{r}–353^{v}, s. XIV 2)[57]

Abridged to 1332 Manuscripts:

30. Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R V 32 (723), fols 2^{v}–59^{r} (prologue on fols 1^{r}–2^{v}, continued by Robert of Avesbury's *De gestis mirabilibus* MS 1, s. XV *in*.)
31. London, British Library, MS Harley 200, fols 6^{r}–79^{v} (prologue on fols 4^{r}–6^{r}, continued by Robert of Avesbury's *De gestis mirabilibus* MS 2, s. XIV/XV)
32. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 128 (SC 21702), fols 63^{v}–163^{v} (prologue on fols 60^{r}–63^{r}, followed by Robert of Avesbury's *De gestis mirabilibus* MS 3, s. XIV 2)

Editions:

The Anonimalle Chronicle, 1307 to 1334, from Brotherton Collection MS 29, ed. by Wendy R. Childs and John Taylor, Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Record Series, 147 (Leeds: Yorkshire Archaeological Society, 1991) [1307–34 of MS 29, additions to standard *Short* text in italics, but it is unclear how the base *Short ANPB* was identified to compare it against]

Prose Brut to 1332, ed. by Heather Pagan, Anglo-Norman Text Society, Annual Texts, 69 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011) [of MSS 30–32]

There is no complete edition of standard version.

Short Anglo-Norman Prose Brut Continuation to 1377

The text is written in Anglo-Norman prose and covers 1307–77.[58] It was probably written shortly thereafter. It is continued by another Anglo-Norman text to 1397. The text's narrative at times seems related to the independent prose of the *Long Anglo-Norman Prose Brut Continuation to 1347* but its narrative for 1327–47 is abridged from the *Prophetic Latin Prose 'Brut'*. The

[57] Bound with *York Short Chronicle*, MS 1. See *Anonimalle*, MS 1. The earlier text is also found in London, British Library, MS Add. 10622, fols 1^{r}–62^{v} (for Arthur–1181, s. XV *in*.) and *Long ANPB*, MS 8, fols 3^{r}–311^{r} (for Noah–1308, continued by *Long ANPB*, s. XIV 2/4). See also John Taylor, 'The Origins of the *Anonimalle Chronicle*', *Northern History*, 31 (1995), 45–64.

[58] Galbraith, 'Extracts', pp. 206–07; Paul Meyer, 'De quelques chroniques anglo-normandes qui ont porté le nom de *Brut*', *Bulletin de la Société des anciens textes français*, 4 (1878), 104–45 (here 132–40).

text is greatly concerned with political and military events. It continues the *Short Anglo-Norman Prose Brut*, MS 9, which is itself said to vary considerably from the other manuscripts.

Manuscript:

1. Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 78, fols 164^{v}–189^{r} (1377–97 narrative on fols 189^{r}–214^{r}, s. XIV/XV)

No edition.

Canterbury Latin Prose Brut

The text is written in Latin prose and covers Brutus–1326, up to right before the Crécy campaign.[59] It was probably written before *c.* 1350. The portion from Brutus to the Harold's death during the Conquest appears to be translated from a version of the *Short Anglo-Norman Prose Brut*, with the original verse prologue put into prose. This portion of the texts in MSS 1 and 2 differ widely and suggests that they might be taken from different manuscripts of the Anglo-Norman text, or are independently abridged. The rest of the text, until 1346, is not based on the vernacular *Brut*s, but seems to be an amalgamation of independent writing and occasional use of authorities. All manuscripts are followed by Adam Murimuth's *Continuatio chronicarum* and the *Canterbury Chronicle*, but without any clear divisions between major source texts. This suggests that writers saw the whole chronicle, from Brutus through 1367, as a single text. Brie and Matheson did not know of MS 4.

Manuscripts:

1. London, British Library, MS Cotton Julius B III, fols 51^{v}–108^{r} (for Brutus–1326, abridged from MS 2 with alternate readings from Monmouth and other Latin sources, Brie claims the former, at least, was in the Anglo-Norman source, continued by Murimuth, *Continuatio chronicarum* MS 11 and *Canterbury Chronicle* MS 3, s. XV or *c.* 1380)[60]
2. London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 99, fols 1^{r}–45^{v} (for Brutus–1326, corresponds with MS 3 version up to 1066 at fol. 22^{v}, continued by Murimuth, *Continuatio chronicarum* MS 12 and *Canterbury Chronicle* MS 1, s. XIV *ex.* or *c.* 1378)[61]

[59] Brie, *Geschichte und Quellen der mittelenglischen Brute*, pp. 127–30; Matheson, *Prose 'Brut'*, pp. 39–42; *Canterbury Chronicle*, pp. xii–xxi.

[60] Bound with historical texts, including 'chronicle of the archbishops of Canterbury to William Whittlesey' for 1369–74 on fols 31^{v}–42^{r}.

[61] Bound with *Gesta Scotorum*, MS 1 and Higden, *Polychronicon*, MS 14.

3. Oxford, Magdalen College, MS Lat. 200, fols 40^{r}–69^{r} (for Brutus–1326, continued by Murimuth, *Continuatio chronicarum* MS 13 and *Canterbury Chronicle* MS 4, s. XIV/XV)[62]
4. Reigate, Parish Church of St Mary Cranston Library, Item 1117, fols 176^{r}–245^{v} (for Brutus–1326, first section goes to 1087 at fol. 207^{r}, second section starts at William I in 1066 at fol. 208^{r}, continued by Murimuth, *Continuatio chronicarum* MS 14 and *Canterbury Chronicle* MS 2, *c.* 1370)[63]

No edition.

Durham Latin Prose 'Brut'

The text is written in Latin prose and covers Brutus–1347.[64] It was probably written shortly after 1347. MS 2 appears to be the earliest extant copy of the text. MS 3 is copied from MS 2 for its main text and from MS 1 for its continuation (in a later hand), per a comment at the end. The text has been largely ignored because it is probably seen as derivative. It draws on many souces, such as Henry of Huntingdon, William of Malmesbury, and John of Tynemouth, throughout. Several of its sections, with some variations, are taken directly from other texts, most importantly the 1328–38 from Tynemouth, and the 1338–47 narrative from the *Minorite Chronicle*. Offler claims that the *Durham* chronicle's presentation of the 1338–47 section is the closer to the now lost source than the other chronicles that draw upon it. MSS 2 and 3 include a wheel diagram of the heptarchy before the text begins. MS 2 was unknown to Offler and MS 3 is entirely unknown to scholars.

Manuscripts:

1. Dublin, Trinity College, MS 485 (E I 27), pp. 1–101 (1347–48 continuation on pp. 101–02, s. XV 2)[65]
2. Durham, Cathedral Dean and Chapter Library, MS B II 35, fols 1^{r}–34^{v} (to 1347, s. XIV)[66]
3. London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius A XX, fols 1^{r}–55^{v} (1347–48 continuation on fols 55^{v}–56^{r} in s. XVII 1 hand, s. XV 2)[67]

No edition.

---

[62] Bound with historical and religious texts, including *Canterbury Chronicle*, MS 4.
[63] Bound with Canterbury Chronicle, MS 2 and Gesta Scotorum, MS 2.
[64] Offler, 'Note on the Northern Franciscan Chronicle'.
[65] Bound with Walter Burley's *De vita et moribus philosophorum et poetarum* on pp. 103–62.
[66] Bound with many other historical and ecclesiastical texts, notably works by Bede, but most of these predate the text.
[67] Bound with historical texts, including a 'chronicle of English history' for 1066–1246 on fols 77^{r}–108^{v} and *Parallel Chronicle*, MS 1.

Prophetic Latin Prose 'Brut'

The text is written in Latin prose and covers Brutus–1347. It ends with a long prophetic digression that does not appear to be related to any of the political prophecies that have so far been studied or edited. It was probably written in 1347 as there is no mention of the Black Death. I have identified the text on fols 30^{v}–38^{v} as the source for the 1327–47 narrative in the *Short Anglo-Norman Prose Brut Continuation* to 1377 on fols 171^{r}–178^{r}, as the latter is more paraphrased at times and continues after the *Prophetic* text's narrative ends. It is concerned with national events, especially war, throughout the later part of its narrative. The text is entirely unknown to scholarship besides a vague and misleading catalogue description as 'Chronicle of British history, Brutus–Edward III (1327–1377)'.

Manuscript:

1. London, British Library, MS Cotton Titus A XIII, fols 2^{r}–41^{v} (s. XIV 2)[68]

No edition.

Canterbury Chronicle

The text is written in Latin prose and covers 1346–65. It also has a continuation to 1367, found only in MSS 1 and 3, that is concerned principally with the battle of Nájera. It was written *c.* 1350–75. Its writer is also known as the Anonymous of Canterbury. Throughout its narrative it is concerned with politics and war. The writer relies on a variety of written sources for certain episodes and includes a few interpolated documents. Its narrative is not as detailed as the other sources that rely on documents, such as John of Tynemouth's *Historia aurea*. Its continuation is far more detailed than the rest of the text, and provides many unique details.

Manuscripts:

1. London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 99, fols 51^{r}–55^{v} (continues *Canterbury Latin Prose Brut* MS 2, s. XIV *ex.* or *c.* 1378)[69]
2. Reigate, Parish Church of St Mary Cranston Library, Item 1117, fols 252^{r}–273^{r} (autograph MS?, *c.* 1370)[70]

---

[68] Bound with historical texts, including *Eulogium*, MS 7a, Higden, *Polychronicon*, MS 29b, and Tynemouth, *Historia*, MS 16b.

[69] Bound with *Gesta Scotorum*, MS 1 and Higden, *Polychronicon*, MS 14.

[70] Bound with *Canterbury LPB*, MS 4 and *Gesta Scotorum*, MS 2.

Abridged Manuscripts:

3. London, British Library, MS Cotton Julius B III, 109^{v}–115^{r} (text is largely unaltered except for omissions, continues *Canterbury Latin Prose Brut* MS 1, s. XV or *c.* 1380)[71]
4. Oxford, Magdalen College, MS Lat. 200, fols 72^{v}–73^{v} (1346–62, summarises, s. XIV/XV)[72]

Edition:

Canterbury Anonymous, *Chronicon, 1346–1365*, ed. by Charity Scott-Stokes and Chris Given-Wilson, OMT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2008)

Croxden Annals

The text is written in Latin prose and covers Creation–1374. It was written in stages and is concerned with local ecclesiastical history, but occasionally (especially in the late 1320s and 1330s) also politics and war in the north of England.

Manuscript:

1. London, British Library, MS Cotton Faustina B VI, part 1 fols 41^{r}–91^{r} (s. XIV *med.*–XVI 1)[73]

No edition.

William Dene, *Rochester History*

The text is written in Latin prose and covers 1315–50. It was written *c.* 1350 and is concerned with local ecclesiastical history, but also occasionally politics and war. It includes narratives of the battles of Sluys, Crécy, and Neville's Cross. These are often in a heavily allusive and religious style, with many direct references to the Bible. It includes a unique newsletter in Anglo-Norman by an English combatant on the siege of Tournai.[74] The text is also known as the *Historia Roffensis*, but should not be confused with the *Annales ecclesiae Roffensis*.

---

[71] Bound with historical texts, including 'chronicle of the archbishops of Canterbury to William Whittlesey' for 1369–74 on fols 31^{v}–42^{r}.

[72] Bound with historical and religious texts, including *Canterbury LPB*, MS 3.

[73] Bound ecclesiastical texts and *Historia Meriadoci regis Kambrie* on fols 2^{r}–23^{r}, *De ortu Waluuanii nepotis Arturi* on fols 23^{r}–38^{v}, and Geoffrey of Monmouth's *De gestis Britonum* abstracted on fols 38^{v}–40^{v}.

[74] Edited as: 'An Unknown News Bulletin from the Siege of Tournai in 1340', ed. by Clifford J. Rogers, *War in History*, 5 (1998), 358–66.

Manuscript:

1. London, British Library, MS Cotton Faustina B V, fols 2^{r}–101^{r} (s. XIV ¼–XV 1)

Mark Buck has been preparing an edition for OMT, since at least 2000, that is expected to be complete in a few years, per correspondence with Cathryn Steele, editor of OMT.

Eulogium historiarum

The text is written in Latin prose and covers Creation–1366. It was written some time after 1366. It also has a later continuations to 1413.[75] Several copies of the text are also bound with the *Chronicon brevius* (for 1–1364) and a genealogy from Rollo to Edward III.[76] The text is an encyclopaedic chronicle in five books written by a monk at Malmesbury Abbey. It frequently draws on Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon*, as well as other key writers, such as Isidore of Seville, Martin of Opava, Jacob of Voragine, William of Malmesbury, Orosius, Pliny, and Geoffrey of Monmouth. In its later years it is concerned with Edward III's wars. The editors did not utilise MSS 6a and 7.

Manuscripts:

1. Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R VII 2 (740), pp. 31–649 (index on pp. 653–62, autograph MS?, s. XIV)[77]
2. Dublin, Trinity College, MS 497 (E II 26), fols 31^{r}–271^{r} (index on fols 23^{r}–28^{v}, s. XIV *ex.*)[78]
3. London, British Library, MS Cotton Cleopatra D II, fols 4^{r}–111^{v} (for bk 5–1346, s. XV *in.*)[79]
4. London, British Library, MS Cotton Galba E VII, fols 18^{r}–191^{r} (index on fols 3^{r}–5^{r}, with continuation for 1364–1413 on fols 191^{r}–208^{v}, s. XV *in.*)[80]
5. London, Lincoln's Inn, MS Hale 73 (68), fols 27^{r}–203^{v} (s. XIV/XV)[81]

---

[75] See 'The Continuation of the *Eulogium historiarum*, 1361–1413', ed. by Stephen N. Clifford (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Leeds, 1975); *Continuatio Eulogii: The Continuation of the Eulogium Historiarum*, ed. by Chris Given-Wilson, OMT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, forthcoming).

[76] 'Chronicon brevius, ab incarnatione usque ad annum Domini .mccclxiv.', in *Eulogium (historiarum sive temporis), ab orbe condito usque ad annum Domini .mcclxci.*, ed. by Frank Scott Haydon, RS, 9, 3 vols (London: Longman, 1858–63), III, 245–313; *Eulogium*, III, 330–32 (genealogy).

[77] Bound with *Chronicon brevius* on pp. 1–29 and genealogy on pp. 650–52.

[78] Bound with *Chronicon brevius* on fols 9^{r}–22^{r} and genealogy on fols 29^{v}–30^{r}.

[79] An illumination of a naval battle on fol. 3^{r} is originally from Jean Froissart's *Chronicles* in London, British Library, MS Arundel 67, per research by Godfried Croenen and myself.

[80] Bound with *Chronicon brevius* on fols 6^{r}–16^{r}.

[81] Sporadically foliated. Foliation starts at misc. notes written during Henry VIII's reign on fols 1^{v}–3^{r}. Bound with *Chronicon brevius* to 1355 on fols 4^{r}–12^{v} with continuation for 1356–1534 on fols 13^{r}–26^{v}, geanealogy on fols 203^{r}–203^{v}, different genealogy on fols 204^{r}, as well as miscellaneous historical texts, lists, etc., from later reigns.

6. Unknown MS (to 1366)

    6a. London, British Library, MS Add. 6914, fols 28^{r}–316^{r} (for 642–1366, versos mostly blank, s. XVIII *in*. copy, Haddon Hindley)[82]

7. Unknown MS (to 1366)

    7a. London, British Library, MS Cotton Titus A XIII, fols 98^{r}–98^{v} (extracts for 1339–66, continues Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 29b, which is continued by John of Tynemouth's *Historia aurea* MS 16b, *c*. 1556, William Lambard)[83]

8. Untraced MS, fols 1^{r}–63^{v}, sold at Les Enluminures April 2016, lot 18 and at Sotheby's 2 December 2014, lot 47, *ex*. Bristol, Baptist College Library, MS Z C 20 (imperf. beg. bk 5–1240, s. XIV 2 or s. XIV 4/4)[84]

Edition:

Eulogium (historiarum sive temporis), ab orbe condito usque ad annum Domini .mccclxci., ed. by Frank Scott Haydon, RS, 9, 3 vols (London: Longman, 1858–63)

Gesta regum Angli compendiose compilata

The text is written in Latin prose and covers Brutus–1376. It was probably written before Edward III's death in 1377. MS 2 includes a brief continuation to Richard II's coronation in 1377. It is written in the style of a regnal chronicle that describes each king's reign and their notable achievements, similar to but in greater detail than *Cronica bona et compendiosa*.[85] It describes, sometimes only briefly, the major military events of both Edward III and Edward of Woodstock in separate sections. The text is entirely unknown to scholarship besides its vague catalogue entry.

---

[82] See *Eulogium*, II, iv–v.

[83] Bound with historical texts, including *Prophetic LPB*, MS 1.

[84] Neil R. Ker and others, *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries*, 5 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969–2002), II, 188–89.

[85] See p. 205 n. 2 above.

Manuscripts:

1. London, British Library, MS Royal 13 E IX, fols 169^{v}–176^{v} (s. XIV/XV, St Albans)[86]
2. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 101 (SC 1949), fols 57^{r}–70^{v} (s. XV *in.*)[87]

No edition.

Gesta Scotorum contra Anglicos

The text is written in Latin prose and covers 1066–1346. It is extended from its beginning to the fifth century and from its end to 1368 in MS 2. It was probably written shortly after 1346, when David II, king of the Scots, was captured at Neville's Cross, but extended in the later MS some time after 1368. The text argues that the Scots owe homage to the English through many illustrative examples, but especially through their defeat by the English. MS 2 is incomplete due to missing leaves but has interpolated a unique copy of 'Passio Scotorum periuratorum', a satirical Latin account of the killing of Scottish heroes in the early fourteenth century.[88] It is unclear how much of the text is derived from other sources, but its account of the 1346 Scottish invasion of England and the battle of Neville's Cross are either drawn from, or the basis for, the *Canterbury Chronicle*'s narrative.

Manuscripts:

1. London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 99, fols 203^{r}–206^{r} (to 1368, s. XIV *ex.* or *c.* 1378)[89]
2. Reigate, Parish Church of St Mary Cranston Library, Item 1117, fols 274^{r}–279^{v} (for 1066–1346 only, *c.* 1370)[90]

No edition.

[86] Bound with historical texts, including Higden, *Polychronicon*, MSS 88 and 167 and Tynemouth, *Historia*, MS 6. For MS contents see Thomas Walsingham, *The St Albans Chronicle: The Chronica maiora, 1376–1422*, ed. by John Taylor, Wendy R. Childs, and Leslie Watkiss, OMT, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003–11), I, xxviii–xxix, 964–68.

[87] Bound with many historical and political texts from different source manuscripts, including *Cronica bona et compendiosa* on fols 1^{r}–12^{r} (see p. 205 n. 2 above), *Bridlington Chronicle*, MS 1, *Gestis Anglorum*, MS 1, and *Parallel Chronicle*, MS 2.

[88] Edited as: 'Notice of a Manuscript, *Passio Scotorum perjuratorum*'.

[89] Bound with *Canterbury LPB*, MS 2 continued by *Canterbury Chronicle*, MS 1, and Higden, *Polychronicon*, MS 14.

[90] Bound with *Canterbury LPB*, MS 4 and *Canterbury Chronicle*, MS 2.

De gestis Anglorum regum, Gallicorum, et Scotorum bellis et aliis infinitis miseriis

The text is written in Latin prose and covers 1274–1367. It was probably written shortly after 1367. In its later years it is wholly concerned with military events, including the Anglo-French and Anglo-Scottish battles. The text is entirely unknown to scholarship besides its vague catalogue entry.

Manuscript:

1. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 101 (SC 1949), fols 32^{r}–35^{v} (*c.* 1400)[91]

No edition.

Thomas Gray, *Scalacronica*

The text is written in Anglo-Norman prose and covers Creation–1362. It was written 1357–62 by an English border knight. It is structured as a universal chronicle but also has extensive narratives of later events. It is very much concerned with war and also, somewhat, political events. The 1066–1362 portion of the text is based on John of Tynemouth's *Historia aurea* and a version of the *Short Anglo-Norman Prose Brut*, especially for 1100–1272, but with many changes throughout. The later sections of the text are largely independent and ostensibly draw on personal experience and eyewitness testimony. Unfortunately, the manuscript is missing parts of its narrative for 1339–56, and all of that for 1340–55, due to missing folios, but an abstract for these was made by the antiquary John Leland (*c.* 1503–52) before their disappearance. Dean and Boulton identify a second MS, but King and Marvin show this to be a *Short Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* text.[92]

Manuscript:

1. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 133, fols 1^{r}–234^{v} (s. XIV/XV)

Editions:

Thomas Gray, *Scalacronica, 1272–1363*, ed. by Andy King, Surtees Society, 209 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005)

---

[91] Bound with many historical and political texts from different source manuscripts, including *Cronica bona et compendiosa* on fols 1^{r}–12^{r} (see p. 205 n. 2 above), *Bridlington Chronicle*, MS 1, *Gesta regum Angli*, MS 2, and *Parallel Chronicle*, MS 2.

[92] *Short ANPB*, MS 2; Dean and Boulton, *Anglo-Norman Literature*, p. 50; King and J. Marvin, 'Warning to the Incurious'.

Thomas Gray, *Scalacronica: A Chronicle of England and Scotland from AD .mlxvi. to AD .mccclxii.*, ed. by Joseph Stevenson (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Printing Company, 1836)

Andy King, Heather Pagan, and Jaclyn Rajsic are preparing an edition of the Creation–1272 narrative.

Hailes Annals

The text is written in Latin prose and covers Creation–1364.[93] It was probably written to 1366. It is related to the *Hailes Abbey Chronicle*, a Cistercian chronicle largely concered with local matters, which goes to 1314 only and is in MS 1, fols 3^{r}–59^{v}. It draws on a number of authorities, including Gerald of Wales, William of Malmesbury, and Sigebert of Gembloux. In MS 2, after 1368, the text narrates early history. It is then followed by a long digression on the founding of the abbey on fols 33^{r}–37^{v}.

Manuscripts:

1. London, British Library, MS Cotton Cleopatra D III, fols 60^{r}–73^{v} (to 1295, s. XIV ¼)[94]
2. London, British Library, MS Harley 3725, fols 2^{r}–31^{v} (to 1364, s. XIV/XV)

No edition.

Ranulf Higden, *Polychronicon* and Continuations

The text is written in Latin prose and survives in three primary versions, all by Higden. The Short Version covers Creation–1327,[95] the Intermediate Version to 1344,[96] and the Long Version to 1352.[97] Each version was probably written shortly after its final date, although little work has been done on the many extant manuscripts to offer precise composition dates.[98] There are also texts that fall somewhere between the Short and Intermediate Versions, as well as Short Version texts that are extended, either through interpolation, continuation, or both, by material from

[93] J. Taylor, *Kirkstall Abbey Chronicles*, pp. 10–17.
[94] Bound with *Long ANPB*, MS 7.
[95] MSS C and D in Higden, *Polychronicon*, through to VIII, 324 at '*Explicit Historia*'.
[96] MSS A and B in Higden, *Polychronicon*, through to VIII, 338 at 'capitis ecarceris interdixit'.
[97] MS E, the base text, in Higden, *Polychronicon*, through to VIII, 346 at 'Angliae et Hiberniae'. However, the standard edition is based on an imperfect MS of the Long Version, and every other full MS of the Long Version includes further text, transcribed at p. 251 below.
[98] See Galbraith, 'Autograph MS'; J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, pp. 89–96 (overall development), 96–98 (Short Version), 98–100 (Intermediate Version), 100 (Long Version), 100–02 (Expanded Version).

John of Tynemouth's *Historia aurea*, in the Expanded Versions. The text is a universal chronicle in four prefaces and seven books, concerned with a variety of topics, especially towards the end of the text with the history of England and Britain. The Higden uses at least two hundred sources, including Josephus, Isidore of Seville, Peter Comestor, Vincent of Beauvais, Bede, William of Malmesbury, Geoffrey of Monmouth, Henry of Huntingdon, Martin of Opava, Gerald of Wales, Pliny, Bartholomaeus Anglicus, Gregorious, the Bible, and others. Many manuscripts include *mappae mundi* as a sort of companion to the geographic and ethnographic sections of the text. The *Polychronicon* was massively popular, likely because its varied topics, encyclopaedic nature, and useful index allowed the reader to quickly access information on nearly any topic without having to read the text in full. It was later translated into several different Middle English versions, the most famous of which is by John Trevisa. Many later chroniclers based their own texts on the Latin text, or continued it, such as John of Tynemouth, John Brompton, Thomas Gray, and Henry Knighton.

Many of the *Polychronicon* manuscripts are continued beyond their customary endings. These continuations all follow immediately after the Intermediate Version of the main text, which was itself copied, in one form or another, from the autograph (MS 162) after the first additions to the text were made.[99] The end point of nearly every copy of the Intermediate Version, through 'interdixit', is signaled in a large number of manuscripts with continuations, either in the text or in the margins. However, because the text has years only sporadically labelled in the margins, and the 1346–52 narrative of the continuations (especially *A Continuation*, *B Continuation*, and *Walsingham A*) share a great deal of their text with the Long Version, the basis of the edition, there has been considerable confusion amongst scholars, both experts of the *Polychronicon* and cataloguers alike, over what point the main text ends and the continuations begin.[100]

A number of continuations were added to the *Polychronicon* in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Some of these are actually sections borrowed from other texts written during

---

[99] Only a handful of Intermediate Version MSS end before the additional paragraphs in the autograph MS at 'discessum est' (Higden, *Polychronicon*, VIII, 336): MSS 50 (continued to the normal end point in a later hand), 54, 62, 68, 78, 99, 116, 145.

[100] See J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, pp. 110–11, 119, and 123–33 (overall development), 111–13 (*A*), 120–21 (*St Albans A*), 113–14 (*B*), 114–16 (*C*), 116–17 (*D*), 117–18 (*E*), 118–19 (*St Albans B*), 121–22 (*St Albans C*), 122–23 (*Walsingham A*), 123 (*Walsingham B*), 123–24 (*Walsingham C*), 134–48 (translations); Vivian H. Galbraith, 'The *Historia aurea* of John, Vicar of Tynemouth, and the Sources of the *St Albans Chronicle* (1327–1377)', in *Essays in History Presented to Reginald Lane Poole*, ed. by Henry W. C. Davis (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927), pp. 379–98 (390–95 for *St Albans A* and *St Albans B*).

the reign of Edward III, including Adam Murimuth's *Continuatio chronicarum* (MSS 15–17) and John of Tynemouth's *Historia aurea* (MSS 8–16b). Only a few continuations were independently written during the reign of Edward III. Two of these with extensive narratives, A and St Albans A, have their own entries as texts below. These continuations are given below in alphabetical order because it is not entirely certain when they were started and completed.

A Continuation: for 1346–77 (later copies add a sentence for 1341), written 1346–77 or 1360–77, possibly in stages. The 1346–52 section draws from the Long Version of the *Polychronicon* and has only a few minor difference from its source. Some copies are continued into the reign of Ricard II and beyond by the *Vita Ricardi Secundi*. The continuation survives in 14 or 15 witnesses: MSS 10, 15, 50, 63, 65, 77, 83, 84, 105, 111, 121 (might be *B Continuation*), 129, 132, 139, and 148. See the separate entry on this text at pp. 249–51 below.

Detroit Continuation: brief continuation for 1339, probably written at some point after 1340 by the scribe who copied the main text. The continuation survives in a single witness: MS 62.[101]

St Albans A Continuation: for 1343–76, written during Edward III's reign, possibly in stages. The continuation survives in 3 witnesses: MSS 163, 164, and 168. See the separate entry on this text at p. 251 below.

***Wigmore Chronicle*:** for 1360–76, written during Edward III's reign, probably in stages. The text is not concerned with war and is thus not discussed in this thesis. It survives in 1 witness: MS 65.[102]

Most of the continuations were written after the death of Edward III, as is clear from internal evidence. They are derived from the earlier continuations, with many additions independently composed or taken from other sources, such as John of Reading's *Chronicle*. The principal

[101] The entire continuation is edited here: Higden, *Polychronicon*, MS 62, fol. 221^{v}: 'anno q[uoque] D[omi]ni mill[es]i[m]o .cccxxxix. rex Angl[ie] E[dwardus] tercius p[ost] [con]quest[um] deuastauit destruxit co[m]bussit [et] spoliauit i[n] regno Francie villas mille .dcc. [et] .vi. q[uorum] quest[um] h[ab]uit eccl[es]iam p[ar]ochiale[m] exceptis cast[ris] et ma[ch]inis magno[rum] d[omi]no[rum] [et] aliis fortaliciis [et] expectauit Philippum de Valesio rege[m] F[ra]ncie p[er] duos dies co[n]tinue in campo qui tunc noluit venire'.

[102] Edited as: 'A Wigmore Chronicle, 1355–1377', in John Taylor, *English Historical Literature in the Fourteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), pp. 285–300.

development of the continuations for Edward III's reign that were written after 1377 are given in chronological order below.

B Continuation: for 1346–76 , written 1377–99. Based on *A Continuation* but revised here and there throughout. John of Reading's *Chronicle* influenced this and subsequent continuations. The continuation survives in 15 or 16 witnesses: MSS 32, 33, 48, 49, 51, 64, 74, 76, 79, 91, 100, 102, 107, 121 (might be *A Continuation*), 127, and 152.[103]

C Continuation: for 1341–77, written *c.* 1379–89. Based on *B Continuation* with additions from *St Albans A Continuation*. Adds narrative for 1343–45 to the beginning of the continuation. The continuation survives in 18 witnesses: MSS 37, 39, 41, 44, 52, 58, 67, 71, 75, 86, 93, 94, 113, 142, 146, 149, 150, and 155.[104]

D Continuation: for 1341–77, written *c.* 1379–99. Based on *C Continuation* to 1360, then *A Continuation* through 1377. Adds greatly to the narrative for 1343–46 and borrows additional passages from John of Reading's *Chronicle*. The continuation survives in 8 witnesses: MSS 60, 92, 98, 110, 120, 126, 128, and 166.[105]

E Continuation: for 1341–77, written *c.* 1379–99. Based on *D Continuation*. Adds passages for 1350s and 1360s and borrows additional passages from John of Reading's *Chronicle*. The continuation survives in 3 witnesses: MSS 43, 69, and 147.[106]

St Albans B Continuation, also known as ***Continuation of Murimuth***: for 1341–77, written *c.* 1379–99. Based on *E Continuation*. Greatly elaborated. The only edition of this continuation was edited from one of two manuscripts (MSS 165 and 167) in which it is found as a continuation of Adam Murimuth's *Continuatio chronicarum* (hence its title in scholarly works), but it was originally meant to serve as a continuation of Higden's *Polychronicon*. The continuation survives in 9 witnesses: MSS 64, 65, 82, 85, 133, 135, 136, 165, and 167.[107]

St Albans C Continuation: for 1341–77, written *c.* 1379–99. Based on *St Albans B Continuation*. Adds passages from Thomas Walsingham's writings. The continuation survives in 2 witnesses: MSS 72 and 122.[108]

---

[103] Edited from MS 48 as: Ranulf Higden, 'Continuation as Given in MS B', in *Polychronicon*, ed. by Joseph Rawson Lumby, RS, 41, 9 vols (London: Longman, 1865–86), VIII, 338–46 (following MS B), 407–28.

[104] Unedited.

[105] Unedited.

[106] Unedited.

[107] Edited from MS 134 as: Ranulf Higden, 'Continuatio', in Adam Murimuth, *Chronica sui temporis*, ed. by Thomas Hog (London: English Historical Society, 1846), pp. 171–227 (here 174–227).

[108] Main addition edited from MS 72 as: Ranulf Higden, 'Addition to the Character of Edward III as Given in the

Walsingham A Continuation: for 1348–77, written *c.* 1379–99. Based on *St Albans B Continuation*, but also shares elements with *A Continuation* that are not mentioned by John Taylor. Adds passages from Thomas Walsingham's writings and has further changes. MS 46 attributes this continuation to John Malvern, but no other manuscripts support this claim. The continuation survives in 19 witnesses: MSS 46, 47, 53, 55, 57, 80, 87, 95, 96, 97, 103, 117, 124, 127, 130, 131, 134, 143, and 154. It is nearly always continued by the *Gesta regis Ricardi Secundi*, and sometimes the *Vita Ricardi Secundi*, for Richard II's reign and beyond, with the exceptions of MSS 95, 124, 130, 131, and 143.[109]

Walsingham B Continuation: for 1341–77, written *c.* 1379–99. Based on *C Continuation*. Adds passages from Thomas Walsingham's writings and the *Eulogium historiarum*. The continuation survives in 2 witnesses: MSS 114 and 153.[110]

Walsingham C Continuation: for 1328–87, written *c.* 1379–99. Borrowed heavily from the Thomas Walsingham's *Short History*. The continuation survives in 1 witness: MS 123.[111]

Laud Continuation: for 1340–73, written *c.* 1379–99. Picks up mid-sentence where the main text breaks off. A brief peculiarly arranged continuation that appears to be based on some of the above continuations, with independent additions. More work needs to be done on this continuation to understand its relationship to the others, however. The continuation survives in 1 witness: MS 115.[112]

Several further continuations were added to the above texts that carried the *Polychronicon* into the reign of Richard II and beyond. These have received far less attention from scholars, such as John Taylor, however, so the classifications below must remain tentative. In cases where it is not entirely certain how the continuations relate to each other, but share many elements, these are grouped together under the generic label of 'variants' or 'extended versions'. These continuations are listed below, with only basic information, in alphabetical order, as they often have varying end dates.

Continuations of the *Polychronicon* and Murimuth', in *Johannis de Reading et Anonymi Cantuariensis*, ed. by James Tait (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1914), p. 91.

[109] Edited from MS 57 as: Ranulf Higden, 'Continuation as Given in MS A, liber septimus', in *Polychronicon*, ed. by Joseph Rawson Lumby, RS, 41, 9 vols (London: Longman, 1865–86), VIII, 338–44 (following MS A), 355–93.

[110] Unedited.

[111] Unedited.

[112] Unedited.

Gesta regis Ricardi Secundi: for 1377–81, written *c.* 1381–99. In nearly every case this continuation follows after *Walsingham A Continuation* (the exceptions are MSS 133 and 167), but it is unclear whether the Edward III and Richard II narratives were written by the same person. It shares elements with the *Vita Ricardi Secundi*, but it is not entirely certain how the two texts relate to each other. It is given its name in rubric in MS 133, fol. 174^{r}. The continuation survives in 13 witnesses: MSS 46, 47, 53, 55, 57, 87, 96, 97, 103, 127, 133, 134, and 167.[113]

Vita Ricardi Secundi: in its fullest form for 1377–1402, written *c.* 1377–1402. This text appears to have circulated independently before it was attached to a variety of continuations on the reign of Edward III. Shares elements with the *Gesta regis Ricardi Secundi* and Thomas Walsingham's writings, but it is not entirely certain how the three texts relate to each other. Excluding the copies of the text not found in manuscripts containing Higden's *Polychronicon*, the continuation survives in 21 witnesses: the standard version of the text ends at different points up to 1401 (MSS 10, 15, 47, 84, 96, 114, 120, 129, and 153), in extended texts to 1451 (MS 111), to 1450 (MSS 105 and 132), and to 1455 (MS 83), and variant versions no. 1 (MSS 80 and 154), no. 2 (MS 117), no. 3 (MS 77), no. 4 (MSS 65, 86, and x4), and a peculiar version (MS 37). Many of these variant and extended versions have considerable differences and need to be investigated further.[114]

Adam Usk's *Chronicle*: for 1377–1421, written *c.* 1377–1421. It includes many important descriptions of the period it covers. The final quire (for 1404–21) of the only surviving witness of the text (MS 71) was removed at some point and only rediscovered in a drawer in Belvoir Castle.[115]

Westminster Chronicle: for 1381–94, written *c.* 1389–97. A valuable account of period it covers. The continuation survives in 1 witness: MS 46.[116]

---

[113] Edited from MS 57 as: Ranulf Higden, 'Continuation as Given in MS A, liber octavus', in *Polychronicon*, ed. by Joseph Rawson Lumby, RS, 41, 9 vols (London: Longman, 1865–86), VIII, 393–406.

[114] Normal text edited as: *Historia vitae et regni Ricardi Secundi*, ed. by George B. Stow (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977); variant version no. 1 edited for 1399–1430 only as: 'A Northern Chronicle, 1399–1430', in Charles Kingsford, *English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), pp. 279–91; variant version no. 4 edited from MS 86, MS x4, and two additional MSS for 1399–1410 only as: 'Pars secunda: De rebus gestis Henrici IV', in *Incerti scriptoris chronicon Angliae de regnis trium regum lancastrensium: Henrici IV, Henrici V, et Henrici VI*, ed. by John A. Giles (London: Nutt, 1848), pp. 3–63.

[115] Edited as: Adam Usk, *Chronicle, 1377–1421*, ed. by Chris Given-Wilson, OMT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).

[116] Edited as: *The Westminster Chronicle, 1381–1394*, ed. by Leonard C. Hector and Barbara F. Harvey, OMT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982).

This thesis uses the Long Version to 1352 only, as the differences between all three versions are minimal for the subjects engaged with here. While basic labels have been given to the nearly two hundred copies of the *Polychronicon*, listed below, it should be noted that a large number of them are actually composite versions. However, it is difficult to identify such composite versions, or to determine how they were written or copied, as there are few indications in the manuscripts for changes in exemplars. The incipits vary only between the Short and the Intermediate/Long Versions, and even then, only for Books 1, 5, 6, and 7. It would require a considerable amount of work, time, and financial support to properly examine all the manuscripts to establish the version of each main text and its various parts. Accordingly, the list below offers only the basic labels for each version that best represent the form of the text. Extant lists of main texts by John Taylor and James Freeman for their main text versions, and Taylor for continuation versions, have been trusted for their main text versions unless there have been obvious reasons to believe they were incorrect (such as a Short Version text ending past 1327). The list below does not mention missing folios or portions of the text otherwise omitted for the sake of space and the amount of work it would require to fully describe each manuscript. *Polychronicon* manuscripts are often decorated at the beginning of each book, and sometimes also at Edward III's coronation, and these leaves have been removed from several manuscripts over the years, making it difficult to properly identify text versions. There are included here each manuscript's basic aspects, including main text version, years covered, continuation versions, and years covered, although many of these are missing in earlier lists of *Polychronicon* manuscripts.

There is no comprehensive list of the many Latin manuscripts of the text. Taylor identified 133 manuscripts and classifies their versions and continuations, but only identifies a handful of Intermediate Version texts.[117] Edwards adds another 10 manuscripts, but does not examine their contents.[118] Freeman, building on these earlier works in his own investigation, lists and comprehensively details 135 manuscripts, adding 8 manuscripts, but largely omits variant versions and fragments, and makes no attempt to classify continuations.[119] Edwards and Freeman,

---

[117] J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, esp. pp. 152–59, 177–81: MSS 1–4, 7–15, 17–19, 21, 23–28, 30, 32–36, 39–41, 43–45, 47–58, 63–65, 67–76, 78–85, 87, 89–97, 99–101, 104–115, 117–132, 134–138, 142, 144, 147, 150–151, 155, 157–158, 160–165, 167–168, 176, 178–179.

[118] Anthony S. G. Edwards, 'Notes on the *Polychronicon*', *Notes and Queries*, 223 (1978), 2–3: MSS 29a, 29b, 31, 60, 62, 98, 103, 116, 139, 156.

[119] He was unable to examine MSS held in libraries outside of Britain and accordingly provides only basic details on these: James Freeman, 'The Manuscript Dissemination and Readership of the *Polychronicon* of Ranulph Higden, *c.* 1330–*c.* 1500' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge, 2013), pp. 207–339: MSS 16, 42, 61, 143, 148, 149, 153, 159.

in a later article, add 16 manuscripts.[120] In the course of my research I have identified 18 additional manuscripts.[121] The list of 185 (and 5 misidentified) manuscripts below draws on these earlier works but is corrected in nearly every case by extensive personal examination of manuscripts. For additional information on the physical aspects and layout of many of the manuscripts see Freeman's thesis and forthcoming monograph on Higden's *Polychronicon*.

Short Version (as C and D) Manuscripts:

1. Bruxelles, Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, MS 3097, fols 1^{r}–148^{v} (to 1327, incomplete index on fols 148^{v}–156^{r}, s. XIV, St Augustine's, Canterbury)
2. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 259, fols 1^{r}–187^{r} (imperf. beg.–1320, continued by Adam Murimuth's *Continuatio chronicarum* MS 15, s. XIV *med*., 1339 or after)
3. Cambridge, St John's College, MS A 12 (12), fols i^{r}–ii^{v}, 1^{r}–218^{r} (to 1327, index on fols 218^{r}–230^{r}, s. XIV/XV, Hyde Abbey)[122]
4. Cambridge, Trinity Hall, MS 25, fols 1^{r}–192^{v} (to 1320, s. XIV *med*.)
5. Canterbury, Christ Church Cathedral Library, MS Add. 68, fols 44^{v}–49^{r} (bk 1 extracts, table of contents on fols 43^{v}–44^{r}, s. XV 2)[123]
6. Dublin, Trinity College, MS 517 (E IV 12), fols 53^{r}–78^{r}, 78^{v}–88^{v}, 150^{r}–155^{r} (extracts for 1066–1327, *c*. 15–*c*. 990, and from bk 1, s. XV 1, fols 150^{r}–155^{r} XV/XVI)[124]
7. Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, MS Advocates 33 IV 12, fols 1^{r}–221^{r} (imperf. beg.–1327, index on fols v^{r}–xiii^{r}, s. XIV *med*.)[125]
8. Lincoln, Cathedral Library, MS 85 (A III 12), fols 1^{r}–103^{r} (imperf. beg.–1327, index on fols 103^{v}–105^{v}, s. XIV)
9. London, British Library, MS Add. 10105, fols 2^{r}–204^{r} (bk 3–1326, s. XIV, Glastonbury, 1512)
10. London, British Library, MS Harley 1728–1729, 1728 fols 9^{r}–101^{v} and 1729 fols 1^{r}–130^{v} (to 1327, index on 1728 fols 2^{r}–6^{v}, continued by Adam Murimuth's *Continuatio chronicarum* MS 16, *A Continuation* MS 1, and *Vita Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–97 on fols 145^{r}–180^{v}, s. XV *med*., Nicholas Shaxton, bishop of Salisbury, 1535–56, originally one volume)
11. London, British Library, MS Harley 1751, fols 2^{r}–216^{v} (imperf. beg.–1320, s. XIV 2, Oxford, Queen's College?)
12. London, British Library, MS Royal 13 C III, fols 13^{r}–128^{v} (to 1278, index on fols 2^{r}–7^{v}, s. XV 1)[126]

---

[120] Edwards and Freeman, 'Further Manuscripts': MSS 5, 20, 38, 59, 66, 77, 102, 140, 141, 170, 172, 174, 180, 182, 184, as well as x1, x3, x4–x5.

[121] MSS 6, 22, 37, 46, 86, 88, 133, 145, 152, 154, 166, 169, 171, 173, 175, 177, 181, 183, as well as x2.

[122] MS D in Higden, *Polychronicon*.

[123] Bound with texts on ecclesiastical matters.

[124] Bound with historical texts and documents, including documents in support of the English claim to Scotland on fols 89^{r}–94^{r}, not in chronological order, but dating 1292–1371, including spurious texts, such as texts claiming that the Scottish kings owed fealty to England.

[125] Bound with *mappa mundi* on fol. xiii^{v}.

[126] Bound with Gerald of Wales' *Descriptio Kambriae* on fols 8^{r}–13^{r}, and with fly-leaf on fol. 129 from a medical treatise.

13. London, British Library, MS Royal 14 C XIII, fols 14^{r}–165^{v} (to 1327, index on fols 3^{r}–10^{v}, s. XIV *med*. or 1327 x 1352, Norwich, Benedictine Cathedral Priory)[127]

14. London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 99, fols 158^{r}–186^{r} (bk 1 extracts, s. XIV *ex.*)[128]

15. London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 104, fols 15^{r}–149^{v} (to 1196, index on fols 6^{r}–14^{r}, continud by Adam Murimuth's *Continuatio chronicarum* MS 17, *A Continuation* MS 2, and *Vita Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–97 on fols 166^{v}–208^{r}, s. XIV *med*. or 1339 x 1369, after fol. 156^{r} s. XV, Exeter Cathedral)[129]

16. New Haven, Yale University Beinecke Library, MS Takamiya 43, fols 1^{r}–206^{r} (imperf. beg.–1327, *olim* Tokyo, Keio University Library, MS Takamiya 43, s. XV 2/4)

17. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson B 191 (SC 11551), fols 1^{r}–142^{v} (to 1327, s. XIV 2, Christ Church, Canterbury)

18. Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 83, fols 1^{r}–182^{v} (to 1327, s. XIV 2, Llanthony)

19. Oxford, Merton College, MS 118, fols 7^{v}–170^{r} (to 1327, index on fols 1^{r}–7^{v}, s. XIV/XV, or 1327 x 1409, Robert Stoneham)[130]

20. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 4126, fols 120^{v}–132^{v} (bk 1 extracts, s. XIV)

Expanded (Short) Version Manuscripts:

21. Cambridge, University Library, MS Dd VIII 7 (441), fols 15^{r}–337^{v} (to 1327, index on fols 8^{r}–14^{v}, continued by John of Tynemouth's *Historia aurea* MS 8, s. XIV *med*., 1347 or after)[131]

22. London, British Library, MS Add. 14251, fols 4^{r}–115^{r} (imperf. beg.–1327 with peculiar abridged bks 2–4, continued by John of Tynemouth's *Historia aurea* MS 9 for 1327–40 on fols 115^{r}–118^{v}, damaged, s. XV)[132]

23. London, British Library, MS Cotton Julius E VIII, fols 1^{r}–177^{r} (for 411–1327, continued by John of Tynemouth's *Historia aurea* MS 10, s. XIV/XV)[133]

24. London, British Library, MS Harley 655, fols 14^{r}–319^{r} (to 1327, index on fols 3^{r}–13^{r}, continued by John of Tynemouth's *Historia aurea* MS 11, s. XIV *med*., 1345 or after)[134]

---

[127] Bound with prologues of classical and Church historians on fols 166^{r}–168^{v}, Gerald of Wales' *Expugnatio Hibernie* on fols 168^{v}–194^{v}, and other historical and travel texts, as well as Nicholas Trevet's commentary on Augustine's *De civitate Dei*.

[128] Bound with *Canterbury LPB*, MS 2 continued by *Canterbury Chronicle*, MS 1, and *Gesta Scotorum*, MS 1.

[129] Bound with pen and ink drawing of Wheel of Fortune on fol. 14^{v} and Edward III's letter to Pope Boniface VIII (*r*. 1294–1303) on his claim to Scotland on fols 225^{r}–226^{v}.

[130] Bound with Jacques de Vitry's *Historia orientalis* abbreviated and continued to 1291 on fols 170^{v}–197^{v} with index on fol. 170^{r}, sermons by Bernard of Clairvaux on fols 229^{v}–240^{v}, sermons attributed to Ambrose on fols 217^{v}–225^{r}, 225^{r}–228^{r}, 228^{r}, 228^{r}–229^{v}, and other texts.

[131] A later exemplar of this version. Bound with Marco Polo's *Travels*.

[132] Bound with historical texts, including a chronicle for Brutus–Danes on fols 14^{r}–20^{v} and an abbreviated chronicle for 1002–*c*. 1275 on fols 171^{r}–176^{r}.

[133] Incorporates Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Vita Merlini* on fols 12^{v}–17^{v}.

[134] An early exemplar of this version. Has Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Vita Merlini* inserted at its appropriate point on fols 200^{v}–204^{v}.

25. London, British Library, MS Royal 13 E I, fols 1^{r}–232^{v} (to 1327, index on fols 242^{r}–249^{r}, continued by John of Tynemouth's *Historia aurea* MS 12, s. XIV *med*. or 1341 x 1386, Lincoln Cathedral)[135]

26. Manchester, Rylands Library, MS Lat. 218, fols 4^{r}–112^{v} (imperf. beg.–1327, continued by John of Tynemouth's *Historia aurea* MS 13, *olim* Phillipps MS 1048, damaged, s. XIV/XV)

27. Oxford, Balliol College, MS 236, fols 1^{r}–295^{v} (to 1327, continued by John of Tynemouth's *Historia aurea* MS 14, same text as MS 21 above, s. XV *med*. or 1444 x 1460, Duke of Buckingham)[136]

28. Oxford, University College, MS 177.1–177.2, 177.1 fols 1*^{r}–208*^{v} and 177.2 fols 233*^{r}–345^{r} (to 1327, continued by John of Tynemouth's *Historia aurea* MS 15, index on 177.1 fols 1^{r}–8^{v}, s. XIV *med*., 1340 or after, Barnwell Priory)

29. Unknown MS (agrees closely with MSS 24 and 25 above)

    29a. London, British Library, MS Add. 43708, fols 1^{r}–86^{v} (abridged for 466–1327, continued by John of Tynemouth's *Historia aurea* MS 16a, *c*. 1565, Laurence Nowell)

    29b. London, British Library, MS Cotton Titus A XIII, fols 43^{r}–93^{v} (for 466–1327, continued by John of Tynemouth's *Historia aurea* MS 16b, and *Eulogium historiarum* MS 7a, main text and Tynemouth continuation copied from MS 29a above, *c*. 1556, William Lambarde)[137]

Peculiar Short Version Manuscripts (All Different):

30. Lincoln, Cathedral Library, MS 109 (A IV 17), fols 1^{r}–143^{v} (abridged and expanded to 1191, s. XV 1)

31. London, British Library, MS Add. 62451, fols 33^{r}–288^{v} (with additions from John of Tynemouth's *Historia aurea* and a Latin 'Brut' to 1326, index on fols 2^{r}–26^{v}, *olim* Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, MS BL 12, s. XIV *med*.)[138]

Short/Intermediate Transitional Version Manuscripts:

32. London, British Library, MS Cotton Nero D VIII, fols 188^{r}–333^{v}, 339^{v}–340^{v} (to 1327 and for 1327–44, index on fols 333^{v}–339^{v}, with *B Continuation* for 1346–76 on fols 340^{v}–344^{v}, s. XIV/XV)[139]

---

[135] With an abridged version of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Vita Merlini* interpolated on fol. 143^{r} and life of St Alban of Mainz on fols 250^{r}–251^{v}. See J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, p. 96.

[136] A later exemplar in this process: J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, p. 177.

[137] Bound with historical texts, including *Prophetic LPB*, MS 1.

[138] Bound with verse genealogy for William I–Edward III with diagramattic representation of offspring on fols 26^{v}–32^{r}, which a note says was made in 1339 but internal evidence suggest 1362 or after.

[139] Bound with historical texts, such as Geoffrey of Monmouth's *De gestis Britonum* on fols 3^{r}–63^{r}, *Historia Brittonum* on fols 63^{r}–71^{r}, Dudo of Saint-Quentin's *Historia Normannorum* on fols 72^{r}–135^{v}, *Gesta Normmanorum ducum* on fols 135^{v}–146^{v}, Robert of Torigni's *Gesta Normmanorum ducum* on fols 146^{v}–159^{v}, *Vita Alexandri regis magni* on fols 160^{r}–169^{r}, *Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem* on fols 169^{r}–174^{v}, Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica* excerpt on fols 174^{v}–175^{r}, Gerald of Wales' *Descriptio Kambrie* on fols 176^{r}–183^{r}, *Disputacio inter clericum et militem* on fols 183^{r}–186^{r}, *De origine gigantium* on fols 186^{r}–187^{r}, and *De longitudine et latitudine Anglie* on fols 187^{r}–187^{v}.

33. London, British Library, MS Harley 3671, fols 25^{r}–214^{r} (to 1344, indices on fols 17^{r}–24^{r} and 17r–24r, with *B Continuation* for 1346–77 on fols 214^{r}–219^{r}, s. XIV/XV, Hospital of St John the Baptist, Exeter)[140]

34. London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 112, fols 1^{r}–127^{r} (to 1327, index on fols 130^{r}–132^{v}, s. XIV 2)

35. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 341 (SC 2445), fols 1^{r}–136^{r} (to 1327, s. XIV *med*., Westminster)[141]

36. Oxford, Magdalen College, MS Lat. 181, fols 1^{r}–112^{v} (to 1327, index on fols 113^{r}–118^{v}, s. XIV/XV, Dunstable)[142]

Intermediate Version (as A and B) Manuscripts:

37. Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, MS 5041C, pp. 1–3 (for 1326–44, with *C Continuation* for 1341–77 on pp. 3–18, and peculiar abridged *Vita Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–80 on pp. 18–20, *olim* Bourdillon MS 41, s. XIV *ex*.)[143]

38. Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, MS 17430B, fols 1^{r}–190^{v}, 193^{v}–200^{v} (rearranged extracts to 1327, s. XV *ex*.)

39. Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, MS Brogyntyn II 24, fols 1^{r}–297^{v} (to 1344, index on fols iii^{r}–xii^{r}, with *C Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 297^{v}–307^{r}, *olim* MS Porkington 40, s. XIV/XV, 1377 or after)

40. Bruxelles, Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, MS 3096, fols 7^{r}–206^{v} (to 1344, index on fols 208^{r}–237^{v}, continued by Walsingham's *Chronicon Angliae* for 1341 on fol. 206^{v}, s. XIV/XV)

41. Cambridge, Christ's College, MS 3, fols 9^{r}–207^{v} (imperf. to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–8^{v}, with *C Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 207^{r}–215^{r}, s. XIV/XV, 1377 or after)[144]

42. Cambridge, Christ's College, MS 13, pp. 1–114 (imperf. bks 1–5, s. XIV 2)

43. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 21, fols 10^{r}–167^{v} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–8^{v}, with *E Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 167^{v}–174^{r}, s. XIV/XV, 1377 or after, Hospital of St John the Evangelist, Cambridge)[145]

44. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 117, fols 7^{v}–155^{r} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–7^{r}, with *C Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 155^{r}–160^{r}, s. XIV/XV)[146]

45. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 164, fols 1^{r}–42^{r} (bks 1–2 imperf. end, s. XIV/XV, Wells Cathedral Chapter)[147]

---

[140] Bound with Latin verse on fol. 220^{v}.
[141] Bound with imperf. Leo of Naples' *Historia de preliis Alexandri Magni* on fols 137^{r}–159^{v}.
[142] MS C in Higden, *Polychronicon*.
[143] Catalogue claims that it is 'apparently a continuation of Ralph Higden's *Polychronicon*'.
[144] Not foliated. My foliation starts at the index on fols 1^{r}–8^{v}.
[145] Bound with *mappa mundi* on fol. 9^{r} and *Cronica bona et compendiosa* on fols 174^{r}–178^{v} (see p. 205 n. 2 above).
[146] Bound with ecclesiastical documents.
[147] Bound with ecclesiastical texts.

46. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 197A, pp. 111–12 (for 1327–44, with short note about authors on p. 112, *Walsingham A Continuation* for 1346–77 with additional unique comments afterwards on pp. 112–26, *Gesta regis Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–81 on pp. 126–30, and *Westminster Chronicle* for 1381–94 on pp. 130–210, s. XV 1/4)[148]

47. Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 58/152, fols 11^{r}–232^{v} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–8^{v}, with *Walsingham A Continuation* for 1346–77 on fols 232^{v}–241^{r}, *Gesta regis Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–81 on fols 241^{v}–244^{r}, and *Vita Ricardi Secundi* for 1381–99 on fols 244^{r}–270^{v}, s. XV 1)[149]

48. Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 82/164, fols 8^{r}–188^{r} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–7^{v}, with *B Continuation* for 1346–76 on fols 188^{r}–192^{v}, s. XIV *ex*. or 1376 x 1400)[150]

49. Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 249/277, fols 10^{r}–124^{r} (to 1344, index on fols 3^{r}–9^{v}, with *B Continuation* for 1346–76 on fols 124^{r}–127^{r}, s. XV 1)[151]

50. Cambridge, Peterhouse, MS 177, fols 37^{r}–192^{r} (to 1344, index on fols 17^{r}–36^{v}, with *A Continuation* MS 3, s. XV 1)[152]

51. Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R IV 1 (634), fols 1^{r}–192^{r} (to 1344, index on fols iii^{r}–ix^{v}, with *B Continuation* for 1346–76 on fols 192^{r}–197^{r}, s. XV *med*.)

52. Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R V 24 (719), fols 1^{r}–268^{v} (to 1344, index on fols i^{r}–x^{v}, with *C Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 268^{v}–278^{r}, s. XV *med*., 1463 or before)

53. Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R V 35 (726), fols 12^{r}–399^{r} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–11^{r}, with *Walsingham A Continuation* for 1346–77 on fols 399^{r}–414^{r}, and *Gesta regis Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–81 on fols 414^{v}–419^{r}, s. XIV/XV)

54. Cambridge, University Library, MS Add. 3077, fols 9^{r}–165^{r} (to 1340, index on fols 1^{r}–7^{v}, s. XIV *med*. or 1367)[153]

55. Cambridge, University Library, MS Dd I 17 (17), part 1 fols 2^{r}–92^{r} (to 1344, with *Walsingham A Continuation* for 1346–77 on fols 92^{r}–96^{v}, continued by *Gesta regis Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–80 on fols 96^{v}–97^{v}, s. XIV/XV, 1380 or after)[154]

56. Cambridge, University Library, MS Ee II 22 (940), fols 5^{r}–100^{v} (to 1324, s. XIV/XV)[155]

---

[148] Bound with miscellaneous documents.

[149] Bound with miscellaneous texts on fol. 9^{r}.

[150] MS B in Higden, *Polychronicon*.

[151] Bound with verses on Henry V's battles on 177^{v} and many miscellaneous texts, such as a family tree through Henry IV on fols 235^{v}–236^{r} and a tabular epitome of the history of the world on fols 236^{v}–243^{r}.

[152] Bound with Gerald of Wales' *Topographia hibernica* on fols 1^{r}–16^{r}, historical text for Edward III to Henry VI on fols 213^{v}–217^{r}, a tract on the Scots' fealty to the English on fols 218^{r}–220^{r}, and a prophecy of Merlin on fols 222^{r}–227^{v}.

[153] Bound with *mappa mundi* on fol. 11^{r}.

[154] Bound in a miscellany with historical texts, such as *Chronicon breve rerum Anglicarum* to 1381 on part 1 fols 159^{r}–160^{v}, Geoffrey of Monmouth's *De gestis Britonum* on part 1 fols 111^{r}–121^{r}, Henry of Huntingdon on part 1 fols 121^{r}–122^{v}, Turpin on part 1 fols 122^{v}–128^{v}, Poloni on part 1 fols 129^{r}–159^{r}, Guido delle Colonne's *Historia destructionis Troiae* on part 1 fols 160^{v}–203^{v}, Jacques de Vitry's *Historia orientalis* on part 1 fols 204^{r}–230^{v}, and Gildas on part 2 fols 83^{r}–93^{v}. The organisation and foliation of the MS has changed radically since the initial catalogue was produced, on which see Montague R. James' unpublished notes held at Cambridge University Library.

[155] Bound with chronicle excerpted from *Flores historiarum* for 1273–*c*. 1307 on fols 101^{r}–103^{v}.

57. Cambridge, University Library, MS Ii II 24 (1757), fols 13^{r}–153^{r} (to 1344, index on fols 5^{r}–11^{v}, with *Walsingham A Continuation* for 1346–77 on fols 153^{r}–159^{r}, and *Gesta regis Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–81 on fols 159^{r}–161^{r}, s. XIV/XV or 1381 x 1408, St Augustine's, Canterbury)[156]

58. Cambridge (Mass.), Harvard University Houghton Library, MS Lat. 116, fols 1^{r}–152^{v} (imperf. beg.–1344, index on fols 161^{r}–170^{v}, with *C Continuation* for 1341–76 on fols 152^{v}–160^{v}, s. XIV *ex.* or XIV 2/XV)

59. Canterbury, Christ Church Cathedral Library, MS Lit. D 16 (58), fols 110^{r}–123^{v} (abridged bk 1 extracts, s. XIV/XV)[157]

60. Chester, Cheshire Archives and Local Studies Centre, MS EDD 3913, fols 1^{r}–164^{r} (to 1344, index on fols i^{r}–vi^{r}, with *D Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 164^{r}–169^{v}, *olim* Chester, Cathedral Library, MS 2, s. XV *med.* or *c.* 1440)[158]

61. Chicago, Newberry Library, MS 33.1, fols 15^{r}–142^{v} (to 1190 due to lost leaves, index on fols 1^{r}–7^{r}, *olim* Phillipps MS 1049, s. XV 1)[159]

62. Detroit, Public Library, MS 2, fols 9^{r}–221^{v} (to 1340, index on fols 1^{r}–8^{v}, with *Detroit Continuation* for 1339 on fol. 221^{v}, s. XIV, 1340 or after)[160]

63. Dublin, Trinity College, MS 486 (E II 1), fols 8^{r}–190^{r} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–7^{v}, with *A Continuation* MS 4, s. XV ¼, 1436 or before, Austin Friars, London)

64. Dublin, Trinity College, MS 487 (E II 6), fols 1^{r}–183^{r} (imperf. beg.–1344, with *B Continuation* and then *St Albans B Continuation* for 1341–76 on fols 183^{r}–195^{v}, s. XV *med.*)[161]

65. Dublin, Trinity College, MS 488 (E II 25), fols 3^{r}–292^{v} (to 1344, with *A Continuation* MS 5, *Wigmore Chronicle* for 1360–76 on fols 294^{r}–298^{r}, peculiar *St Albans B Continuation* for 1376–77 on fols 303^{v}–304^{v}, and *Vita Ricardi Secundi* variant version no. 4 for 1377–1410 on fols 304^{v}–361^{v}, s. XV, fols 1^{r}–2^{v} and 355^{r}–392^{r} s. XVI 1)[162]

66. Dublin, Trinity College, MS 516 (E V 10), fols 14^{v}, 15^{r}, 34^{v}, 39^{v}, 40^{v}, 49^{r}–53^{v}, 56^{r}–75^{v}, 112^{v}, 117^{r}, 117^{v}–118^{r} (extracts, mostly of tales, s. XIV/XV)[163]

---

156 MS A in Higden, *Polychronicon*.

157 Bound with *mappa mundi* and ecclesiastical texts.

158 Improperly and sporadically foliated. My foliation starts at the index on fols i^{r}–vi^{r} and the first fol. of the *Polychronicon* that is presently in the MS as fol. 2^{r}. Several leaves are missing throughout, notably those with the incipits for Books 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6. However, because the fols with the incipits for Books 3 and 7 were previously removed and since restored (fols 47 and 136), I include in my foliation those fols that have been removed and might be restored at some point (including fol. 1). The following fols have been misfoliated: 51 (misfoliated as 50), 74 (as 73), 95 (as 94, also '97' in newer pencil), and 119 (as 118). Bound with *mappa mundi* on inside of front board.

159 Bound with *Cronica bona et compendiosa* on fols 8^{r}–11^{v} (see p. 205 n. 2 above) and letters on fols 11^{v}–14^{r}, including one from Edward I to the pope on fols 11^{v}–13^{v}.

160 Not foliated. My foliation starts at the index on fols 1^{r}–8^{v}.

161 J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, pp. 113, 118.

162 J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, p. 112 n. 2. Bound with historical texts, including abridged chronicle for 1066–1387 on fols 1^{r}–2^{v}, *Gesta Henrici Quinti* on fols 362^{r}–377^{v}, Pseudo-Thomas of Elmham's *Vita Henrici Quinti* abridged on fols 378^{r}–385^{v}, *De actibus tempore regis Henrici Sexti* on fols 386^{r}–392^{r}, as well as a description of Wales on fol. 361^{v}, with considerable marginal notes throughout the MS. See also Marvin L. Colker, 'A Previously Unknown Manuscript of the *Gesta Henrici Quinti*', *Revue d'histoire des textes*, 12–13 (1985), 401–05. The copy of *Vita Ricardi Secundi* in this MS is not mentioned in Stow's edition.

163 Extracts scattered throughout a miscellany of mostly historical and prophetic texts, which includes *Bridlington Prophecies* on fols 3^{r}–14^{r}, prophecies of Merlin from Geoffrey Monmouth's *De gestis Britonnum* on fols 17^{r}–22v,

67. Eton, College Library, MS 213, fols 1^{r}–237^{v} (to 1344, index on fols iii^{r}–ix^{r}, with *C Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 237^{v}–245^{r} and annalistic continuation for 1377–1420 on fols 245^{r}–268^{v}, s. XV 1, 1420 or after, Witham, Charterhouse of the Holy Cross)[164]

68. Exeter, Cathedral Library, MS 3509, fols 9^{r}–181^{r} (to 1340, index on fols 1^{r}–8^{v}, s. XIV 2 or 1340 x 1392, Exeter Cathedral)

69. Glasgow, University of Glasgow Library, MS Hunter 72 (T III 10), fols 11^{r}–279^{r} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–10^{r}, with *E Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 278^{r}–289^{r}, s. XV *med.*)[165]

70. Glasgow, University of Glasgow Library, MS Hunter 223 (U II 14), fols 10^{r}–199^{r} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–9^{v}, s. XIV 2)

71. London, British Library, MS Add. 10104, fols 9^{r}–149^{v} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–7^{r}, with *C Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 149^{v}–154^{v}, and Adam Usk's *Chronicle* for 1377–1404 on fols 154^{v}–176^{v}, 1377 x 1430, Adam Usk)[166]

72. London, British Library, MS Add. 12118, fols 9^{r}–150^{v} (to 1344, index on fols 2^{r}–8^{r}, with *St Albans C Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 150^{v}–157^{r}, s. XIV/XV, 1377 or after)[167]

73. London, British Library, MS Add. 15759, fols 2^{r}–164^{v} (to 1344, s. XIV/XV, Norwich Cathedral)[168]

74. London, British Library, MS Add. 39236, fols 1^{r}–134^{r} (to 1344, index on fols 141^{r}–147^{r}, with *B Continuation* for 1346–76 on fols 134^{v}–137^{v}, s. XV 2)[169]

75. London, British Library, MS Arundel 86, fols 8^{r}–120^{v} (to 1344, index on fols 2^{r}–7^{v}, with *C Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 120^{v}–124^{v}, s. XIV/XV, 1377 or after, John Lutton)

76. London, British Library, MS Cotton Nero D II, fols 204^{r}–206^{v} (for 1307–44, with peculiar *B Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 206^{v}–214^{r}, s. XIV)[170]

77. London, British Library, MS Cotton Otho D I, fols 32^{r}–152^{v} (to 1344, with *A Continuation* MS 6, and *Vita Ricardi Secundi* variant version no. 3 for 1377–1422 on fols 156^{r}–195^{v}, damaged, s. XV 2/4)[171]

78. London, British Library, MS Harley 1707, fols 1^{r}–223^{v} (to 1340, index on fols 224^{r}–231^{r}, s. XIV/XV)

79. London, British Library, MS Harley 1320, fols 1^{r}–201^{v} (to 1202 due to lost leaves, with *B Continuation* for 1376–77 on fols 202^{r}–203^{r}, s. XV 1)

---

miscellaneous prophecies on fols 15^{r}, 16^{r}–16^{v}, 24^{r}–25^{v}, 38^{v}–39^{r}, 40^{r}, 41^{r}–49^{r}, 111^{r}–112^{v}, 114^{r}–115^{v}, 118^{r}, 118^{v}, 189^{v}, macaronic verses in English and Latin on the evils of the age on fols 108^{r}–110^{r}, Giovanni da Legnano's *Tractatus de bello* on fols 76^{r}–107^{v}, geographical wonders on fols 203^{v}–204^{r}, short chronicles on fols 119^{r}–121^{r}, 123^{r}–126^{v}, 127^{r}–128^{v}, 201^{v}–202^{v}, and a longer chronicle for Adam–1462 on fols 132^{r}–188^{r}, and lists of English kings and their reigns on fols 23^{r}, 23^{v}, 30^{v}, 188^{r}.

[164] Bound with genealogy for Egbert–Henry VI on fols ix^{r}–x^{v}. Similar to MS 27 below.

[165] Sporadically foliated, only at the first fol. of each quire. The MS was not foliated until March 2018, when Robert MacLean, Assistant Librarian at the University of Glasgow Library, reassessed its collation as a result of my inquiries.

[166] Bound with *mappa mundi* on fol. 8^{r}.

[167] Bound with *Cronica bona et compendiosa* on fols 158^{r}–161^{r} (see p. 205 n. 2 above).

[168] London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 188, fols 175–179, has been detached from the beginning of this MS.

[169] Bound with genealogy for Louis X–Henry V on fol. 147^{v}.

[170] Bound with historical texts, including *Annales ecclesiae Roffensis* to 1307 on fols 2^{r}–199^{v}, Tynemouth, *Historia*, MS 18, *De mirabilibus Anglie* and other miscellaneous texts on fols 245^{v}–246^{v}, and Jean Froissart's *Chronicles* on fols 306^{r}–313^{r} taken from London, British Library, MS Arundel 67.

[171] Bound with historical and geographical texts.

80. London, British Library, MS Harley 3600, fols 2^{r}–225^{v} (to 1344, with *Walsingham A Continuation* for 1346–77 on fols 226^{r}–230^{r}, and *Vita Ricardi Secundi* variant version no. 1 for 1377–1422 on fols 230^{r}–237^{r}, s. XV 1, 1422 or after, Whalley Abbey)[172]

81. London, British Library, MS Harley 3673, fols 1^{r}–73^{v}, 82^{r}–83^{r}, 85^{r}–104^{v} (bks 1–2 imperf. and misc. extracts, s. XV ¾, before 1466)[173]

82. London, British Library, MS Harley 3877, fols 9^{r}–207^{v} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–8^{r}, with *St Albans B Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 207^{v}–217^{v}, s. XV *med.*)

83. London, British Library, MS Harley 3884, fols 1^{r}–178^{r} (imperf. to 1344, index on fols 237^{r}–244^{v}, with *A Continuation* MS 7, and *Vita Ricardi Secundi* extended version for 1377–1455 on fols 183^{v}–229^{r}, s. XV 2, 1455 or after)[174]

84. London, British Library, MS Harley 4875, fols 10^{v}–190^{v} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–10^{r}, with *A Continuation* MS 8, and *Vita Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–99 on fols 196^{r}–228^{v}, s. XV *med.*)

85. London, British Library, MS Lansdowne 239, fols 121^{r}–124^{v} (for 1307–44, continues Walter of Guisborough's *Chronicle* on fols 1^{r}–120^{v}, with *St Albans B Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 124^{v}–133^{r}, s. XV)[175]

86. London, British Library, MS Royal 13 C I, fols 1^{r}–37^{v} (for 1110–1344, with *C Continuation* for 1341–75 on fols 38^{r}–42^{r}, differs verbally throughout, *c.* 1453–59, halfway through fol. 41^{r} through 42^{r} s. XVI)[176]

87. London, British Library, MS Royal 13 D I, fols 10^{r}–165^{r} (to 1344, index on fols 3^{r}–9^{r}, with *Walsingham A Continuation* for 1346–77 on fols 165^{r}–172^{r}, and *Gesta regis Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–81 on fols 172^{r}–174^{v}, s. XIV/XV, 1385 or after, London, St Peter, Cornhill)[177]

88. London, British Library, MS Royal 13 E IX, fols 160^{r}–169^{v} (bk 1 extracts describing Britain in peculiar order, *c.* 1400)[178]

89. London, British Library, MS Royal 14 C IX, fols 9^{r}–134^{v} (to 1344, index on fols 3^{r}–8^{r}, s. XIV/XV, Ramsey, Benedictine abbey)[179]

90. London, British Library, MS Sloane 289, fols 1^{r}–54^{r} (bk 1 extracts, s. XV)[180]

91. London, British Library, MS Stowe 64, fols 9^{r}–239^{r} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–8^{v}, with *B Continuation* for 1346–76 on fols 239^{r}–243^{v}, s. XV *med.*)[181]

---

[172] See J. Taylor, *Kirkstall Abbey Chronicles*, pp. 35–36; J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, pp. 132–33.

[173] Bound with genealogical, historical, and political texts, including a historical digest that mentions Edward III and famous battles on fols 173^{r}–177^{v} and a chronicle to the reign of Edward III on fols 179^{r}–193^{v}.

[174] Bound with genealogies on fols 229^{v}–236^{r}, including one for Louis–Henry VI on fol. 229^{v}.

[175] Bound with a note on terms for horses not found in certain countries on fol. 150^{r}.

[176] Bound with historical texts, including Pseudo-Thomas of Elmham's *Vita Henrici Quinti* on fols 62^{r}–71^{v}, *De actibus tempore regis Henrici Sexti* on fols 72^{r}–88^{v}, and *Vita Ricardi Secundi* variant version no. 4 on fols 89^{r}–130^{r}.

[177] Bound with historical texts, including short chronicle for founding of Rome–1385 on fols 242^{v}–243^{r} and Higden, *Polychronicon*, MS 166. *Walsingham A Continuation*'s 1376–77 narrative edited as: Ranulf Higden, 'MS Reg. 13 D I, Collated with MS Lambeth 160', in Thomas Walsingham, *Chronicon Angliae, ab anno Domini 1328 usque ad annum 1388*, ed. by Edward Maunde Thompson, RS, 64 (London: Longman, 1874), pp. 391–401.

[178] Bound with historical texts, including Higden, *Polychronicon*, MS 167, *Gesta regum Angli*, MS 1, and Tynemouth, *Historia*, MS 6. For MS contents see Walsingham, *St Albans Chronicle, 1376–1422*, I, xxviii–xxix, 964–68.

[179] Bound with large *mappa mundi* on fols 1^{v}–2^{r} and another smaller one, on fol. 2^{v}.

[180] Bound with historical texts, especially on Christianity, such as *Nomina regum Majoris Britanniae* on fol. 184^{r} and *De heptarchia Saxonum et de rebus gestis in Britannia ab eorum adventu usque ad Edwardum Confessorum* imperf. on fols 184^{r}–195^{v}.

[181] See J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, p. 100.

92. London, College of Arms, MS Arundel 2, fols 9^{r}–269^{r} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–7^{v}, with *D Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 269^{r}–277^{r}, s. XV)

93. London, College of Arms, MS Arundel 4, fols 1^{r}–157^{r} (imperf. beg.–1344, with *C Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 157^{r}–162^{v}, s. XIV/XV)[182]

94. London, Inner Temple, MS Petyt 511.5, fols 10^{r}–257^{r} (imperf. beg.–1344, index on fols 1^{r}–9^{v}, with *C Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 257^{r}–264^{r}, s. XV 2, Francis Babington, rector of Lincoln College, 1559)[183]

95. London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 48, fols 1^{r}–201^{r} (to 1344, index on fols i^{r}–vii^{v}, with *Walsingham A Continuation* for 1346–77 on fols 201^{r}–208^{r}, s. XIV/XV, 1377 or after)

96. London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 160, fols 11^{r}–213^{r} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–9^{v}, with *Walsingham A Continuation* for 1346–77 on fols 213^{r}–221^{v}, *Gesta regis Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–81 on fols 221^{v}–224^{v}, and *Vita Ricardi Secundi* for 1381–99 on fols 224^{v}–255^{v}, s. XV *med.*)[184]

97. London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 181, fols 13^{r}–211^{v} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–9^{r}, with *Walsingham A Continuation* for 1346–77 on fols 211^{v}–220^{v}, and *Gesta regis Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–81 on fols 220^{v}–223^{v}, s. XIV/XV, 1381 or after)

98. London, Lincoln's Inn, MS Hale 139 (Misc. 19), fols 361^{r}–364^{r} (for 1307–44, with *D Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 364^{r}–370^{v}, s. XV *ex.*)[185]

99. London, Royal College of Physicians, MS 398, fols 10^{r}–163^{r} (to 1340, index on fols 2^{r}–8^{v}, s. XIV *med.*, 1340 or after)

100. Manchester, Rylands Library, MS Lat. 170, fols 1^{r}–113^{v} (to 1344, with *B Continuation* for 1346–76 on fols 113^{v}–119^{r}, *olim* Phillipps MS 1048, s. XV 1)

101. Manchester, Rylands Library, MS Lat. 217, fols 14^{r}–209^{r} (to 1327, index on fols 4^{r}–13^{r}, s. XV 1, 1431 or before, St Mary, Dublin)[186]

102. New Haven, Yale University Beinecke Library, MS Osborn fa51, fols 14^{r}–366^{v} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–11^{r}, with *B Continuation* for 1346–76 on fols 366^{v}–374^{v}, earlier sold at Christie's 3 June 2009, lot 12, s. XV *med.*)[187]

103. New York City, Columbia University Library, MS Plimpton 252, fols 13^{r}–229^{r} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–11^{r}, with *Walsingham A Continuation* for 1346–77 on fols 229^{r}–238^{v}, and *Gesta regis Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–81 on fols 238^{v}–242^{r}, s. XIV or XIV/XV)

104. Oxford, Balliol College, MS 235, fols 19^{r}–182^{v} (to 1288, index on fols 12^{r}–18^{v}, s. XIV/XV, 1415 or before?, Thomas Gascoigne, 1448)[188]

---

[182] At the end of the MS, on fols 162^{v}–163^{r}, has historical notes on Richard II's reign in perhaps the same hand as marginalia throughout.

[183] Bound with short chronicle for 843–1377 on fols 264^{v}–267^{r}. Incorrectly listed as '511–15' in J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, p. 155.

[184] Walsingham A Continuation's 1376–77 narrative edited as: Higden, 'MS Reg. 13 D I with MS Lambeth 160'.

[185] Differs from printed editions. Bound with historical texts, mainly Edward II yearbooks.

[186] Bound with Gerald of Wales's *Topographia hibernica* extracts on fols 2^{v}–3^{r}.

[187] Not foliated. My foliation starts at the index on fols 1^{r}–11^{r}. See also Higden, *Polychronicon*, VI, lvii–lviii.

[188] Bound with miscellaneous notes and texts, mainly ecclesiastic, on fols 1^{v}–11^{v}.

105. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 796 (SC 7434), fols 10^{r}–220^{r} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–8^{v}, with *A Continuation* MS 9, and *Vita Ricardi Secundi* extended version for 1377–1450 on fols 227^{v}–302^{r}, s. XV *med*., 1450 or after)

106. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 316 (SC 2752), fols 8^{r}–150^{r} (to 1344, index on fols 2^{r}–7^{v}, continued by Thomas Walsingham's *Chronica maiora* for 1376 on fols 150^{r}–151^{v}, s. XIV or 1394 x 1397 College of Holy Trinity, Pleshey)[189]

107. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 358 (SC 2453), fols 1^{r}–209^{r} (to 1344, with *B Continuation* for 1346–76 on fols 209^{v}–213^{v}, s. XV *med*., 1468 or before)

108. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 359 (SC 2457), fols 9^{r}–96^{v} (bks 1–5, index on fols 1^{r}–7^{v}, s. XIV/XV)

109. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 82 (SC 1683), fols 2^{r}–40^{r} (bk 1 extracts, s. XV)[190]

110. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 196 (SC 1797), fols 111^{r}–146^{v}, 166^{r}–177^{v} (bks 7–1344 and bk 1, with *D Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 146^{v}–153^{r}, catalogue notes several shorter extracts from Higden throughout, s. XV)[191]

111. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 201 (SC 1802), fols 13^{r}–220^{r} (to 1344, with *A Continuation* MS 10, and *Vita Ricardi Secundi* extended version for 1377–1451 on fols 226^{r}–288^{v}, s. XV *med*.)

112. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 138 (SC 21712), fols 9^{r}–280^{v} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–8^{r}, s. XV 2)

113. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 14 (SC 4105), fols 1^{r}–186^{r} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–7^{v}, with *C Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 186^{r}–192^{v}, s. XIV/XV, 1377 or after, Charterhouse of Jesus of Bethlehem, Sheen)

114. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 529 (SC 1510), fols 9*^{r}–122^{v} (with Evesham interpolations to 1344, index on fols 2^{r}–9^{r}, with *Walsingham B Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 122^{v}–150^{r}, and *Vita Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–96 on fols 150^{r}–184^{v}, s. XV 1)

115. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 545 (SC 1378), fols 9^{r}–209^{r} (to 1340, index on fols 1^{r}–7^{v}, with *Laud Continuation* for 1340–73 on fols 209^{r}–209^{v}, s. XV 1, Franciscan convent, London)[192]

116. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Lawn Medieval 21, fols 3^{r}–75^{v} (imperf. beg.–1340, index on fols 76^{r}–80^{r}, *olim* London, Brian Lawn, MS 21, earlier sold at Sotheby's 8 July 1974, lot 61, s. XIV 2)

---

[189] Has a partly defaced miniature of the Trinity and a kneeling monk on fol. 8^{r}. Bound with Thomas Walsingham's *Short Chronicle* for 1328–88 on fols 152^{r}–175^{r}. Originally bound together with London, British Library, MS Harley 3634, fols 137–163, which includes Thomas Walsingham's so-called *Scandalous Chronicle*.

[190] Bound with miscellaneous historical texts, including short chronicle for founding of Rome–1381 on fols 58^{r}–62^{r}.

[191] Bound in a miscellany, notably with prophetic and historical texts, such as a prophecy of Merlin to Henry IV on fols 18^{v}–19^{v}, Gildas' prophecy ending with Edward III on fol. 24^{v}, brief chronicle for Brutus–Richard II on fols 26^{r}–27^{v}, genealogical table for Henry III–Henry VI on fol. 35^{r}, tract on the six ages of the world on fol. 53^{v}, short annals for Incarnation–1377 on fols 75^{r}–77^{v}, chronicle of England for Brutus–Conquest on fols 96^{r}–111^{r}, brief annals on the English for 1378–1436 on fols 153^{v}–154^{r}, brief chronicle for Richard II–Henry V on fols 156^{v}–158^{r}, a few chronological notes on English events for 1315–1382 on fol. 164^{r}, *Cronica bona et compendiosa* on fols 183^{v}–187^{v} (see p. 205 n. 2 above), *mappa mundi* on fol. 195^{v}. Catalogue notes several short extracts from Higden's *Polychronicon* included throughout.

[192] Bound with a paragraph on Charlemagne on fol. 8^{v}.

117. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Lyell 21, fols 1^{r}–199^{v} (to 1344, index on fols 223^{r}–231^{r}, with *Walsingham A Continuation* for 1346–77 on fols 199^{v}–208^{v}, *Gestis regis Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–81 on fols 208^{v}–211^{v}, and *Vita Ricardi Secundi* variant version no. 2 for 1381–1400 on fols 212^{r}–222^{v}, s. XIV 2, 1400 or after, fols 212^{r}–222^{v} s. XV 1, Abingdon)[193]

118. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson B 154 (SC 11524), fols 1^{r}–24^{r} (bk 1 imperf. end, s. XIV)

119. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson B 179 (SC 11546), fols 1^{r}–146^{v} (to 1327, s. XV 1)

120. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Tanner 19 (SC 9839), fols 8^{r}–205^{v} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–7^{v}, with peculiar *D Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 205^{v}–213^{r}, and *Vita Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–87 on fols 213^{r}–237^{v}, s. XIV/XV, 1387 or after)[194]

121. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Tanner 170 (SC 9996), fols 13^{r}–214^{r} (to 1344, index on fols 3^{r}–11^{v}, with *A Continuation* or *B Continuation* [not enough text to determine which] for 1346–47 on fol. 214^{r}, s. XIV *med*., 1347 or after, Gloucester, Austin priory)[195]

122. Oxford, Christ Church, MS 89, fols 9^{r}–178^{r} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–7^{v}, with *St Albans C Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 178^{r}–186^{r}, s. XIV/XV, 1377 or after)

123. Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 89, fols 12c^{r}–144^{r} (to 1344, index on fols 5^{r}–11^{r}, with *Walsingham C Continuation* for 1328–87 on fols 144^{r}–164^{r}, s. XV 1, St Peter's Abbey, Gloucester)[196]

124. Oxford, Lincoln College, MS Lat. 107, fols 9^{r}–182^{r} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–8^{v}, with *Walsingham A Continuation* for 1346–77 on fols 182^{r}–190^{r}, s. XIV/XV, 1377 or after)

125. Oxford, Magdalen College, MS Lat. 29, fols 11^{r}–366^{v} (to 1320, index on fols 1^{r}–10^{v}, s. XV *med*.)

126. Oxford, Magdalen College, MS Lat. 97, fols 9^{r}–200^{v} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–8^{v}, with *D Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 200^{v}–207^{r}, s. XV *med*.)

127. Oxford, Magdalen College, MS Lat. 147, fols 1^{r}–216^{v} (to 1344, indices on fols 235^{r}–301^{v}, with *B Continuation/Walsingham A Continuation* for 1346–77 on fols 216^{v}–224^{r}, and *Gesta regis Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–81 on fols 224^{r}–227^{r}, s. XV *med*. or 1437 x 1449, St Sepulchre's, Newgate, 1449)[197]

128. Oxford, Magdalen College, MS Lat. 190, fols 52^{v}–235^{v} (to 1327 due to lost leaf, but likely originally to 1344, index on fols 45^{r}–52^{r}, with *D Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 236^{r}–242^{v}, s. XV 1)[198]

129. Oxford, Merton College, MS 121, fols 1^{r}–139^{v} (to 1344, with *A Continuation* MS 11, and *Vita Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–1401 on fols 144^{r}–168^{v}, s. XV 1, 1401 or after)[199]

130. Oxford, New College, MS 152, fols 10^{r}–158^{v} (to 1344, index on fols 2^{r}–8^{v}, with *Walsingham A Continuation* for 1346–77 on fols 158^{v}–165^{v}, s. XIV/XV, William North, Bath and Wells)

---

[193] Five and a half lines, possibly on Wyclif, are erased from fol. 212^{r}.
[194] J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, pp. 116–17.
[195] Bound with *mappa mundi* on fol. 15^{v}.
[196] Bound with *mappa mundi* on fol. 12a^{v}.
[197] Bound with historical and geographical texts. J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, p. 123 n. 2.
[198] Bound with *mappa mundi* on fol. iv^{v} and Martinus of Troppau's *Chronicon Pontificum Imperatorumque* on fols 1^{r}–43^{r}.
[199] Bound with Martin of Troppau's *Chronicon Pontificum Imperatorumque* imperf. beg.–1109 on fols 169^{r}–192^{v}.

131. Oxford, Oriel College, MS 16, fols 50^{r}–222^{r} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–8^{r}, with *Walsingham A Continuation* for 1346–77 on fols 222^{r}–230^{v}, s. XV 1)[200]

132. Oxford, Oriel College, MS 74, fols 11^{r}–189^{v} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–10^{v}, with *A Continuation* MS 12, and *Vita Ricardi Secundi* extended version for 1377–1450 on fols 195^{r}–246^{v}, s. XV 2, 1450 or after)[201]

133. Oxford, Queen's College, MS 304, fols 163^{v}–164^{r} (for 1337–44, continues Adam Murimuth's *Continuatio chronicarum* MS 10, with *St Albans B Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 164^{r}–174^{r}, and *Gesta regis Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–81 on fols 174^{r}–177^{r}, s. XV)[202]

134. Oxford, Queen's College, MS 307, fols 10^{r}–129^{r} (to 1344, index on fols 2^{v}–9^{r}, with *Walsingham A Continuation* for 1346–77 on fols 129^{r}–134^{v}, and *Gesta regis Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–81 on fols 134^{v}–136^{r}, s. XIV/XV or 1381 x 1419, St Augustine's, Canterbury)

135. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 4922, fols 11^{r}–183^{v} (to 1344, index on fols 2^{v}–8^{v}, with *St Albans B Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 183^{v}–191^{r}, s. XIV 2 or 1377 x 1393, similar to MS 106 above, Norwich Cathedral)[203]

136. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 4923, fols 1^{r}–128^{v} (to 1344, index on fols i^{r}–viii^{r}, with *St Albans B Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 128^{v}–134^{v}, s. XIV or XIV/XV)

137. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 12502, fols 21^{r}–251^{r} (bks 1–4, index on fols 1^{r}–20^{v}, s. XV)

138. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 15014, fols 1^{r}–237^{v} (bks 1–3 imperf. end, s. XV 2/4, St Victor of Paris)

139. Princeton, University Library, MS Garrett 152, fols 9^{r}–140^{r} (to 1344, index on fols 1^{r}–8^{v}, with *A Continuation* MS 13, s. XIV/XV or XV)

140. Provo, Brigham Young University Library, MS 091 H534, fols 4^{r}–237^{v} (to 1344, indices on fols 238^{r}–247^{v}, *c.* 1375)[204]

141. San Marino, Huntington Library, MS HM 48570, fol. 1^{r} (bk 1 extracts, s. XV ¾)

142. Taunton, Somerset County Heritage Centre, MS DD/SAS C/1193/66, pp. 27–417 (to 1344, index on pp. 11–26, with *C Continuation* for 1341–77 on pp. 417–30, *olim* Somerset County Museum, s. XIV/XV, Richard Godwyn, 15th cent., Keynsham, Austin Abbey)[205]

143. Urbana, University of Illinois Library, MS 132, fols 1^{r}–161^{r} (to 1344, with *Walsingham A Continuation* for 1346–61 on fols 161^{r}–163^{v}, s. XIV *ex*. or XIV/XV)

---

[200] Bound with Geoffrey of Monmouth's *De gestis Britonum* on fols 9^{v}–48^{r}.

[201] Contains many historical texts on fols 247^{r}–256^{v} (s. XV 2, 1455 or after).

[202] Edited as: Higden, 'Continuatio', pp. 171–73 (Higden), 174–227 (*St Albans B Continuation*); Higden, 'Continuatio continuationis: Illustrissimi regis Ricardi II', in Adam Murimuth, *Chronica sui temporis*, ed. by Thomas Hog (London: English Historical Society, 1846), pp. 228–43 (*Gesta regis Ricardi Secundi*). Bound with historical and genealogical texts, including Peter of Ickham's *De gestis Britonum et Anglorum* on fols 1^{r}–45^{r}, genealogies of the kings of England and France by John Moorlinch (s. XV *in*.) to Henry V with Henry VI added by a later hand on fols 49^{r}–57^{v}, genealogy of the kings of England from 'Deus' to Henry VI on fols 179^{r}–182^{v}, and genealogy with discussion on Edward III's claiim to France on fols 186^{v}–187^{r} different from those in MSS 1 and 6, as well as other genealogies on bishops, abbots, and other church figures.

[203] Bound with *mappa mundi* on fol. 2^{r}.

[204] Bound with Edward I's letter to Pope Boniface VIII on his claim to Scotland on fols 1^{r}–3^{v}.

[205] Sporadically paginated. Pagination starts at *Cronica bona et compendiosa* on pp. 1–10 (see p. 205 n. 2 above).

144. València, Biblioteca de la catedral, MS 89, fols 1r–166r (to 1344, index on fols ir–viir, s. XIV 2)

145. Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca apostolica, MS Chig. G VIII 231, fols 1r–148v (to 1340, s. XIV 2)[206]

146. Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca apostolica, MS Reg. lat. 731, fols 19r–251v (to 1344, index on fols 1r–15r, with *C Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 251v–259v, s. XIV *ex.*)[207]

147. Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca apostolica, MS Vat. lat. 1959, fols 1r–149r (to 1344, index on fols ivr–xv, with *E Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 149r–155v, s. XIV or XV/XV)[208]

148. Warminster, Longleat House, MS 50, fols 8v–146v (to 1344, index on fols 1r–7r, with *A Continuation* MS 14, s. XIV 2, 1360 or after)[209]

149. Warminster, Longleat House, MS 51, fols 25r–207r (to 1344, index on fols 3r–23v, with *C Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 207r–214r, s. XV *med.*)[210]

150. Winchester, College Library, MS 15, fols 14r–213r (to 1344, index on fols 7r–12v, with *C Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 213r–220r, s. XIV/XV or 1377 x 1404, William of Wykeham)[211]

151. Winchester, College Library, MS 27, fols 10r–229v (to 1265, index on fols 1r–9r, s. XV 2)

Peculiar Intermediate Version Manuscripts (All Different):

152. London, British Library, MS Add. 14251, fols 177v–192v (abridged and expanded for kings of Wessex–1344, with peculiar *B Continuation* for 1346–66 on fols 192v–195r, and brief entries for 1377–1422 on fols 195r–196r, s. XV)[212]

153. London, British Library, MS Cotton Cleopatra D IV, fols 16r–153r (with interpolations for bk 7–1344, table of contents on fols 4r–14v, with *Walsingham B Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 153r–182r, and *Vita Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–96 on fols 182r–221v, s. XIV/XV, 1396 or after)

154. London, British Library, MS Cotton Domitian A XII, fols 57r–120r (abridged, peculiar rearrangement to resemble a Brut chronicle, for imperf. beg.–1341, with *Walsingham A Continuation* for 1346–77 on fols 120r–128v, and *Vita Ricardi Secundi* variant version no. 1 for 1377–1422 on fols 128v–140v, s. XV 2)[213]

---

[206] Bound with incomplete *mappa mundi* on fol. 171r.

[207] Bound with *mappa mundi* on fol. iv.

[208] Bound with *Cronica bona et compendiosa* on fols 155v–160r (see p. 205 n. 2 above), chronicle on the papacy excerpted from Higden on fols 161r–167r, and *Historia de Bruto* on fols 167r–207v (see p. 205 n. 4 above).

[209] Sporadically foliated, only at the first fol. of each quire. Foliation starts at the index on fols 1r–7r. Bound with *mappa mundi* on fol. 7v.

[210] Sporadically foliated, only at the first fol. of each quire. Foliation starts at a list of English kings on fols 1v–2v. Bound with another list of English kings on fol. 23v, list of popes on fols 24r–24v, and summary chronicle for 1348–1425 on fols 226r–228v.

[211] Bound with *Cronica bona et compendiosa* on fols 1r–5r (see p. 205 n. 2 above) and *mappa mundi* on fol. 13r.

[212] Bound with historical texts, including a chronicle for Brutus–Danes on fols 14r–20v and an abbreviated chronicle on fols 171r–176r.

[213] Bound with *Woburn*, MS 1.

155. London, British Library, MS Royal 14 C XII, fols 10^{r}–130^{v} (to 1344, index on fols 2^{r}–8^{v}, with *C Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 131^{r}–136^{v}, s. XIV/XV, 1377 or after, Hospital of St Thomas of Acon, Cheapside)[214]

Long Version (as E) Manuscripts:

156. Bryn Mawr, College Library, MS Gordan 64, fols 1^{r}–175^{v} (to 1352, index on fols 176^{r}–182^{r}, *olim* New York, P. G. and J. D. Gordan Jr, MS 64, s. XIV *ex*. or XIV/XV)

157. Cambridge, Trinity College, MS O V 12 (1293), fols 1^{r}–149^{r} (to 1352, index on fols i^{r}–xxxi^{r}, s. XV *med*., 1488 or before, Roger Walle, prebendary of Lichfield, *c*. 1450–60)

158. Cambridge, University Library, MS Ii III 1 (1765), fols 11^{r}–275^{r} (to 1348, index on fols 3^{r}–10^{v}, s. XIV 2, 1348 or after, Christ Church, Canterbury)[215]

159. Columbia, University of South Carolina Library, MS 61, fols 9^{r}–335^{v} (to 1352, index on fols 1^{r}–6^{r}, s. XV *med*. or *c*. 1440 x *c*. 1450)

160. London, British Library, MS Egerton 871, fols 2^{r}–317^{r} (to 1352, index on fols 318^{r}–320^{v}, s. XIV 2, 1352 or after, John Macclesfield, 1416–17)

161. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 619 (SC 759), fols 9^{v}–154^{r} (to 1352, index on fols 1^{r}–9^{r}, s. XIV/XV, Fountains)

162. San Marino, Huntington Library, MS HM 132, fols 1^{r}–281^{v} (autograph MS and earliest version to 1352, in two sections, to 1340 on fols 1^{r}–281^{r} and authorial additions for 1340–48 on fols 281^{r}–281^{v} and final entry for 1352 on fol. 281^{v}, index on fols 284^{r}–293^{v}, *olim* MS Phillips 20712, s. XIV *med*., St Werburgh's)[216]

Continuation without *Polychronicon* Main Text Manuscripts:

163. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 6, fols 294^{r}–299^{r} (imperf. beg. due to lost leaves, *St Albans A Continuation* for 1344–77, appears to continue Tynemouth's *Historia aurea* MS 1.2, s. XV, St Albans)

164. Dublin, Trinity College, MS 511 (E V 8), fols 1^{r}–14^{v} (*St Albans A Continuation* for 1341–77 with unique additions, continued by Thomas Walsingham's *Chronica maiora* abridged for 1377–1417 on fols 14^{v}–87^{r}, s. XV *med*.)[217]

165. London, British Library, MS Cotton Otho C II, fols 102^{v}–107^{v} (*St Albans B Continuation* for 1347–76, continues Adam Murimuth's *Continuatio chronicarum* MS 5, heavily damaged, s. XIV 2)[218]

166. London, British Library, MS Royal 13 D I, fols 249^{r}–254^{v} (*D Continuation* for 1341–77, s. XIV/XV, 1385 or after, London, St Peter, Cornhill)[219]

---

[214] Bound with *mappa mundi* on fol. 9^{v}. See J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, p. 99.

[215] MS E (base text) in Higden, *Polychronicon*.

[216] Bound with *mappa mundi* on fol. 4^{v}. See Galbraith, 'Autograph MS'; J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, pp. 92–96. James Freeman is currently preparing an edition of this MS.

[217] Bound with Thomas Walsingham's *Chronica maiora* for 1373–85 on fols 97^{r}–231^{v} in different hand.

[218] Bound with Thomas Walsingham's *Chronica maiora* for 1377–79 on fols 116^{r}–37^{v}.

[219] Bound with historical texts, including short chronicle for founding of Rome–1385 on fols 242^{v}–243^{r} and Higden, *Polychronicon*, MS 166.

167. London, British Library, MS Royal 13 E IX, fols 150^{r}–155^{r} (*St Albans B Continuation* for 1347–77, continued by *Gesta regis Ricardi Secundi* peculiar expanded version for 1377–93 on fols 155^{v}–159^{r}, *c.* 1400)[220]

168. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson B 152 (SC 11522), fols 38^{r}–50^{v} (*St Albans A Continuation* for 1341–77, within Walsingham's *Chronica maiora* abridged for 1307–1417, in 4 vols, s. XV)

Heavily Abridged and Expanded Manuscripts (All Different):

169. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 367, fols 1^{r}–29^{v} (to 1429, s. XV)

170. Durham, University Library, MS Cosin 5 III 19, fols 1^{r}–19^{r} (to 1406, s. XV *in.*)

171. London, British Library, MS Add. 10099, fols 213^{r}–226^{v} (imperf. beg.–1361, s. XV)[221]

172. London, British Library, MS Cotton Otho C XVI, fols 1^{r}–26^{r} (to 1430, heavily damaged, s. XV)[222]

173. London, British Library, MS Harley 139, fols 28^{r}–28^{v}, 31^{r} (for 1066–1290, s. XVI 2)[223]

Fragments (Possibly from MSS Listed Above?):

174. Cambridge, University Library, MS Add. 3392, fols 155^{r}–158^{v} (two leaves folded double for bks 3 and 4, s. XIV/XV)

175. London, British Library, MS Burney 277, fols 56^{r}–56^{v}, 57^{v}–57^{r} (two leaves for bk 3, fol. 57 is bound backwards, s. XV)

176. Maidstone, Kent Archives, Item U49/Z15 (for bks 2 end and 3 beg., in wrapper for s. XVII book, s. XIV)

177. New Haven, Yale University Beinecke Library, MSS 712.127–712.128 (two loose bifolia previously used in bookbinding, damaged, s. XIV 2)

178. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 218 (SC 1819), fols 108^{r}–108^{v} (for bk 6, s. XIV)[224]

179. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 218 (SC 1819), fol. 109^{r} (for 1352, s. XIV)[225]

Significant Portions Used Mostly Unaltered in Other Texts:

180. Cambridge, King's College, MS 43 (extracts used in genealogical roll on Noah–Henry VI, s. XV 1)

---

[220] Bound with historical texts, including Higden, *Polychronicon*, MS 88, *Gesta regum Angli*, MS 1, and Tynemouth, *Historia*, MS 6. For MS contents see Walsingham, *St Albans Chronicle, 1376–1422*, I, xxviii–xxix, 964–68.

[221] Bound with historical texts and documents, as well as *Middle English Prose Brut* on fols 11^{r}–203^{v} (CV–1461). See Matheson, *Prose 'Brut'*, pp. 159–61.

[222] Bound with miscellaneous texts (s. XVI).

[223] Bound with historical and local material through s. XVI.

[224] Bound in a miscellany, which has sermons on fols 94^{v}–97^{v} and notes on a few events in England in 1371, 1399, 1403, and 1405 on fol. 197^{v}. From a different MS than the fragment in Higden, *Polychronicon*, MS 179.

[225] Bound in a miscellany, which has sermons on fols 94^{v}–97^{v} and notes on a few events in England in 1371, 1399, 1403, and 1405 on fol. 197^{v}. From a different MS than the fragment in Higden, *Polychronicon*, MS 178.

181. Chicago, University of Chicago Library, MS 224, fols 25^{r}–40^{r} (for 786–1377 and 1403, abridged and expanded version on the kings of England, Richard II and Henry V are blank except for kings' names, used in the *Fundatorum historia* on the Mortimer Family, s. XV *in*.)[226]

182. London, Gray's Inn, MS 9, fols 129^{r}–136^{r}, 138^{r}–142^{v} (bk 1 extracts and 1320–77 used in the *Dieulacres Chronicle* to 1403, s. XV)[227]

183. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley Rolls 10 (SC 2967) (bk 1 extracts used in genealogical roll, *c*. 1430–40)

184. San Marino, Huntington Library, MS HM 19960 (within geographical and historical compilation on fols 1^{v}–175^{r}, *olim* Phillipps MS 11301, s. XV *med*.)

Misidentified as Higden's *Polychronicon* Manuscripts by Scholars:

x1. London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius D XII, fols 1^{r}–28^{r} (actually expanded version of *Cronica bona et compendiosa* on Noah–1410, s. XV 1)[228]

x2. London, British Library, MS Harley 3776, fols 92^{r}–92^{v} (extracts on the hermit Fursa that are closer to Bede, Higden's source, than the *Polychronicon*, *c*. 1345–60s)[229]

x3. London, British Library, MS Royal 13 A XVII, fols 9^{r}–68^{v} (actually *Historia de Bruto*, s. XV *in*.)[230]

x4. London, British Library, MS Sloane 1776 (actually *Vita Ricardi Secundi* variant version no. 4, continued by *Gesta Henrici Quinti*, Pseudo-Thomas of Elmham's *Vita Henrici Quinti*, and *De actibus tempore regis Henrici Sexti*, s. XV)[231]

x5. New Haven, Yale University Beinecke Library, MS Takamiya 114, pp. 37–194 (actually *Historia de Bruto*, *olim* Tokyo, Keio University Library, MS Takamiya 114, s. XV 1)[232]

Edition:

Ranulf Higden, *Polychronicon*, ed. by Churchill Babington and Joseph Rawson Lumby, RS, 41, 9 vols (London: Longman, 1865–86)

---

[226] Bound with genealogical and historical material, including the *Wigmore Abbey Chronicle* on fols 1^{v}–5^{r} and a Latin 'Brut' different from any other known types on fols 7^{r}–24^{v}. See also Chris Given-Wilson, 'Chronicles of the Mortimer Family, *c*. 1250–1450', in *Family and Dynasty in Late Medieval England: Proceedings of the 1997 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. by Richard Eales and Shaun Tyas (Donington: Tyas, 2003), pp. 67–86 (here 69–77).

[227] See Maude V. Clarke and Vivian H. Galbraith, 'The Deposition of Richard II', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 14 (1930), 125–81.

[228] As claimed by Edwards and Freeman, 'Further Manuscripts', p. 524. See p. 205 n. 2 above.

[229] As claimed by the British Library catalogue.

[230] As claimed by Edwards and Freeman, 'Further Manuscripts', p. 524. See p. 205 n. 4 above.

[231] As claimed by Edwards and Freeman, 'Further Manuscripts', p. 523. For MS contents see *Gesta Henrici Quinti*, p. xvii.

[232] As claimed by Edwards and Freeman, 'Further Manuscripts', p. 524 (as 'Takamiya MS s.n.'). See p. 205 n. 4 above.

Ranulf Higden, *Polychronicon A Continuation*

The text is written in Latin prose and covers 1340–77. It was written 1340–77, possibly in stages. The 1340–52 narrative is written by Ranulf Higden and is also silently included as part of the Long Version of the *Polychronicon* (ends at 1352). The text also continues other versions of the *Polychronicon*. There are probably more extant copies of the text, as examinations of *Polychronicon* manuscripts, especially their continuations, are incomplete.

Continuing Short Version and Adam Murimuth's *Continuatio chronicarum* Manuscripts:

1. London, British Library, MS Harley 1729 fols 138^{r}–145^{r} (for 1353–77, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 10, and Murimuth's *Continuatio chronicarum* MS 16, continued by *Vita Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–97 on fols 145^{r}–180^{v}, s. XV *med*., Nicholas Shaxton, bishop of Salisbury, 1535–56)
2. London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 104, fols 161^{r}–166^{v} (for 1353–77, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 15, and Murimuth's *Continuatio chronicarum* MS 17, continued by *Vita Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–97 on fols 166^{v}–208^{r}, s. XIV *med*. or 1339 x 1369, after fol. 156^{r} s. XV, Exeter Cathedral)[233]

Continuing Intermediate Version manuscripts:

3. Cambridge, Peterhouse, MS 177, fols 192^{r}–192^{v} (for 1346–59, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 50, s. XV 1)[234]
4. Dublin, Trinity College, MS 486 (E II 1), fols 190^{r}–190^{v} (for 1341–58, ends early due to lost leaves, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 63, s. XV ¼, 1436 or before, Austin Friars, London)
5. Dublin, Trinity College, MS 488 (E II 25), fols 292^{v}–294^{r} and 298^{v}–303^{v} (for 1346–76, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 65, interrupted by *Wigmore Chronicle* for 1360–76 on fols 294^{r}–298^{r}, continued by peculiar *St Albans B Continuation* for 1376–77 on fols 303^{v}–304^{v}, and *Vita Ricardi Secundi* variant version no. 4 for 1377–1410 on fols 304^{v}–361^{v}, s. XV, fols 1^{r}–2^{v} and 355^{r}–392^{r} s. XVI 1)[235]
6. London, British Library, MS Cotton Otho D I, fols 152^{v}–156^{r} (for 1341–77, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 77, continued by *Vita Ricardi Secundi* variant version no. 3 for 1377–1422 on fols 156^{r}–195^{v}, damaged, s. XV 2/4)[236]

---

[233] Bound with pen and ink drawing of Wheel of Fortune on fol. 14^{v} and Edward III's letter to Pope Boniface VIII on his claim to Scotland on fols 225^{r}–226^{v}.

[234] Bound with Gerald of Wales' *Topographia hibernica* on fols 1^{r}–16^{r}, historical text for Edward III–Henry VI on fols 213^{v}–217^{r}, a tract on the Scots' fealty to the English on fols 218^{r}–220^{r}, and a prophecy of Merlin on fols 222^{r}–227^{v}.

[235] J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, p. 112 n. 2. Bound with historical texts, including abridged chronicle for 1066–1387 on fols 1^{r}–2^{v}, *Gesta Henrici Quinti* on fols 362^{r}–377^{v}, Pseudo-Thomas of Elmham's *Vita Henrici Quinti* abridged on fols 378^{r}–385^{v}, *De actibus tempore regis Henrici Sexti* on fols 386^{r}–392^{r}, as well as a description of Wales on fol. 361^{v}, with considerable marginal notes throughout the MS. See also Colker, 'Previously Unknown Manuscript'. The copy of *Vita Ricardi Secundi* in this MS is not mentioned in Stow's edition.

[236] Bound with historical and geographical texts.

7. London, British Library, MS Harley 3884, fols 178^{r}–183^{v} (for 1341–77, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 83, continued by *Vita Ricardi Secundi* extended version for 1377–1455 on fols 183^{v}–229^{r}, s. XV 2, 1455 or after)[237]
8. London, British Library, MS Harley 4875, fols 190^{v}–196^{r} (for 1341–77, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 84, continued by *Vita Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–99 on fols 196^{r}–228^{v}, s. XV *med*.)
9. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 796 (SC 7434), fols 220^{r}–227^{v} (for 1341–77, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 105, continued by *Vita Ricardi Secundi* extended version for 1377–1450 on fols 227^{v}–302^{r}, s. XV *med*., 1450 or after)
10. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 201 (SC 1802), fols 220^{r}–226^{r} (for 1341–77, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 111, continued by *Vita Ricardi Secundi* extended version for 1377–1451 on fols 226^{r}–288^{v}, s. XV *med*.)
11. Oxford, Merton College, MS 121, fols 139^{v}–144^{r} (for 1346–77, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 129, continued by *Vita Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–1401 on fols 144^{r}–168^{v}, s. XV 1, 1401 or after)[238]
12. Oxford, Oriel College, MS 74, fols 189^{v}–195^{r} (for 1341–77, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 132, continued by *Vita Ricardi Secundi* extended version for 1377–1450 on fols 195^{r}–246^{v}, s. XV 2, 1450 or after)[239]
13. Princeton, University Library, MS Garrett 152, fols 140^{v}–141^{r} (for 1346–59, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 139, s. XIV/XV or XV)
14. Warminster, Longleat House, MS 50, fols 146^{v}–147^{r} (for 1346–60, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 148, s. XIV 2, 1360 or after)[240]

Editions:

Ranulf Higden, *Polychronicon*, ed. by Churchill Babington and Joseph Rawson Lumby, RS, 41, 9 vols (London: Longman, 1865–86), VIII, 334–46 [1344–48 narrative essentially the same as that in the Long Version, the basis of this edition]

Ranulf Higden, 'Historia Eduardi Tertii, e codice veteri MS describendam curavit cl. Tannerus, cap. 56–62', in *Historia de rebus gestis Eduardi I, Eduardi II, et Eduardi III*, ed. by Thomas Hearne (Oxford: Sheldonian Theatre, 1731), pp. 421–52 [1353–77 narrative from MS 1]

A final paragraph of the Long Version, on the death of Clement VI in 1352, is omitted from the edition because the manuscript used, MS 158, ends imperfectly at 1348.[241] The missing paragraph, from Higden, *Polychronicon*, MS 160, fol. 317^{r}, which is closest to the autograph MS, is as follows:

---

[237] Bound with genealogies on fols 229^{v}–236^{r}, including one for Louis–Henry VI on fol. 229^{v}.
[238] Bound with Martin of Troppau's *Chronicon Pontificum Imperatorumque* imperf. beg.–1109 on fols 169^{r}–192^{v}.
[239] Bound with historical texts on fols 247^{r}–256^{v} (s. XV 2, 1455 or after).
[240] Sporadically foliated, only at the first fol. of each quire. Foliation starts at Higden's *Polychronicon* index on fols 1^{r}–7^{r}.
[241] Galbraith claims the omission in the MS used in the RS edition is due to it having been copied from the autograph MS before the final paragraph was added by Higden: Galbraith, 'Autograph MS', p. 16 n. 24.

> Die s[an]c[t]i Nicolai obiit p[a]p[a] Clemens VI. Et cito post el[e]c[t]us est in p[a]p[am] Steph[an]us Hostien[si]s ep[iscop]us sum[mus] p[a]p[ae] p[e]ni[tenti]arius, [et] vocatus est Innocenci[us] sextus. Quo eciam anno incepit magna caristia re[rum] plu[m]bi ferri stagni eris clauo[rum] ligno[rum] canabi lini [et] spe[cie]rum.

This paragraph is altered in the *A Continuation*, and, with only a handful of very minor and inconsequential changes, is the same as that of the *B Continuation* in the edition.[242] Hearne's edition omits it because the exemplar manuscript, MS 1, starts at 1353.

Ranulf Higden, *Polychronicon St Albans A Continuation*

The text is written in Latin prose and covers 1341–77.[243] It was written *c.* 1343–77, possibly in stages. Internal evidence shows that it was originally meant as a continuation of Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon* (a cross reference to the *Polychronicon* as 'above'), although no extant copies are also bound with Higden's text.[244] Some parts of the text show similarities with A Continuation, but overall it provides much greater detail. It makes use of the abbreviated version of John of Tynemouth's *Historia aurea* to 1347. It shares some passages with John of Reading's *Chronicle* as well. Other texts in turn drew elements from this text, such as the C Continuation of Higden's *Polychronicon* and Thomas Walsingham. It has been suggested, without any conclusive evidence, that Walsingham might have written this been text.[245]

Manuscripts:

1. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 6, fols 294^{r}–299^{r} (imperf. beg. due to lost leaves, for 1344–77, appears to continue Tynemouth's *Historia aurea* MS 1.2, s. XV, St Albans)
2. Dublin, Trinity College, MS 511 (E V 8), fols 1^{r}–14^{v} (for 1341–77 with unique additions, continued by Thomas Walsingham's *Chronica maiora* abridged for 1377–1417 on fols 14^{v}–87^{r}, s. XV *med.*)[246]
3. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson B 152 (SC 11522), fols 38^{r}–50^{v} (for 1341–77, within Walsingham's *Chronica maiora* abridged for 1307–1417, in 4 vols, s. XV)

No edition.

---

[242] Higden, 'Continuation B', p. 407, from 'Die Sancti Nicholai' to 'steriliora esse coeperunt'.
[243] Galbraith, '*Historia aurea*', pp. 390–95; J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, pp. 115, 120–21.
[244] Other continuations of Higden's *Polychronicon* became attached to other texts, such as the *St Albans B Continuation*: J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, p. 118.
[245] Walsingham, *St Albans Chronicle, 1376–1422*, I, xxxviii.
[246] Bound with Thomas Walsingham's *Chronica maiora* for 1373–85 on fols 97^{r}–231^{v} in different hand.

Kirkstall Abbey Long Chronicle

The text is written in Latin prose and covers Vortigern–1360, but also mentions 1370. It was written *c*. 1370–76.[247] It is concerned with many subjects but in its later years discusses Edward III's wars in detail. The 1327–60 narrative on fols 77^{v}–88^{r} draws heavily on the *Bridlington Prophecy* (at fols 77^{r}–78^{r}, 80^{v}–84^{r}, 86^{r}–87^{r}) and John of Tynemouth's *Historia aurea* (at fols 78^{v}–79^{r}, 81^{r}–81^{v}) for various episodes and commentary.[248]

Manuscript:

1. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 722 (SC 1174), fols 38^{v}–88^{r} (s. XV)

No edition.

Lanercost Chronicle

The text is written in Latin prose and covers 1202–1347. It does not end at 1346 as scholarship suggests. It was written probably in the mid-fourteenth century. The text is concerned with the effects of war on society, especially on the Anglo-Scottish border. It continues Roger of Howden's *Chronicle* with some alterations and additions. The 1334–47 narrative is based on the *Minorite Chronicle*, but with many additional colourful passages that are often critical of Scottish attacks on England. The text varies greatly in style and content, which suggests that several later writers were involved in editing the text during or shortly after 1347, or over time in sections.[249] Internal evidence suggests they were either Augustinian Canons of Lanercost Priory, who moved around northern England, especially Berwick, or Minorite Friars of Carlisle.[250] Despite current acceptance of Little's overly-simplistic claim that there were just two writers (Richard of Durham for 1201–97 and Thomas Otterbourne for 1298–1346), each section is internally inconsistent and not completely distinct from the other, which prevents any simple delineation.[251]

---

[247] J. Taylor, *Kirkstall Abbey Chronicles*, p. 24.

[248] For content and sources, see J. Taylor, *Kirkstall Abbey Chronicles*, pp. 46–51.

[249] Wilson, 'Authorship'.

[250] Stevenson argues that unemphasised events concerning Lanercost Prioriy and more numerous mentions of Carlisle suggest the writer was a Minorite of Carlisle, but Wilson points out that Stevenson misreads passages, ignores the highly critical description of David II's 1346 attack on the Lanercost priory, and misses the text's language suggesting a perspective from the priory: *Lanercost*, pp. v–x; Wilson, 'Authorship', pp. xx–xxxi.

[251] Little bases his argument on different vocabulary, allusions, stories, inserted documents, and attention to military detail, briefly in one paragraph, but notes that his conclusions are not absolute, while Gransden and Kehnel discuss Durham's and Otterbourne's chronicles as distinct texts: Andrew G. Little, 'The Authorship of the *Lanercost*

Manuscript:

1. London, British Library, MS Cotton Claudius D VII, fols 25^{r}–245^{v} (s. XIV *med.*/XV *med.*)[252]

Edition:

Chronicon de Lanercost, .mcci.–.mcccxlvi., e codice cottoniano, ed. by Joseph Stevenson (Edinburgh: Maitland Club, 1839)

London French Chronicles

The text is written in Anglo-Norman prose and covers 1259–1343. It was probably written *c.* 1344. It is mostly concerned with events in and around London, but describes some military events in great detail, especially during the reign of Edward III.

Manuscript:

1. London, British Library, MS Cotton Cleopatra A VI, fols 54^{r}–106^{v} (s. XIV *med.*)

Edition:

Croniques de London, depuis l'an 44 Hen. III jusqu'à l'an 17 Edw. III, ed. by James Aungier, Camden Old Series, 28 (London: Nichols, 1844)

There is a recent and by all accounts superior edition of the text in 'A Study of the French Chronicle of London, with Special Reference to Syntax', ed. by David C. Cox (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of London, 1971). The University of London refused the University of Leeds' interlibrary loan request (sent 4 February 2016) and failed to respond to correspondence (sent 21 February 2018) requesting an appointment to examine the thesis in person in London. Therefore, Aungier's edition, despite its flaws, has been used throughout this thesis.

London St Paul's Annals

The text is written in Latin prose and covers 1307–41.[253] It was probably written shortly after 1341, as it makes no mention of Edward III's later victories in 1346–47. It continues the *Flores historiarum*, in a Westminster manuscript because of its focus and added details. The dozen or

---

Chronicle', *English Historical Review*, 31–32 (1916–17), 269–79, 48–49 (here 272–73, 279); Gransden, *Historical Writing*, I, 494–501; Annette Kehnel, 'The Narrative Tradition of the Medieval Franciscan Friars on the British Isles: Introduction to the Sources', *Franciscan Studies*, 63 (2005), 461–530 (here 508–09).

[252] Bound with an unidentified theological text on fols 3^{r}–4^{v}, a historical miscellany on fols 5^{r}–23^{v}, the couplet 'Wille Gris, Wylle Gris' on fol. 184^{v}, and a genealogy with discussion on Edward III's claim to France on fols 240^{v}–241^{r}.

[253] Henry G. Richardson, 'The *Annales paulini*', *Speculum*, 23 (1948), 630–40.

so lines for 1340 are all scratched out, but multispectral imagery suggests that these were concerned only with civic matters. The text is primarily concerned with the history of London and ecclesiastical matters. The third section of the text, for 1321–31, has some Guildhall documents interpolated and the fourth section, for 1332–41, is largely based on an early recension of Adam Murimuth's *Continuatio chronicarum* that went to 1337.[254] This final section makes many changes to its source. The manuscript appears to be close to the authorial version.

Manuscript:

1. London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 1106, fols 93^{r}–110^{v} (s. XIV 1)[255]

Edition:

'Annales paulini', in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, ed. by William Stubbs, RS, 76, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1882–83), I, 255–370

Minorite Chronicle

Also known as the *Northern Franciscan Chronicle*, the text was likely written in Latin prose and probably covered the first half of the fourteenth century, probably ending at 1347.[256] Studies have shown that at least four texts derived portions of their narrative from the *Minorite Chronicle*: the *Anonimalle Chronicle* (1334–46 narrative shared), *Durham Latin Prose 'Brut'* (1338–47 narrative shared), *Lanercost Chronicle* (1334–47 narrative shared), and a full manuscript of John Washington's *De primordio et progressu sedis episcopalis* (1346 narrative, at least, shared, text written *c*. 1405–15). [257] It was concerned with northern events, especially details of the wars with Scotland.

No witnesses survive.

[254] However, Stubbs believes the text to be the basis of Adam Murimuth's shared narrative: *London St Paul's*, pp. lxx–lxxv.

[255] Bound with historical texts.

[256] *Anonimalle*, pp. xxiv–xxxiv; Offler, 'Note on the Northern Franciscan Chronicle'.

[257] The only full copy of Washington's chronicle is: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 748 (SC 1339), fols 6^{r}–67^{r} (to 1356, s. XV). See also Sharpe, *Handlist of Latin Writers*, pp. 342–43.

Adam Murimuth, *Continuatio chronicarum*

The text is written in Latin prose and covers 1303–47. It was written *c.* 1325–47. Some manuscripts include a continuation to 1380 that was originally for Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon*. It is concerned with the Anglo-French, and to a lesser extent, the Anglo-Scottish conflicts. It has a complicated textual history with several versions and continuations that has not been convincingly resolved, especially considering the edition did not make use of MSS 2, 11–15, 17–18, or the sections of the text used by other chroniclers in the fourteenth century, such as Geoffrey le Baker. It makes heavy use of documents in Anglo-Norman, French, and Latin. The manuscripts are often bound with other historical texts. An earlier version of Murimuth's text, to 1337 or 1341, was borrowed in large sections with a few additions by the *London St Paul's Annals* for 1332–35, and also perhaps for a small paragraph from 1339, and another was used by Geoffrey le Baker. The edition is based on MS 6, with variants from the other MSS included. However, the often different phrasing of the other manuscripts is typically ignored. MS 5, heavily damaged in the 1731 Cotton Library fire, is only used occasionally.

Primary Manuscripts:

1. London, British Library, MS Additional 32167, fols 2^{r}–48^{v} (for 1333–46, s. XIV 2)[258]
2. London, British Library, MS Additional 54184, fols 131^{r}–144^{r} (for 1307–34, 1307–08 is different and fuller than the edition's, continues Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum* imperf. on fols 1^{r}–48^{v}, and Nicholas Trevet's *Annales sex regum Anglie* for 1135–1307 on fols 49^{r}–130^{v}, s. XIV/XV)[259]
3. London, British Library, MS Cotton Claudius E VIII, fols 242^{r}–255^{v} (for 1303–41, continues *Flores historiarum* for 1–1307 on fols 27^{v}–240^{r} with index on fols 18^{r}–26^{v}, document appendix on 255^{v}–262^{v}, *c.* 1400)[260]
4. London, British Library, MS Cotton Nero D X, fols 113^{r}–137^{v} (peculiar version for 1323–1346, continues an amalgamation of Nicholas Trevet's *Annales sex regum Anglie* and the *Flores historiarum* for 1286–1323 on fols 105^{r}–113^{r}, s. XIV *med.*)
5. London, British Library, MS Cotton Otho C II, fols 90^{r}–102^{v} (for 1330–47, similar to MS 4, continues an amalgamation of Nicholas Trevet's *Annales sex regum Anglie* and the *Flores historiarum* for imperf. beg.–1303 on fols 1^{r}–89^{v}, continued by Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 165, heavily damaged, document appendix for 1339–40 on fols 108^{r}–114^{v}, s. XIV 2)[261]

[258] Genealogy with discussion on Edward III's claim to France interpolated on fols 10^{v}–11^{v}.
[259] Bound with a table for 1335–1477 (s. XIV *ex.*) on fols 144^{v}–146^{v} and miscellaneous notes on fols 146^{v}–147^{v}.
[260] Bound with prophecies on fols 5^{v} and 27^{r}–27^{v} and other miscellaneous historical texts.
[261] Bound with Thomas Walsingham's *Chronica maiora* for 1377–79 on fols 116^{r}–137^{v}.

6. London, British Library, MS Harley 3836, fols 1^{r}–69^{r} (for 1303–46, from fuller version of the text in MS 1, s. XIV 2)[262]

7. London, British Library, MS Royal 13 A XVIII, fols 117^{r}–135^{v} (for 1303–43, s. XIV *med.*)[263]

8. London, College of Arms, MS Arundel 18, pp. 14–34 (for 1303–37, continues the continuation of Nicholas Trevet's *Annales sex regum Anglie* for 1307–18 on pp. 1–14, s. XIV *med.*)[264]

9. Oxford, Magdalen College, MS Lat. 53, pp. 82–136 (for 1303–41, s. XV ¼)[265]

10. Oxford, Queen's College, MS 304, fols 151^{v}–163^{v} (for 1303–37, continues Nicholas Trevet's *Annales sex regum Anglie* for 1136–1307 and its continuation to 1318 on fols 67^{r}–151^{v}, continued by Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 133, *Polychronicon St Albans B Continuation* for 1341–77 on fols 164^{r}–174^{r}, and *Gesta regis Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–81 on fols 174^{r}–177^{r}, s. XV)[266]

    10a. London, British Library, MS Harley 448, fols 1^{r}–85^{v} (an inscription on fol. 1*^{r} suggests that this is a copy of MS 5 above, 'exemplar hujus libri in Biblioteca Cottoniana', but this text actually follows MS 10 and its continuations, 1704 copy)[267]

Abridged Version in *Canterbury Chronicle* Manuscripts:

11. London, British Library, MS Cotton Julius B III, fols 108^{r}–109^{v} (heavily abridged for 1326–42, continues *Canterbury LPB* MS 1, continued by *Canterbury Chronicle* MS 3, s. XV or *c.* 1380)[268]

12. London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 99, fols 45^{v}–51^{r} (for 1326–42, continues *Canterbury LPB* MS 2, continued by *Canterbury Chronicle* MS 1, s. XIV *ex.* or *c.* 1378)[269]

13. Oxford, Magdalen College, MS Lat. 200, fols 69^{r}–72^{r} (for 1326–41, continues *Canterbury LPB* MS 3, continued by *Canterbury Chronicle* MS 4, s. XIV/XV)[270]

14. Reigate, Parish Church of St Mary Cranston Library, Item 1117, fols 245^{v}–252^{r} (for 1326–42, continues *Canterbury LPB* MS 4, continued by *Canterbury Chronicle* MS 2, *c.* 1370)[271]

---

[262] Genealogy with discussion on Edward III's claim to France interpolated on fols 22^{v}–23^{v}.

[263] Bound with historical texts, such as the first part of Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum* on fols 77^{r}–104^{v}, genealogy for Rollo–Edward II on fols 104^{v}–108^{v}, genealogy (with French explanations) of kings of England for Heptarchy–Henry III with diagram on fols 150^{r}–156^{v}, as well as poem 'Si valeas paleas' on victories over Scots and French on fol. 211^{r} in a section added later to the MS, and other miscellaneous texts.

[264] Edited as: Adam Murimuth, 'Historia sui temporis', in *Nicolai Triveti; Adami Murimuthensis*, ed. by Anthony Hall (Oxford: Sheldonian Theatre, 1722), pp. 33–89.

[265] Bound with historical texts from different source manuscripts, including Tynemouth, *Historia*, MS 19.

[266] Bound with historical and genealogical texts, including Peter of Ickham's *De gestis Britonum et Anglorum* on fols 1^{r}–45^{r}, genealogies of the kings of England and France by John Moorlinch (s. XV *in.*) to Henry V with Henry VI added by a later hand on fols 49^{r}–57^{v}, genealogy of the kings of England from 'Deus' to Henry VI on fols 179^{r}–182^{v}, and genealogy with discussion on Edward III's claim to France on fols 186^{v}–187^{r} different from those in MSS 1 and 6, and other genealogies on bishops, abbots, and other church figures.

[267] I omit from my list the several other copies of Adam Murimuth's *Continuatio chronicarum* that were made in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, mostly from MSS now in the British Library.

[268] Bound with historical texts, including 'chronicle of the archbishops of Canterbury to William Whittlesey' for 1369–74 on fols 31^{v}–42^{r}.

[269] Bound with *Gesta Scotorum*, MS 1 and Higden, *Polychronicon*, MS 14.

[270] Bound with historical and religious texts, including *Canterbury Chronicle*, MS 4.

[271] Bound with *Canterbury Chronicle*, MS 2 and *Gesta Scotorum*, MS 2.

Continues Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon* Short Version:

15. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 259, fols 187^{r}–200^{r} (for 1322–39, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 2, s. XIV *med*., 1339 or after)
16. London, British Library, MS Harley 1729, fols 130^{r}–138^{r} (for 1327–39, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 10, with *Polychronicon A Continuation* MS 1, and *Vita Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–97 on fols 145^{r}–180^{v}, s. XV *med*., Nicholas Shaxton, bishop of Salisbury, 1535–56)
17. London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 104, fols 150^{r}–156^{r} (for 1330–39, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 15, with *Polychronicon A Continuation* MS 2, and *Vita Ricardi Secundi* for 1377–97 on fols 166^{v}–208^{r}, s. XIV *med*. or 1339 x 1369, after fol. 156^{r} s. XV, Exeter Cathedral)[272]

Abridged in the So-Called *Westminster Chronicle*:

18. London, British Library, MS Cotton Cleopatra A XVI, fols 142^{v}–150^{r} (for 1325–38, continued by Robert of Avesbury's *De gestis mirabilibus*, MS 4 and John of Reading's *Chronicle* MS 1, 1356 or after)

Edition:

Adam Murimuth, 'Continuatio chronicarum', in *Adae Murimuth; Robertus de Avesbury*, ed. by Edward Maunde Thompson, RS, 93 (London: Eyre, 1889), pp. 3–276

Northampton St Andrew's Chronicle

The text is written in Latin prose and covers 1–1339. It is related to the *Lewes Annals* and *Reading Annals*, which are themselves related to the *Winchester Annals* and the *Worcester Annals*. The text discusses the Anglo-Scottish conflict during Edward III's early years. It is largely ignored by scholarship.

Manuscript:

1. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 281, fols 80^{r}–127^{r} (s. XIV)[273]

No edition.

[272] Bound with pen and ink drawing of Wheel of Fortune on fol. 14^{v} and Edward III's letter to Pope Boniface VIII on his claim to Scotland on fols 225^{r}–226^{v}.

[273] Bound with an interpolated letter from Edward I on his claim to Scotland on fols 114^{r}–116^{r}.

Osney Chronicle

The text is written in Latin prose and covers 1016–1347. It was written in stages by several authors from *c*. 1233 to *c*. 1350. It relies on many sources for its narrative up to 1233. The final section, for 1293–1347, is somewhat based on Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon* with a continuation, and is in a single s. XIV *med*. hand. The text focuses on the Osney Abbey in Oxfordshire, but also frequently comments on political and national events.

Manuscript:

1. London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius A IX, fols 52^{r}–98^{r} (probably the original, s. XIII *med*.–XIV *med*.)[274]

Edition:

'Annales de Oseneia', in *Annales monastici*, ed. by Henry Richards Luard, RS, 36, 5 vols (London: Longman, 1864–69), IV, 3–352

Parallel Chronicle

The text is written in Latin prose and covers Creation–1347. It was probably written shortly after 1347. MS 1 is probably the first manuscript and is arranged in facing page, with the narrative from Christ to 1347 on the versos and Creation to Christ on the rectos. The Old Testament narrative runs longer than the other text, which leaves many of its verso pages blank. The text in MS 2 is rearranged into two separate texts rearranged in chronological order. In its later years it discusses national events and war, and at times seems to be derived from John of Tynemouth's *Historia aurea*. The text is entirely unknown to scholarship besides its vague catalogue entry.

Manuscripts:

1. London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius A XX, fols 109^{v}–132^{r} (s. XIV *med*., Tynemouth Priory)[275]
2. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 101 (SC 1949), fols 36^{r}–56^{v} (s. XIV *med*.)[276]

No edition.

---

[274] Bound with miscellaneous historical and prophetic texts, all of which predate this text.

[275] Bound with historical texts, including a 'chronicle of English history' for 1066–1246 on fols 77^{r}–108^{v} and *Durham LPB*, MS 3.

[276] Bound with many historical and political texts from different source manuscripts, including *Cronica bona et compendiosa* on fols 1^{r}–12^{r} (see p. 205 n. 2 above), *Bridlington Chronicle*, MS 1, *Gesta regum Angli*, MS 2, and *Gestis Anglorum*, MS 1.

Peterborough Chronicle

The text is written in Latin prose and covers 654–1368. It was probably written shortly after 1368. It begins with the foundation of the Peterborough Monastery but covers a variety of topics, including national and military events. Robert of Boston is sometimes claimed to have composed the final part of the text.

Manuscript:

1. London, British Library, MS Cotton Claudius A V, fols 2^{r}–45^{r} (s. XIV 2, 869–899 text on fols 5^{v}–9^{r} is s. XVI/XVII)[277]

Edition:

Chronicon Angliae Petriburgense, ed. by John A. Giles (London: Nutt, 1845)

Pipewell Abbey Chronicle

The text is written in Latin prose and covers 1–1347.[278] It was originally bound in a different manuscript that is now separated into London, British Library, MS Cotton Vespasian A IX, fols 122^{r}–153^{v} and Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, MS Advocates 33 V 3. In its later years it is concerned with national events, especially Edward III's conflict with Scotland. Taylor claims that it was not actually produced at the Pipewell Abbey.[279]

Manuscripts:

1. London, British Library, MS Cotton Caligula A XIII, fols 5^{r}–15^{v} (s. XIV 4/4–XV ¼)
    1a. London, British Library, MS Harley 624, fols 21^{r}–35^{v} (*c.* 1639–43 copy, Simonds d'Ewes)

No edition.

John of Reading, *Chronicle*

The text is written in Latin prose and covers 1346–67. It was written *c.* 1366–67 or to 1369. It is largely concerned with the English people and their conflicts. In MS 1 it is the concluding

[277] Bound with historical and ecclesiastical material.
[278] C. J. Rogers and Buck, 'Scottish Invasion', p. 53.
[279] J. Taylor, *Kirkstall Abbey Chronicles*, p. 13 n. 57.

portion of the so-called *Westminster Chronicle*, which is composed of an abridgement of the *Flores historiarum* for 1299–1306, continued by Robert of Reading's *Chronicle* to 1325, and then a unique amalgamation and abridgement of Adam Murimuth's *Continuatio chronicarum* (MS 18) and Robert of Avesbury's *De gestis mirabilibus* (MS 4). John of Reading continues this compilation with his own chronicle, from Edward III's 1346 normandy campaign until its abrupt end in 1367. He draws on Avesbury and one of the continuations of Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon* from time to time, until 1356 in his narrative. Reading might have drawn on now lost sources for his 1356–67 narrative, but most scholars believe this section of his narrative to be entirely unique. Although he claims that he defers to 'common talk' he frequently draws upon newsletters and personal correspondence that were copied in full by other chroniclers, but only uses them for occasional details, such as casualty lists after battles. Many later texts draw upon a better, now lost manuscript of Reading's *Chronicle*, such as other continuations of Higden's *Polychronicon*, the *Middle English Prose Brut* continuation to 1377, and Thomas Walsingham's texts. The one full manuscript that survives has many errors that obstruct its original meaning, and probably resulted in transcription. Accordingly, there were probably many other copies of the text made and circulated, but are now lost. Tait repeatedly derides the text for possessing 'no literary and but moderate historical value'.[280]

Manuscripts:

1. London, British Library, MS Cotton Cleopatra A XVI, fols 154^{v}–195^{r} (originally two separate MSS, bound together by Cotton, the first of which is a miscellany and the second is the *Westminster Chronicle*, s. XIV–XV *med.*)
2. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Lat. 5 (SC 1394), fol. 1^{v} (1361–62 and 1366, a few abbreviated passages, mainly on portents thought to allude to birth and baptism of Richard II, on first fol. of a psalter from an Augustinian Priory of Gusburn, but not copied from MS 1, 1399 or after)[281]

Edition:

John of Reading, 'Chronicon, 1346–1367', in *Johannis de Reading et Anonymi Cantuariensis*, ed. by James Tait (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1914), pp. 99–186

[280] Reading, *Chronicle*, p. 8.

[281] Although these passages have traditionally been attributed to John of Reading, it is also possible, and more likely, that they came from one of the continuations of Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon* that share passages with Reading's *Chronicle*.

Southern Chronicle

The text is written in Latin prose and covers 1066–1347.[282] It was probably written shortly after 1347. It was originally in a manuscript with many other historical texts, including the *Vita Edwardi Secundi*. The text is said to be compiled from portions of Geoffrey le Baker's *Chronicle*, the *Eulogium historiarum*, and other sources. It is concerned with national events. The text is entirely unknown to scholarship besides Childs' provisional examination, and must be examined in greater detail at a later date.

Manuscript:

1. London, James West MS, now lost
    1a. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson B 414 (SC 11761), fols 12^{r}–45^{r} (S. XVIII copy, Thomas Hearne)[283]

No edition.

John of Tynemouth, *Historia aurea*

The text is written in Latin prose and covers Creation–1347.[284] It was probably written *c*. 1347–50. It is in the form of a universal chronicle, modelled on Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon* but restructured and greatly elaborated, at an estimated seven to nine times in length.[285] The text draws on many authorities, such as Vincent of Beauvais, Bede, and Nicholas Trevet. It discusses a wide range of topics, including geography, national identity, and war. Many documents are interpolated in the later part of the narrative, which is otherwise independently composed. The text was combined with earlier forms of Higden's *Polychronicon* to form the Expanded Version, and was also widely used in other texts, such as the *Durham Latin Prose 'Brut'*, Thomas Gray's *Scalacronica*, and the *Kirkstall Abbey Long Chronicle*, and continued to be seen as an authority by later chroniclers, such as Henry Knighton and Thomas Walsingham. The later portions of

---

[282] *Vita Edwardi Secundi*, ed. by Wendy R. Childs, OMT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005), pp. xv–xix.

[283] Sporadically foliated, but consistently paginated in older ink as pp. 1–67. Portions of the now lost MS are copied here and in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson B 180 (SC 15494).

[284] *Nova legenda Anglie, as Collected by John of Tynemouth, John Capgrave, and Others*, ed. by Carl Horstman, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901), I, xliv–lxvi; J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, p. 177; Walter of Guisborough, *Chronicle*, ed. by Harry Rothwell, Camden Third Series, 89 (London: Royal Historical Society, 1957), pp. xii–xiv, xxiii–xxiv.

[285] Seven according to Taylor and nine according to Galbraith: J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, p. 144; Galbraith, 'Extracts', p. 204.

the text, from 1327 on, are used as continuations in some manuscripts of Higden's *Polychronicon* and Walter of Guisborough's *Chronicle*.[286]

Manuscripts (All Slightly Different):

1. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MSS 5–6, fols 1^{r}–284^{v} and 1^{r}–292^{v} (to 1343, indices on MS 5 fols iii^{r}–ix^{r} with imperf. beginning and x^{r}–xvi^{v}, the second of which follows after fol. 284^{v}, MS 6 fol. 293 added by Parker's scribes with historical notes on missing text, appears to be continued by Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon St Albans A Continuation* MS 1, s. XV, St Albans)
2. London, Lambeth Palace Library, MSS 10–12, fols 1^{r}–302^{v}, 1^{r}–292^{v}, and 1^{r}–247^{r} (to 1347, indices on MSS 10 fols i^{r}–vii^{r}, 11 fols i^{r}–iv^{r}, 12 fols i^{r}–vi^{r}, s. XIV, Durham)
3. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 240 (SC 2469), pp. 1–582 (sometimes abridged 'part 2' with St Edmund material interpolated to 1347, index on pp. vii–xxxix, notes about text on pp. xli–xliii, 1377, Bury St Edmund's)[287]

Manuscript Likely Abridged from MS 2 with Documents Omitted:

4. Cambridge, University Library, MS Dd X 22 (581), fols 1^{r}–159^{v} ('part 2' to 1342, s. XV)

Abridged Manuscripts:

5. London, British Library, MS Cotton Rolls XIII 2 (to 1347, s. XIV/XV)[288]
6. London, British Library, MS Royal 13 E IX, fols 138^{r}–150^{r} (from MS 5 above, s. XIV/XV, St Albans)[289]

Extracts Related to MSS 5 and 6 Above:

7. Cambridge, Jesus College, MS Q B 7 (24), fols 111^{r}–124^{r} (s. XIV, probably Durham)

Continues Short or Expanded Short Version of Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon*:

8. Cambridge, University Library, MS Dd VIII 7 (441), fols 337^{v}–355^{v} (for 1327–47, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 21, s. XIV *med.*, 1347 or after)[290]
9. London, British Library, MS Add. 14251, fols 115^{r}–118^{v} (for 1327–40, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 22, s. XV)[291]

---

[286] For differences from the 'standard' version, see Galbraith, '*Historia aurea*'; Galbraith, 'Extracts'.

[287] Bound with saints lives, some by Tynemouth.

[288] Edited as: John of Tynemouth, 'Chronicon, a principio ad an. 1350', in *Reliquiae manuscriptorum omnis aevi diplomatum ac monumentorum*, ed. by Johann Peter von Ludewig, 12 vols (Frankfurt am Main: Orphanotropheum, 1720–41), XII, 82–165.

[289] Bound with historical texts, including *Gesta regum Angli*, MS 1 and Higden, *Polychronicon*, MSS 88 and 167. For MS contents see Walsingham, *St Albans Chronicle, 1376–1422*, I, xxviii–xxix, 964–68.

[290] Bound with Marco Polo's *Travels*.

[291] Bound with historical texts, including a chronicle for Brutus–Danes on fols 14^{r}–20^{v} and an abbreviated chronicle on fols 171^{r}–176^{r}.

10. London, British Library, MS Cotton Julius E VIII, fols 177^{r}–181^{v} (for 1327–40, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 23, s. XIV/XV)

11. London, British Library, MS Harley 655, fols 319^{r}–338^{r} (for 1327–45, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 24, s. XIV *med*., 1345 or after)

12. London, British Library, MS Royal 13 E I, fols 232^{v}–242^{r} (for 1327–41, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 25, s. XIV *med*. or 1341 x 1386, Lincoln Cathedral)[292]

13. Manchester, Rylands Library, MS Lat. 218, fols 112^{v}–121^{v} (for 1327–41, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 26, *olim* Phillipps MS 1048, damaged, s. XIV/XV)

14. Oxford, Balliol College, MS 236, fols 295^{v}–311^{v} (for 1327–47, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 27, same text as MS 8 above, s. XV *med*. or 1444 x 1460, Duke of Buckingham)[293]

15. Oxford, University College, MS 177.2 fols 345^{r}–353^{v} (for 1327–40, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 28, s. XIV *med*., 1340 or after, Barnwell Priory)

16. Unknown MS (close to MS 11 and possibly MS 9 above)

    16a. London, British Library, MS Add. 43708, fols 86^{v}–94^{r} (for 1327–40, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 29a, s. XVI or *c*. 1565, Laurence Nowell)

    16b London, British Library, MS Cotton Titus A XIII, fols 93^{v}–97^{v} (for 1327–40, continues Higden's *Polychronicon* MS 29b, continued by *Eulogium historiarum* MS 7a, main text and Tynemouth continuation copied from MS 16a above, s. XVI or *c*. 1556, William Lambarde)[294]

Continues Walter of Guisborough's *Chronicle*, as *De gestis regis Edwardi Tertii*, for 1327–46 (up to before Crécy):

17. Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R V 10 (704), pp. 317–361 (to 1346, s. XVI)

18. London, British Library, MS Cotton Nero D II, fols 277^{r}–296^{v} (to 1346, without Guisborough's *Chronicle*, s. XVI or later)[295]

19. Oxford, Magdalen College, MS Lat. 53, pp. 253–315 (to 1346, without Guisborough's *Chronicle*, *c*. 1400 or s. XV *in*.)[296]

---

[292] Bound with life of St Alban of Mainz on fols 250^{r}–251^{v}. See J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, p. 96.

[293] A later exemplar of this version: J. Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, p. 177.

[294] Bound with historical texts, including *Prophetic LPB*, MS 1.

[295] Bound with historical texts, including *Annales ecclesiae Roffensis* to 1307 on fols 2^{r}–199^{v}, Higden, *Polychronicon*, MS 136, *De mirabilibus Anglie* and other miscellaneous texts on fols 245^{v}–246^{v}, and Jean Froissart's *Chronicles* on fols 306^{r}–313^{r} taken from London, British Library, MS Arundel 67.

[296] Bound with historical texts from different source manuscripts, including Murimuth, *Continuatio*, MS 9.

Extract(s) in Walsingham's *Chronica maiora*:[297]

20. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 195, pp. 143–67 (for 1328–40, clearly separated from Edward II narrative with blank p. 142, s. XV/XVI)[298]
21. London, College of Arms, MS Arundel 7, pp. 141–48 (for 1327–40, from MS 18 above, s. XV)[299]
22. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 462 (SC 2454), fols 21^{r}–34^{r}, 131^{r}, 132^{v}, 133^{v}, 137^{v}, 146^{v}–148^{v} (first extract is in miscellany section for 1339–47 and the others are integrated into Walsingham's *Chronica maiora* and relate to Edward III in 1338, *c.* 1420–30)[300]

Editions:

No complete edition. Galbraith outlines the differences between MSS 15–17, which are edited by Hamilton, and MSS 1–3.

Galbraith, Vivian H., 'The *Historia aurea* of John, Vicar of Tynemouth, and the Sources of the *St Albans Chronicle* (1327–1377)', in *Essays in History Presented to Reginald Lane Poole*, ed. by Henry W. C. Davis (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927), pp. 379–98

———, 'Extracts from the *Historia aurea* and a French "Brut" (1317–47)', *English Historical Review*, 43 (1928), 203–17

John of Tynemouth, 'De gestis regis Edwardi Tertii, et caeteris eventibus', in Walter of Guisborough, *Chronicon*, ed. by Hans Claude Hamilton, 2 vols (London: English Historical Society, 1848–49), II, 297–426

Woburn Chronicle

The text is written in Latin prose and covers Brutus–1335/36.[301] It was probably written up to 1336 by a Cistercian. It is discusses local matters but occasionally also national events.

---

[297] It is unclear how many Walsingham MSS use John of Tynemouth's text. The few MS lists that have been published are almost certainly incomplete and focus almost entirely on the later original narrative: Vivian H. Galbraith, 'Thomas Walsingham and the *Saint Albans Chronicle*, 1272–1422', *English Historical Review*, 47 (1932), 12–30 (here 30); Walsingham, *St Albans Chronicle, 1376–1422*, I, l–li. Unfortunately, J. Taylor's extensive notes on these MSS were discarded after his death in 2009 by his family, per personal correspondence from Wendy R. Childs.

[298] The Tynemouth portion is edited as: John of Tynemouth, 'De tempore regis Edwardi tertii', in Thomas Walsingham, *Historia breuis*, ed. by Matthew Parker (London: Bynneman, 1574), pp. 110–31.

[299] The Tynemouth portion is edited as: John of Tynemouth, 'De rege Edwardo Tertio', in Thomas Walsingham, *Historia anglicana*, ed. by Henry Thomas Riley, RS, 28.1, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1863–64), I, 191–221. See also Walsingham, *St Albans Chronicle, 1376–1422*, I, xxxiv, II, xxii.

[300] Walsingham, *St Albans Chronicle, 1376–1422*, II, xix–xx, xxxix–xl.

[301] J. Taylor, *Kirkstall Abbey Chronicles*, pp. 10–17; Burton, *Melsa*, II, xxxiv–xxxv.

Manuscripts:

1. London, British Library, MS Cotton Domitian A XII, fols 3^{r}–54^{r} (table of contents on fols 55^{r}–56^{r}, s. XIV *ex.*)[302]
2. London, British Library, MS Cotton Vespasian E IX, fols 17^{r}–85^{v} (s. XV 2)[303]

No edition.

York Short Chronicle

The text is written in Latin prose and covers 1307–56.[304] It was probably written shortly after 1356. It is concerned with national events. The text is largely ignored by scholarship.

Manuscript:

1. Leeds, University of Leeds Library, MS Brotherton 29, fols 26^{v}–29^{v} (s. XIV 2)[305]

No edition.

[302] Bound with Higden, *Polychronicon*, MS 154.
[303] This MS is mentioned, but not explicitly identified as *Woburn* in Burton, *Melsa*, II, xxxiv. A comparison of the MSS shows them to be the same text.
[304] Tyson, 'Three Short Anglo-Norman Texts', pp. 88–89.
[305] Bound with *Anonimalle*, MS 1 and *Short ANPB*, MS 29.

Bibliography

PRIMARY SOURCES: MANUSCRIPTS

Manuscripts marked with an asterisk were examined for this thesis

Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales
* 5028C [*Long ANPB* 2]
* 5041C [Higden, *Polychronicon* 37]
* 17430B [Higden, *Polychronicon* 38]
* Brogyntyn II 24 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 39]
* Peniarth 398D

Austin, Harry Ransom Center
48

Bruxelles / Brussel, Bibliothèque royale de Belgique / Koninklijk Bibliotheek van België
* 3096 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 40]
* 3097 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 1]
6943

Bryn Mawr, College Library
* Gordan 64 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 156]

Cambridge, Christ's College
* 3 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 41]
* 13 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 42]

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College
* 5 [Tynemouth, *Historia* 1]
* 6 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 163; Higden, *Polychronicon SAA Continuation* 1; Tynemouth, *Historia 1*]
* 21 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 43]
* 98 [*Short ANPB* 1]
* 117 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 44]
* 133 [Gray, *Scalacronica* 1]
* 164 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 45]
* 177
* 195 [Tynemouth, *Historia* 20]
* 197A [Higden, *Polychronicon* 46]
* 251
* 259 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 2; Murimuth, *Continuatio* 15]
* 281 [*Northampton* 1]
* 367 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 169]
* 370 [*Acta bellicosa* 1]

Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College
* 58/152 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 47]
* 82/164 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 48]
* 249/277 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 49]

Cambridge, Jesus College
* Q B 7 (24) [Tynemouth, *Historia* 7]
* Q G 10 (58) [*Short ANPB* 2]

Cambridge, King's College
43 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 180]

Cambridge, Magdalene College
Pepys 2516

Cambridge, Peterhouse (available for examination at Cambridge, University Library)
* 177 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 50; Higden, *Polychronicon A Continuation* 3]

Cambridge, St John's College
* A 12 (12) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 3]

Cambridge, Trinity College
* O V 12 (1293) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 157]
* O V 37 (1318) [*Bridlington Chronicle* 2a]
* R IV 1 (634) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 51]
* R V 10 (704) [Tynemouth, *Historia* 17]
* R V 24 (719) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 52]
* R V 32 (723) [Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus* 1; *Short ANPB* 30]
* R V 35 (726) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 53]
* R VII 2 (740) [*Eulogium* 1]
* R VII 14 (752) [*Short ANPB* 13]

Cambridge, Trinity Hall
* 25 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 4]

Cambridge, University Library
* Add. 3077 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 54]
* Add. 3392 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 174]
* Dd I 17 (17) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 55]
* Dd VIII 7 (441) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 21; Tynemouth, *Historia* 8]
* Dd X 22 (581) [Tynemouth, *Historia* 4]
* Ee I 20 (909) [*Long ANPB* 1]
* Ee II 22 (940) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 56]
* Gg I 15 (1410) [*Short ANPB* 14]
* Ii II 24 (1757) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 57]
* Ii III 1 (1765) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 158]
* Ii VI 8 (1887) [*Long ANPB* 3]
* Mm I 33 (2294) [*Short ANPB* 3]

Cambridge (Mass.), Harvard University Houghton Library
Fr. 152
* Lat. 116 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 58]

Canterbury, Christ Church Cathedral Library
* Add. 68 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 5]
Lit. D 16 (58) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 59]

Châlons-en-Champagne, Bibliothèque municipale
81 [Le Bel, *Chronicle* 1]

Chester, Cheshire Archives and Local Studies Centre
* EDD 3913 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 60]

Chicago, Newberry Library
* 33.1 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 61]

Chicago, University of Chicago Library
* 224 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 181]

Columbia, University of South Carolina Library
* 61 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 159]

Detroit, Public Library
* 2 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 62]

Dresden, Landes-und Universitätsbibliothek
Dc 182

Dublin, Trinity College
* 485 (E I 27) [*Durham LPB* 1]
* 486 (E II 1) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 63; Higden, *Polychronicon A Continuation* 4]
* 487 (E II 6) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 64]
* 488 (E II 25) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 65; Higden, *Polychronicon A Continuation* 5]
* 490 (E II 15)
497 (E II 26) [*Eulogium* 2]
* 500 (E II 33) [*Short ANPB* 15]
* 501 (E V 5) [*Long ANPB* 4]
* 511 (E V 8) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 164; Higden, *Polychronicon SAA Continuation* 2]
* 516 (E V 10) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 66]
* 517 (E IV 12) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 6]

Durham, Cathedral Dean and Chapter Library
* B II 35 [*Durham LPB* 2]

Durham, University Library
* Cosin 5 III 19 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 170]

Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland
* Advocates 33 IV 12 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 7]
Advocates 33 V 3

Edinburgh, University of Edinburgh Library
* 181 (Laing III 51) [*Short ANPB* 16]

Eton, College Library
213 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 67]

Exeter, Cathedral Library
3509 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 68]

Glasgow, University of Glasgow Library
* Hunter 72 (T III 10) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 69]
* Hunter 223 (U II 14) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 70]

Kortrijk, Stadsbibliotheek
Codex 329

Leeds, University of Leeds Library
* Brotherton 29 [*Anonimalle* 1; *Short ANPB* 29; *York Short Chronicle* 1]

Lincoln, Cathedral Library
85 (A III 12) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 8]
* 109 (A IV 17) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 30]

Lisboa, Biblioteca nacional de Portugal
* ilum. 134
* ilum. 135

London, British Library
* Add. 6914 [*Eulogium* 6a]
* Add. 10099 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 171]
* Add. 10104 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 71]
* Add. 10105 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 9]
Add. 10622
* Add. 12118 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 72]
* Add. 14251 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 22; Higden, *Polychronicon* 152; Tynemouth, *Historia* 9]
* Add. 15759 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 73]
* Add. 18462 [*Long ANPB* 5; *Short ANPB* 17]
Add. 25461
* Add. 32097
* Add. 32167 [Murimuth, *Continuatio* 1]
* Add. 35113 [*Short ANPB* 4]
* Add. 39236 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 74]
* Add. 43708 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 29a; Tynemouth, *Historia* 16a]

London, British Library (continued)

Add. 47680
* Add. 54184 [Murimuth, *Continuatio* 2]
* Add. 62451 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 31]
* Arundel 67
* Arundel 86 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 75]
* Arundel 123
* Burney 277 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 175]
* Cotton Appendix LII [Le Baker, *Chronicle* 1]
* Cotton Caligula A XIII [*Pipewell* 1]

Cotton Caligula D V
* Cotton Claudius A V [*Peterborough* 1]
* Cotton Claudius B VI
* Cotton Claudius D VII [*Lanercost* 1]
* Cotton Claudius E VIII [Murimuth, *Continuatio* 3]

Cotton Cleopatra A VI [*London French* 1]
* Cotton Cleopatra A XVI [Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus* 4; Murimuth, *Continuatio* 18; Reading, *Chronicle* 1]
* Cotton Cleopatra D II [*Eulogium* 3]
* Cotton Cleopatra D III [*Long ANPB* 7; *Hailes* 1]
* Cotton Cleopatra D IV [Higden, *Polychronicon* 153]
* Cotton Cleopatra D VII [*Short ANPB* 5]

Cotton Domitian A X [*Short ANPB* 6]
* Cotton Domitian A XII [Higden, *Polychronicon* 154; *Woburn* 1]
* Cotton Faustina B V [Dene, *Rochester* 1]
* Cotton Faustina B VI [*Croxden Annals* 1]
* Cotton Galba E VII [*Eulogium* 4]
* Cotton Galba E IX
* Cotton Julius A I [*Short ANPB* 7]
* Cotton Julius B III [*Canterbury LPB* 1; *Canterbury Chronicle* 3; Murimuth, *Continuatio* 11]

Cotton Julius E IV
* Cotton Julius E VIII [Higden, *Polychronicon* 7]
* Cotton Nero D II [Higden, *Polychronicon* 23; Tynemouth, *Historia* 10]
* Cotton Nero D VI
* Cotton Nero D VIII [Higden, *Polychronicon* 32]
* Cotton Nero D X [Murimuth, *Continuatio* 4]
* Cotton Otho C II [Higden, *Polychronicon* 165; Murimuth, *Continuatio* 5]
* Cotton Otho C XVI [Higden, *Polychronicon* 172]
* Cotton Otho D I [Higden, *Polychronicon* 77; Higden, *Polychronicon A Continuation* 6]
* Cotton Rolls XIII 2 [Tynemouth, *Historia* 5]
* Cotton Tiberius A VI [*Long ANPB* 12; *Long ANPB Continuation* 1]

Cotton Tiberius A IX [*Osney* 1]
* Cotton Tiberius E VIII
* Cotton Titus A XIII [*Prophetic LPB* 1; *Eulogium* 7a; Higden, *Polychronicon* 29b; Tynemouth, *Historia* 16b]

Cotton Vespasian A IX

London, British Library (continued)

* Cotton Vespasian E IX [*Woburn* 2]
* Cotton Vitellius A XX [*Durham LPB* 3; *Parallel Chronicle* 1]
* Cotton Vitellius C IV
* Cotton Vitellius D IX [*St Benet at Holme* 1]
* Cotton Vitellius D XII [Higden, *Polychronicon* x1]
* Cotton Vitellius E XII
* Egerton 871 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 160]

Harley 53

* Harley 139 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 173]
* Harley 200 [Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus* 2; *Short ANPB* 31]
* Harley 448 [Murimuth, *Continuatio* 10a]
* Harley 624 [*Pipewell* 1a]
* Harley 655 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 24; Tynemouth, *Historia* 11]
* Harley 688 [*Bridlington Chronicle* 2b]
* Harley 1320 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 79]
* Harley 1707 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 78]

Harley 1728 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 10]

* Harley 1729 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 10; Higden, *Polychronicon A Continuation* 1; Murimuth, *Continuatio* 16]
* Harley 1751 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 11]
* Harley 3600 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 80]

Harley 3634

* Harley 3671 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 33]
* Harley 3673 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 81]
* Harley 3725 [*Hailes* 2]
* Harley 3776 [Higden, *Polychronicon* x2]
* Harley 3836 [Murimuth, *Continuatio* 6]
* Harley 3877 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 82]
* Harley 3884 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 83; Higden, *Polychronicon A Continuation* 7]
* Harley 3945
* Harley 4875 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 84; Higden, *Polychronicon A Continuation* 8]
* Harley 6359 [*Short ANPB* 18]
* Lansdowne 239 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 85]

Lansdowne 285

* Royal 13 A XVII [Higden, *Polychronicon* x3]
* Royal 13 A XVIII [Murimuth, *Continuatio* 7]
* Royal 13 C I [Higden, *Polychronicon* 86]
* Royal 13 C III [Higden, *Polychronicon* 12]
* Royal 13 D I [Higden, *Polychronicon* 87; Higden, *Polychronicon* 166]
* Royal 13 E I [Higden, *Polychronicon* 25; Tynemouth, *Historia* 12]
* Royal 13 E IX [*Gesta regum Angli* 1; Higden, *Polychronicon* 88; Higden, *Polychronicon* 167; Tynemouth, *Historia* 6]
* Royal 14 B VI
* Royal 14 C IX [Higden, *Polychronicon* 89]
* Royal 14 C XII [Higden, *Polychronicon* 155]
* Royal 14 C XIII [Higden, *Polychronicon* 13]
* Royal 19 C IX [*Long ANPB* 89]

London, British Library (continued)
* Royal 20 A III [*Long ANPB* 6]
* Royal 20 A XVIII [*Long ANPB* 8]
* Royal Appendix 85 [*Long ANPB* 9]
* Sloane 289 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 90]
Sloane 1776 [Higden, *Polychronicon* x4]
* Stowe 64 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 91]
* Stowe 67
* Stowe 140

London, College of Arms
* Arundel 2 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 92]
* Arundel 4 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 93]
* Arundel 7 [Tynemouth, *Historia* 21]
* Arundel 18 [Murimuth, *Continuatio* 8]
* Arundel 31 (169) [*Short ANPB* 19]

London, Gray's Inn
* 9 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 182]

London, Inner Temple
* Petyt 511.5 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 94]
* Petyt 511.19 [*Short ANPB* 20]

London, Lambeth Palace Library
* 10 [Tynemouth, *Historia* 2]
* 11 [Tynemouth, *Historia* 2]
* 12 [Tynemouth, *Historia* 2]
* 48 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 95]
* 99 [*Canterbury LPB* 2; *Canterbury Chronicle* 1; *Gesta Scotorum* 1; Higden, *Polychronicon* 14; Murimuth, *Continuatio* 12]
* 104 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 15; Higden, *Polychronicon A Continuation* 2; Murimuth; *Continuatio* 17]
* 112 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 34]
* 160 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 96]
* 181 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 97]
188
* 504 [*Short ANPB* 21]
1106 [*London St Paul's* 1]

London, Lincoln's Inn
* Hale 73 (68) [*Eulogium* 5]
* Hale 88 (83) [*Long ANPB* 13]
* Hale 139 (Misc. 19) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 98]

London, Royal College of Physicians
398 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 99]

London, Westminster Abbey
25 [*Short ANPB* 22]

Maidstone, Kent Archives
* Item U49/Z15 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 176]

Manchester, John Rylands Library
* Eng. 103
* Eng. 206
* Lat. 113
* Lat. 170 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 100]
* Lat. 217 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 101]
* Lat. 218 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 26; Tynemouth, *Historia* 13]

New Haven, Yale University Beinecke Library
86 [*Short ANPB* 8]
405 [*Short ANPB* 9]
* 494
* 593 [*Short ANPB* 23]
* Osborn fa51 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 102]
* Takamiya 43 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 16]
* Takamiya 114 [Higden, *Polychronicon* x5]

New York City, Columbia University Library
* Plimpton 252 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 103]

Oxford, Balliol College
* 235 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 104]
* 236 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 27; Tynemouth, *Historia* 14]

Oxford, Bodleian Library
* Ashmole 796 (SC 7434) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 105; Higden, *Polychronicon A Continuation* 9]
* Ashmole 1804 (SC 25174) [*Long ANPB* 10]
* Bodley 101 (SC 1948) [*Bridlington Chronicle* 1; *Gesta regum Angli* 2; *Gestis Anglorum* 1; *Parallel Chronicle* 2]
* Bodley 240 (SC 2469) [Tynemouth, *Historia* 3]
* Bodley 302 (SC 2086)
* Bodley 316 (SC 2752) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 106]
* Bodley 341 (SC 2445) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 35]
* Bodley 358 (SC 2453) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 107]
Bodley 359 (SC 2457) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 108]
* Bodley 462 (SC 2454) [Tynemouth, *Historia* 22]
* Bodley 761 (SC 2535) [Le Baker, *Chronicle* 2; Le Baker, *Chroniculum* 1]
* Bodley 840 (SC 27654)
Bodley Rolls 10 (SC 2967) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 183]
* Digby 82 (SC 1683) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 109]
* Digby 196 (SC 1797) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 110]

Oxford, Bodleian Library (continued)

* Digby 201 (SC 1802) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 111; Higden, *Polychronicon A Continuation* 10]
* Digby 218 (SC 1819) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 178; Higden *Polychronicon* 179]
* Douce 128 (SC 21702) [Avesbury, *Gestis mirabilibus* 3; *Short ANPB* 32]
* Douce 138 (SC 21712) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 112]
* Douce 323 (SC 21897)
* e Musaeo 108 (SC 3697) [*Short ANPB* 24]
* Hatton 14 (SC 4105) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 113]
* Laud Lat. 5 (SC 1394) [Reading, *Chronicle* 2]
* Laud Misc. 529 (SC 1510) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 114]
* Laud Misc. 545 (SC 1378) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 115]
* Laud Misc. 619 (SC 759) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 161]
* Laud Misc. 637 (SC 1592)
* Laud Misc. 722 (SC 1174) [*Kirkstall* 1]
* Laud Misc. 748 (SC 1339)
* Lawn Medieval 21 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 116]
* Lyell 17 [*Short ANPB* 25]
* Lyell 21 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 117]
* Rawlinson B 152 (SC 11522) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 168; Higden, *Polychronicon SAA Continuation* 3]
* Rawlinson B 154 (SC 11524) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 118]
* Rawlinson B 171 (SC 11539)
* Rawlinson B 179 (SC 11546) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 119]

  Rawlinson B 180 (SC 15494)
* Rawlinson B 191 (SC 11551) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 17]
* Rawlinson B 414 (SC 11761) [*Southern Chronicle* 1a]
* Rawlinson C 155 (SC 12019)
* Rawlinson D 329 (SC 13117) [*Short ANPB* 26]
* Tanner 19 (SC 9839) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 120]
* Tanner 170 (SC 9996) [Higden, *Polychronicon* 121]

Oxford, Christ Church

* 89 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 122]
* 92

Oxford, Corpus Christi College

* 78 [*Short ANPB* 10; *Short ANPB Continuation* 1]
* 83 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 18]
* 89 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 123]
* 293A [*Short ANPB* 11]

Oxford, Lincoln College (available for examination at Oxford, Bodleian Library)

* Lat. 107 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 124]

Oxford, Magdalen College
* Lat. 29 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 125]
* Lat. 53 [Murimuth, *Continuatio* 9; Tynemouth, *Historia* 19]
* Lat. 97 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 126]
* Lat. 147 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 127]
* Lat. 181 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 36]
* Lat. 190 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 128]
* Lat. 200 [*Canterbury LPB* 3; *Canterbury Chronicle* 4; Murimuth, *Continuatio* 13]

Oxford, Merton College
* 118 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 19]
* 121 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 129; Higden, *Polychronicon A Continuation* 11]

Oxford, New College
* 152 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 130]

Oxford, Oriel College (available for examination at Oxford, Bodleian Library)
* 16 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 131]
* 74 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 132; Higden, *Polychronicon A Continuation* 12]

Oxford, Queen's College
* 304 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 133; Murimuth, *Continuatio* 10]
* 307 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 134]

Oxford, University College (available for examination at Oxford, Bodleian Library)
* 177.1 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 28]
* 177.2 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 28; Tynemouth, *Historia* 15]

Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal
* 3346 [*Short ANPB* 27]

Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Institut
326

Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine
* 1860 [*Long ANPB* 11]

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France
fr. 10144
* fr. 12155 [*Long ANPB* 15]
* fr. 12156 [*Short ANPB* 28]
* lat. 4126 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 20]
* lat. 4922 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 135]
* lat. 4923 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 136]
* lat. 6049
* lat. 12502 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 137]
* lat. 15014 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 138]

Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève
* 935 [*Long ANPB* 16]

Princeton, University Library
* Garrett 152 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 139; Higden, *Polychronicon A Continuation* 13]

Provo, Brigham Young University Harold B. Lee Library
* 091 H534 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 140]

Reading, University Library
* Item JGL 1/18/2

Reigate, Parish Church of St Mary Cranston Library
* Item 1117 [*Canterbury LPB* 4; *Canterbury Chronicle* 2; *Gesta Scotorum* 2; Murimuth, *Continuatio* 14]

San Marino, Huntington Library
HM 132 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 162]
* HM 19960 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 184]
* HM 48570 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 141]

Sankt-Peterburg, Rossiyskaya natsional'naya biblioteka
Fr. F v IX
Fr. Q v IV 8 [*Short ANPB* 12]

Taunton, Somerset County Heritage Centre
* DD/SAS C/1193/66 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 142]

Urbana, University of Illinois Library
* 132 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 143]

València, Biblioteca de la catedral
89 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 144]

Città del Vaticano, Archivio segreto vaticano
Introitus et exitus 184

Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca apostolica
* Chig. G VIII 231 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 145]
* Reg. lat. 731 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 146]
* Vat. lat. 1959 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 147]

Warminster, Longleat House
* 50 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 148; Higden, *Polychronicon A Continuation* 14]
* 51 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 149]

Winchester, College Library
* 15 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 150]
27 [Higden, *Polychronicon* 151]

Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek
* Codex Guelf. 84 Gud. Lat.

Untraced[1]
MS sold at Les Enluminures April 2016, lot 18 [*Eulogium* 8]
MS sold at Gros & Delettrez, 2011, lot 549

[1] The two untraced MSS listed by Edwards and Freeman are not included here because they might already be listed in the Appendix under different shelf marks or misidentified as copies of Higden's *Polychronicon*: Edwards and Freeman, 'Further Manuscripts', p. 524.

PRIMARY SOURCES: EDITED

'Acta bellicosa', in *Le Prince Noir en Aquitaine (1355/56–1362/70)*, ed. by Joseph Moisant (Paris: Picard, 1894), pp. 157–74

Ainsworth, Peter, and Godfried Croenen, eds, *The Online Froissart*, v. 1.5 (Sheffield: HRIOnline, 2013) <hrionline.ac.uk/onlinefroissart>

'Albine and Isabelle: Regicidal Queens and the Historical Imagination of the Anglo-Norman Prose *Brut* Chronicles with an Edition and Translation of the Prose Prologue to the Long Version of the Anglo-Norman Prose *Brut*', ed. by Julia Marvin, *Arthurian Literature*, 18 (2001), 143–91

The Alliterative Morte Arthure: A Critical Edition, ed. by Valerie Krishna (New York: Franklin, 1976)

Allmand, Christopher, ed., *Society at War: The Experience of England and France during the Hundred Years War*, rev. edn (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1998)

'The Anglo-Norman Prose *Brut*: An Edition of British Library, MS Cotton Cleopatra D III', ed. by Marcia Lusk Maxwell (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1995)

Anastasius Bibliothecarius, 'Chronographia tripertita', in Theophanes the Confessor, *Chronographia*, ed. by Carl de Boor, BT, 2 vols (Leipzig: Teubner, 1883–85), II, 31–346

'Annales de Oseneia', in *Annales monastici*, ed. by Henry Richards Luard, RS, 36, 5 vols (London: Longman, 1864–69), IV, 3–352

'Annales paulini', in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, ed. by William Stubbs, RS, 76, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1882–83), I, 255–370

'Annales prioratus de Wigornia, AD 1–1377', in *Annales monastici*, ed. by Henry Richards Luard, RS, 36, 5 vols (London: Longman, 1864–69), IV, 355–546

The Anonimalle Chronicle, 1307 to 1334, from Brotherton Collection MS 29, ed. by Wendy R. Childs and John Taylor, Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Record Series, 147 (Leeds: Yorkshire Archaeological Society, 1991)

The Anonimalle Chronicle, 1333 to 1381, from a MS Written at St Mary's Abbey, York, ed. by Vivian H. Galbraith, rev. edn (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1970)

Aquinas, Thomas, 'Summa theologiae cum commentariis Thomae de Vio Caietani ordinis praedicatorum', in *Opera omnia iussu impensaque Leonis XIII*, ed. by Tommaso Maria Zigliara and others, 39 vols so far (Roma: Typographia poliglotta S. C. de Propaganda Fide, 1882–), IV–XII

Aristotle, *Ethica nicomachea*, trans. by Robert Grosseteste, ed. by René Antonin Gauthier, Aristoteles latinus, 26.1–26.3, 5 vols (Leiden: Brill, 1972–74)

Avesbury, Robert of, 'De gestis mirabilibus regis Edwardi Tertii', in *Adae Murimuth; Robertus de Avesbury*, ed. by Edward Maunde Thompson, RS, 93 (London: Eyre, 1889), pp. 279–471

———, *Historia de mirabilibus gestis Eduard III*, ed. by Thomas Hearne (Oxford: Sheldonian Theatre, 1720), pp. 256–66

Le Baker, Geoffrey, *Chronicle*, trans. by David Preest, notes by Richard Barber (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2012)

———, *Chronicon*, ed. by Edward Maunde Thompson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889)

———, 'Chroniculum', in *Chronicon*, ed. by Edward Maunde Thompson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889), pp. 156–74

Barber, Richard, ed., *The Life and Campaigns of the Black Prince*, rev. edn (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1986)

Bartholomaeus Anglicus, *Le Livre des regions*, ed. by Brent A. Pitts, Anglo-Norman Text Society, Plain Texts Series, 15 (London: Anglo-Norman Text Society, 2006)

———, *De genuinis rerum coelestium, terrestrium et inferarum proprietatibus*, ed. by Georg Barthold Pontanus von Breitenberg (Frankfurt am Main: Richter, 1601)

———, *De proprietatibus rerum*, ed. by Christel Meier, Heinz Meyer, Baudouin Van den Abeele, and Iolanda Ventura, 8 vols (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007–)

———, *On the Properties of Things*, trans. by John Trevisa, ed. by Michael C. Seymour, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975–88)

Baston, Robert, 'De striuelinensi obsidione', in Walter Bower, *Scotichronicon*, ed. by Donald E. R. Watt, 9 vols (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1987–98), VI, 366–75, 458–60

Bede, *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, ed. by Bertram Colgrave, Roger A. B. Mynors, and John M. Wallace-Hadrill, OMT, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969–88)

Le Bel, Jean, *Chronique*, ed. by Jules Viard and Eugène Déprez, ShF, 317, 324, 2 vols (Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1904–05)

Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem, ed. by Robert Weber, Roger Gryson, and Bonifatius Fischer, 5th edn (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007)

Bouvet, Honoré, '*L'Arbre des batailles*: Étude de l'oeuvre et édition critique des textes français et occitan', ed. by Hélène Biu, 3 vols (unpublished doctoral thesis, Université Paris-Sorbonne, Paris IV, 2004)

Bower, Walter, *Scotichronicon*, ed. by Donald E. R. Watt, 9 vols (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1987–98)

Bradwardine, Thomas, *De causa Dei contra Pelagium et de virtute causarum*, ed. by Anna Lukács (Göttingen: V&R Unipress, 2013)

Bradwardine, Thomas, 'Victory Sermon in 1346', in Hilary S. Offler, *Church and Crown in the Fourteenth Century: Studies in European History and Political Thought*, ed. by A Ian Doyle (Aldershot: Variorum, 2000), XIII

Le Breton, Guillaume, 'Gesta Philippi Augusti', in *Oeuvres de historiens de Philippe-Auguste*, ed. by Henri-François Delaborde, ShF, 210, 224, 2 vols (Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1882–85), I, 168–333

Breviarium ad usum insignis ecclesiae Sarum, ed. by Francis Procter and Christopher Wordsworth, 3 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1879–86)

Bridlington, John of, 'Versus propheciales, prophecia', ed. by Michael Curley (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1973)

Brinton, Thomas, *Sermons, 1373–1389*, ed. by Mary Aquinas Devlin, Camden Third Series, 85–86, 2 vols (London: Royal Historical Society, 1954)

Bromyard, John, *Summa praedicantium*, ed. by Arcangelus Ritius, 2 vols (Venezia: Nicolinus, 1586)

Le Brut Moyen-Anglais en prose (version commune des origines à 1333), ed. by Marie-Françoise Alamichel (Turnhout: Brepols, 2016)

The Brut, or the Chronicles of England, ed. by Friedrich W. D. Brie, EETSos, 131, 136, 2 vols (London: Paul, 1906–08)

Burghersh, Bartholomew, 'Letter to John Montagu, 1356', in Chandos Herald, *The Black Prince: An Historical Poem, Written in French*, ed. by Henry Octavius Coxe (London: Shakespeare Press, 1842), pp. 369–70

Burton, Thomas de, *Chronica monasterii de Melsa, a fundatione usque ad annum 1396*, ed. by Edward A. Bond, RS, 43, 3 vols (London: Longman, 1866–68)

Bury, Richard de, *Philobiblon: Edizione critica*, ed. by Antonio Altamura (Napoli: Fausto Fiorentino, 1954)

Caesar, Gaius Julius, *Bellum gallicum*, ed. by Wolfgang Hering, BT (Leipzig: Teubner, 1987)

Calais Anonymous, 'Crécy', in 'Propaganda of the Hundred Years War: Poems on the Battles of Crécy and Durham (1346), a Critical Edition', ed. by Arthur G. Rigg, *Traditio*, 54 (1999), 177–88, 197–205

———, 'Durham', in 'Propaganda of the Hundred Years War: Poems on the Battles of Crécy and Durham (1346), a Critical Edition', ed. by Arthur G. Rigg, *Traditio*, 54 (1999), 188–96, 205–11

Calendar of the Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office, Edward III, ed. by Henry Maxwell Lyte, 16 vols (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1891–1916)

Canterbury Anonymous, *Chronicon, 1346–1365*, ed. by Charity Scott-Stokes and Chris Given-Wilson, OMT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2008)

Castleford, Thomas, *Chronicle, or the Boke of Brut*, ed. by Caroline D. Eckhardt, EETSos, 305–06, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996)

Chandos Herald, *La Vie du Prince Noir*, ed. by Diana B. Tyson (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1975)

Charny, Geoffroi de, *The Book of Chivalry: Text, Context, and Translation*, ed. by Richard W. Kaeuper, trans. by Elspeth Kennedy (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996)

———, 'A Critical Edition of the *Livre Charny* and the *Demandes pour la joute, les tournois et la guerre*', ed. by Michael A. Taylor (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1977)

Chaucer, Geoffrey, 'The Canterbury Tales, Fragment I (Group A)', in *The Riverside Chaucer*, ed. by Larry D. Benson, 3rd edn (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987), pp. 23–86, 795–853, 1118–25

Chauliac, Guy de, *Inventarium sive Chirurgia magna*, ed. by Michael McVaugh, 2 vols (Leiden: Brill, 1997)

Chronicon Angliae Petriburgense, ed. by John A. Giles (London: Nutt, 1845)

Chronicle of Lanercost, 1272–1346, trans. by Herbert Maxwell (Glasgow: Maclehose, 1913)

Chronicon de Lanercost, .mcci.–.mcccxlvi., e codice cottoniano, ed. by Joseph Stevenson (Edinburgh: Maitland Club, 1839)

Chronique normande du XIV^e siècle, ed. by Émile Molinier, ShF, 205 (Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1882)

Continuatio Eulogii: The Continuation of the Eulogium Historiarum, ed. by Chris Given-Wilson, OMT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, forthcoming)

Clanvowe, John, 'The Two Ways', in *Works*, ed. by Vincent J. Scattergood (Cambridge: Brewer, 1975), pp. 57–80, 86–89

'Cleopatra Itinerary', in *The Battle of Crécy: A Casebook*, ed. by Michael Livingston and Kelly DeVries (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2015), pp. 22–27, 339–40

'Concilium karrofense, 989', in *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, ed. by Giovanni Domenico Mansi, 54 vols (Venezia: Zatta, 1759–98), XIX, cols 89–90

'The Continuation of the *Eulogium historiarum*, 1361–1413', ed. by Stephen N. Clifford (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Leeds, 1975)

'Convention entre Philippe de Valois et les normands pour la conquête de l'Angleterre (23 mars 1338)', in Jean Froissart, *Oeuvres*, ed. by Joseph Kervyn de Lettenhove, 25 vols (Bruxelles: Devaux, 1867–77), XVIII, 67–73

Croniques de London, depuis l'an 44 Hen. III jusqu'à l'an 17 Edw. III, ed. by James Aungier, Camden Old Series, 28 (London: Nichols, 1844)

Curtius Rufus, Quintus, *Historia*, ed. by Carlo M. Lucarini, BT (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009)

The Declaration of Arbroath, ed. by James Fergusson (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1970)

Des grantz geanz: An Anglo-Norman Poem, ed. by Georgine E. Brereton (Oxford: Blackwell, 1937)

'Dispute between the Englishman and the Frenchman', in *Political Poems and Songs Relating to English History, Composed during the Period from the Accession of Edw. III to that of Ric. III*, ed. by Thomas Wright, RS, 14, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1859–61), I, 91–93

'Durham Feilde', in *Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript: Ballads and Romances*, ed. by John W. Hales and others, 3 vols (London: Trübner, 1867–68), II, 191–99

Edward III, 'Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 18 June 1340', in *A Chronicle of London, from 1089 to 1483, Written in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. by Nicholas Harris Nicolas (London: Longman, 1827), pp. 198–99

———, 'Letter to the Chancellor, Treasurer and Other Members of his Council in London, 29 July 1346', in Kenneth Fowler, 'News from the Front: Letters and Despatches of the Fourteenth Century', in *Guerre et société en France, en Angleterre et en Bourgogne, XIV^e–XV^e siècles*, ed. by Philippe Contamine, Charles Giry-Deloison, and Maurice Keen (Villeneuve d'Ascq: Centre d'histoire de la région du nord et de l'Europe du nord-ouest, Université Charles de Gaulle-Lille III, 1991), pp. 83–84

———, 'Letter to Edward of Woodstock, 24 June 1340', in *A Chronicle of London, from 1089 to 1483, Written in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. by Nicholas Harris Nicolas (London: Longman, 1827), pp. 199–201

———, 'Letter to Thomas de Lucy, 3 September 1346', in Chandos Herald, *The Black Prince: An Historical Poem, Written in French*, ed. by Henry Octavius Coxe (London: Shakespeare Press, 1842), pp. 351–55

———, 'Lettre sur ses succès en Normandie (fin de juillet 1346), sequitur cedula', in Jean Froissart, *Oeuvres*, ed. by Joseph Kervyn de Lettenhove, 25 vols (Bruxelles: Devaux, 1867–77), XVIII, 286–87

'Epigram on the Assumption of the Arms of France', in *Political Poems and Songs Relating to English History, Composed during the Period from the Accession of Edw. III to That of Ric. III*, ed. by Thomas Wright, RS, 14, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1859–61), I, 26

Eulogium (historiarum sive temporis), ab orbe condito usque ad annum Domini .mccclxci., ed. by Frank Scott Haydon, RS, 9, 3 vols (London: Longman, 1858–63)

'The Execution of Sir Simon Fraser', in *Historical Poems of the XIVth and XVth Centuries*, ed. by Rossell Hope Robbins (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), pp. 14–21, 252–56

Fastolf, John, 'Report upon the Management of the War in France upon the Conclusion of the Treaty of Arras', in *Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Wars of the English in France during the Reign of Henry the Sixth, King of England*, ed. by Joseph Stevenson, RS, 22, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1861–64), II, 575–85

Fossor, John, 'Letter to Thomas Hatfield, Bishop of Durham, July 1346', in *Historical Papers and Letters from the Northern Registers*, ed. by James Raine, RS, 61 (London: Longman, 1873), pp. 385–86

———, 'Letter to Thomas Hatfield, Bishop of Durham, October 1346', in *Historical Papers and Letters from the Northern Registers*, ed. by James Raine, RS, 61 (London: Longman, 1873), pp. 387–89

'The French Plan of Battle during the Agincourt Campaign', ed. by Christopher Phillpotts, *English Historical Review*, 99 (1984), 59–66

Froissart, Jean, 'Besançon, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 864', ed. by Valentina Mazzei, in *The Online Froissart*, ed. by Peter Ainsworth and Godfried Croenen, v. 1.5 (Sheffield: HRIOnline, 2013) <hrionline.ac.uk/onlinefroissart>

———, 'Chroniques abrégées', in *Oeuvres*, ed. by Joseph Kervyn de Lettenhove, 25 vols (Bruxelles: Devaux, 1867–77), XVII

———, *Chroniques, dernière rédaction du premier livre: Édition du manuscrit de Rome, Reg. lat. 869*, ed. by George Diller (Genève: Librairie Droz, 1972)

———, *Chroniques, Livre I: Le Manuscrit d'Amiens, Bibliothèque municipale, no. 486*, ed. by George Diller, 5 vols (Genève: Librairie Droz, 1991–98)

———, 'Chroniques, Livre premier', in *Chroniques*, ed. by Siméon Luce, ShF, 147, 148, 154, 159, 164, 169, 180, 188, 15 vols (Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1869–1975), I–VIII

———, 'New York, Morgan Library, MS M.804', ed. by Rob Sanderson, in *The Online Froissart*, ed. by Peter Ainsworth and Godfried Croenen, v. 1.5 (Sheffield: HRIOnline, 2013) <hrionline.ac.uk/onlinefroissart>

Frontinus, Sextus Julius, *Strategemata*, ed. by Robert Ireland, BT (Leipzig: Teubner, 1990)

———, *Strategematon, libro qui fertur quarto*, ed. by Gotthold Gundermann, BT (Leipzig: Teubner, 1881)

'Gesta Edwardi de Carnarvan, auctore canonico Bridlingtoniensi, cum continuatione ad AD 1377', in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, ed. by William Stubbs, RS, 76, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1882–83), II, 25–151

Gesta Henrici Quinti, ed. by Frank Taylor and John Roskell, OMT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975)

The Parliament Rolls of Medieval England, 1275–1504, ed. by Chris Given-Wilson and others (Leicester: National Archives, 2005) <sd-editions.com/PROME>

Gower, John, 'To King Henry the Fourth, in Praise of Peace', in *English Works*, ed. by George C. Macaulay, EETSes, 81–82, 2 vols (London: Paul, 1900–01), II, 481–92, 550–54

Gratian, 'Decretum', in *Corpus iuris canonici*, ed. by Emil Friedberg and Aemilius Ludwig Richter, 2nd edn, 2 vols (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1959), I

———, *Decretum: La Traduction en ancien français*, ed. by Leena Löfstedt, 5 vols (Helsinki: Societas Scientarum Fennica, 1991–2001)

Gray, Thomas, *Scalacronica, 1272–1363*, ed. by Andy King, Surtees Society, 209 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005)

———, *Scalacronica: A Chronicle of England and Scotland from AD .mlxvi. to AD .mccclxii.*, ed. by Joseph Stevenson (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Printing Company, 1836)

Gregory IX, 'Decretalium', in *Corpus iuris canonici*, ed. by Emil Friedberg and Aemilius Ludwig Richter, 2nd edn, 2 vols (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1959), II

Guisborough, Walter of, *Chronicle*, ed. by Harry Rothwell, Camden Third Series, 89 (London: Royal Historical Society, 1957)

'Halidon Hill', in Laurence Minot, *Poems*, ed. by Joseph Hall, 3rd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914), pp. 101–03, 123

Higden, Ranulf, 'Addition to the Character of Edward III as Given in the Continuations of the *Polychronicon* and Murimuth', in *Johannis de Reading et Anonymi Cantuariensis*, ed. by James Tait (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1914), p. 91

———, 'Continuatio', in Adam Murimuth, *Chronica sui temporis*, ed. by Thomas Hog (London: English Historical Society, 1846), pp. 171–227

———, 'Continuatio continuationis: Illustrissimi regis Ricardi II', in Adam Murimuth, *Chronica sui temporis*, ed. by Thomas Hog (London: English Historical Society, 1846), pp. 228–43

———, 'Continuation as Given in MS A, liber septimus', in *Polychronicon*, ed. by Joseph Rawson Lumby, RS, 41, 9 vols (London: Longman, 1865–86), VIII, 338–44 (following MS A), 355–93

Higden, Ranulf, 'Continuation as Given in MS A, liber octavus', in *Polychronicon*, ed. by Joseph Rawson Lumby, RS, 41, 9 vols (London: Longman, 1865–86), VIII, 393–406

———, 'Continuation as Given in MS B', in *Polychronicon*, ed. by Joseph Rawson Lumby, RS, 41, 9 vols (London: Longman, 1865–86), VIII, 338–46 (following MS B), 407–28

———, 'Historia Eduardi Tertii, e codice veteri MS describendam curavit cl. Tannerus, cap. 56–62', in *Historia de rebus gestis Eduardi I, Eduardi II, et Eduardi III*, ed. by Thomas Hearne (Oxford: Sheldonian Theatre, 1731), pp. 421–52

———, 'MS Reg. 13 D I, Collated with MS Lambeth 160', in Thomas Walsingham, *Chronicon Angliae, ab anno Domini 1328 usque ad annum 1388*, ed. by Edward Maunde Thompson, RS, 64 (London: Longman, 1874), pp. 391–401

———, *Polychronicon*, ed. by Churchill Babington and Joseph Rawson Lumby, RS, 41, 9 vols (London: Longman, 1865–86)

Hippo, Augustine of, *De civitate Dei*, ed. by Bernard Dombart and Alphonsus Kalb, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 47–48, 2 vols (Turnhout: Brepols, 1955)

Historia vitae et regni Ricardi Secundi, ed. by George B. Stow (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977)

Huntingdon, Henry of, *Historia Anglorum*, ed. by Diana Greenway, OMT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996)

Josephus, Titus Flavius, 'Antiquitatis', in *Opera*, ed. by Johann Froben (Basel: Froben, 1524), pp. 1–592

———, *The Antiquities*, ed. by Franz Blatt, Acta Jutlandica, 30.1, Humanistisk Serie, 44, 2 vols (Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget i Aarhus, 1958–)

———, 'De bello iudaico', in *Opera*, ed. by Johann Froben (Basel: Froben, 1524), pp. 593–852

Juvénal des Ursins, Jean, 'Histoire de Charles VI, roy de France', in *Choix de chroniques et mémoires sur l'histoire de France*, ed. by Jean A. C. Buchon (Paris: Desrez, 1838), pp. 323–573

'Kitchen Journal', in Geoffrey le Baker, *Chronicon*, ed. by Edward Maunde Thompson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889), pp. 252–53

'Kitchen Journal', in *The Battle of Crécy: A Casebook*, ed. by Michael Livingston and Kelly DeVries (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2015), pp. 20–23, 339

Knighton, Henry, *Chronicle, 1337–1396*, ed. by Geoffrey H. Martin, OMT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995)

'Lanercost Chronicle', in *The Battle of Crécy: A Casebook*, ed. by Michael Livingston and Kelly DeVries (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2015), pp. 86–89, 349–50

'Lateran II, 1139', in *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. by Norman P. Tanner, 2 vols (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1990), I, 195–203

'Lateran III, 1179', in *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. by Norman P. Tanner, 2 vols (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1990), I, 205–25

Legnano, Giovanni da, *Tractatus de bello, de represaliis et de duello*, ed. by Thomas Erskine Holland (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1917)

'Letre Dauyd de Bruys', in Laurence Minot, *Poems*, ed. by Joseph Hall, 3rd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914), pp. 112–14, 127

Livius, Titus, *Ab urbe condita*, ed. by John Briscoe, 1 vol. so far, OCT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2016–)

Lucanus, Marcus Annaeus, *De bello civili, libri .x.*, ed. by David R. Shackleton Bailey, BT (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1988)

Lydgate, John, 'A Praise of Peace', in *Minor Poems*, ed. by Henry MacCracken and Merriam Sherwood, EETSos, 107, 192, 2 vols (London: Oxford University Press, 1911–34), II, 785–91

Malmesbury, William of, *Gesta regum Anglorum*, ed. by Roger A. B. Mynors, Rodney M. Thomson, and Michael Winterbottom, OMT, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998–99)

Mannyng, Robert, *Chronicle*, ed. by Idelle Sullens (Binghamton: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1996)

Map, Walter, 'Cambriae epitome', in *Latin Poems*, ed. by Thomas Wright, Camden Old Series, 16 (London: Nichols, 1841), pp. 131–46

Marcellinus, Ammianus, *Rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt*, ed. by Wolfgang Seyfarth, 2 vols, BT (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1978)

'Merlin's Prophecy of the Six Kings', in Rupert Taylor, *The Political Prophecy in England* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1911), pp. 160–64

Mézières, Philippe de, *Letter to King Richard II: A Plea Made in 1395 for Peace between England and France*, ed. by George W. Coopland (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1975)

Middle English Sermons, from British Museum, MS Royal 18 B XXIII, ed. by Woodburn O. Ross, EETSos, 209 (London: Oxford University Press, 1940)

Milemete, Walter de, 'A *speculum principis* for Edward III', ed. by Stanley J. Bird (unpublished master's thesis, University of North Carolina, 1975)

Minot, Laurence, 'Poems', ed. by Carolyn P. Collette (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 1971)

———, *Poems*, ed. by Joseph Hall, 3rd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914)

Minot, Laurence, *Poems, 1333–1352*, ed. by Thomas Beaumont James and John Simons (Exeter: University of Exeter, 1989)

———, *Poems, 1333–1352*, ed. by Richard H. Osberg (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University, 1996)

Monmouth, Geoffrey of, *De gestis Britonum*, ed. by Michael D. Reeve, trans. by Neil Wright (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007)

'MS Royal 14 B VI de la British Library (Londres)', in Olivier de Laborderie, '"Ligne de reis": Culture historique, représentation du pouvoir royal et construction de la mémoire nationale en Angleterre à travers les généalogies royales en rouleau du milieu du XIII[e] siècle du début du XV[e] siècle' (unpublished doctoral thesis, École des hautes études en sciences sociales, Paris, 2002), pp. 1299–1312

Le Muisit, Gilles, 'Chronique', in *Chronique et annales*, ed. by Henri Lemaître, ShF, 323 (Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1906), pp. 1–219

Murimuth, Adam, 'Continuatio chronicarum', in *Adae Murimuth; Robertus de Avesbury*, ed. by Edward Maunde Thompson, RS, 93 (London: Eyre, 1889), pp. 3–276

———, 'Historia sui temporis', in *Nicolai Triveti; Adami Murimuthensis*, ed. by Anthony Hall (Oxford: Sheldonian Theatre, 1722), pp. 33–89

'A Northern Chronicle, 1399–1430', in Charles Kingsford, *English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), pp. 279–91

'Notice of a Manuscript of the Latter Part of the Fourteenth Century, Entitled *Passio Scotorum perjuratorum*', ed. by John Patrick Crichton-Stuart, *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, n.s., 7 (1885), 166–92

Nova legenda Anglie, as Collected by John of Tynemouth, John Capgrave, and Others, ed. by Carl Horstman, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901)

Nursia, Benedict of, *Regula monachorum*, ed. by Eduard Wölfflin, BT (Leipzig: Teubner, 1895)

The Oldest Anglo-Norman Prose 'Brut' Chronicle, ed. by Julia Marvin (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2006)

'On the Battle of Nevile's Cross', in *Political Poems and Songs Relating to English History, Composed during the Period from the Accession of Edw. III to that of Ric. III*, ed. by Thomas Wright, RS, 14, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1859–61), I, 40–41

'Ordinances for the English Army, 1385', in Anne Curry, 'Disciplinary Ordinances for English and Franco-Scottish Armies in 1385: An International Code?', *Journal of Medieval History*, 37 (2011), 286–91

Page, John, *The Siege of Rouen, from London, British Library, MS Egerton 1995*, ed. by Joanna Bellis (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2015)

Pagula, William of, 'Speculum regis Edwardi III, ex codice bodleiano 624', in *De speculo regis Edwardi III: Seu tractatu quem de mala regni administratione*, ed. by Joseph Moisant (Paris: Picard, 1891), pp. 127–69

'Pars secunda: De rebus gestis Henrici IV', in *Incerti scriptoris chronicon Angliae de regnis trium regum lancastrensium: Henrici IV, Henrici V, et Henrici VI*, ed. by John A. Giles (London: Nutt, 1848), pp. 3–63

Petrarca, Francesco, 'Ad eundem, de mutatione Fortune eamque ex morum et presertim rei militaris mutatione procedere', in *Le Familiari: Edizione critica*, ed. by Vittorio Rossi, 4 vols (Firenze: Sansoni, 1933–42), IV, 138–52

'Un plan de bataille du duc de Bourgogne (14 septembre 1417) et la tactique de l'époque', ed. by Jean F. Verbruggen, *Revue internationale d'histoire militaire*, 20 (1959), 443–51

Plinius Secundus, Gaius, *Naturalis historia*, ed. by Ludwig von Jan and Karl Friedrich Theodor Mayhoff, 6 vols, BT (Leipzig: Teubner, 1875–1906)

'Prophecies of Merlin', in Laurence Minot, *Poems*, ed. by Joseph Hall, 3rd edn (London: Oxford University Press, 1914), pp. 103–11, 123–26

Prose Brut to 1332, ed. by Heather Pagan, Anglo-Norman Text Society, Annual Texts, 69 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011)

Reading, John of, 'Chronicon, 1346–1367', in *Johannis de Reading et Anonymi Cantuariensis*, ed. by James Tait (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1914), pp. 99–186

Rome, Giles of, *De regimine principum*, ed. by Hieronymus Samaritanius (Roma: Zannettus, 1607)

Salisbury, John of, *Policratici*, ed. by Clement Charles Julian Webb, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909)

Sallustius Crispus, Gaius, 'De bello iugurthino', in *Catilina; Iugurtha; Historiarum fragmenta selecta; Appendix sallustiana*, ed. by Leighton D. Reynolds, OCT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), pp. 54–149

Samson, Thomas, 'Lettre aux amys et compaignouns (1346)', in Jean Froissart, *Oeuvres*, ed. by Joseph Kervyn de Lettenhove, 25 vols (Bruxelles: Devaux, 1867–77), V, 489–92

Seville, Isidore of, *Etymologiarum sive originum*, ed. by Wallace M. Lindsay, 2 vols, OCT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911)

The Siege of Jerusalem, ed. by Ralph Hanna and David Lawton, EETSos, 320 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)

Solinus, Gaius Julius, *Collectanea rerum memorabilium*, ed. by Theodor Mommsen, 2nd edn (Berlin: Weidmann, 1895)

'A Study of the French Chronicle of London, with Special Reference to Syntax', ed. by David C. Cox (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of London, 1971)

'Synodus helenensis, 1027', in *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, ed. by Giovanni Domenico Mansi, 54 vols (Venezia: Zatta, 1759–98), XIX, cols 483–84

'Tractatus belli apud Crucem', in Laurence Minot, *Poems*, ed. by Joseph Hall, 3rd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914), pp. 114–22, 127–29

Trevet, Nicholas, 'The Anglo-Norman Chronicle: Text, with Historical, Philological and Literary Study', ed. by Alexander Rutherford (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of London, Birkbeck, 1932)

Troyes, Chrétien de, *Le Chevalier au lion*, ed. by William W. Kibler (New York: Garland, 1985)

———, *Le Chevalier de la charrete*, ed. by William W. Kibler (New York: Garland, 1981)

Tynemouth, John of, 'Chronicon, a principio ad an. 1350', in *Reliquiae manuscriptorum omnis aevi diplomatum ac monumentorum*, ed. by Johann Peter von Ludewig, 12 vols (Frankfurt am Main: Orphanotropheum, 1720–41), XII, 82–165

———, 'De gestis regis Edwardi Tertii, et caeteris eventibus', in Walter of Guisborough, *Chronicon*, ed. by Hans Claude Hamilton, 2 vols (London: English Historical Society, 1848–49), II, 297–426

———, 'De rege Edwardo Tertio', in Thomas Walsingham, *Historia anglicana*, ed. by Henry Thomas Riley, RS, 28.1, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1863–64), I, 191–221

———, 'De tempore regis Edwardi tertii', in Thomas Walsingham, *Historia breuis*, ed. by Matthew Parker (London: Bynneman, 1574), pp. 110–31

'An Unknown News Bulletin from the Siege of Tournai in 1340', ed. by Clifford J. Rogers, *War in History*, 5 (1998), 358–66

Usk, Adam, *Chronicle, 1377–1421*, ed. by Chris Given-Wilson, OMT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997)

Valerius Maximus, *Factorum et dictorum memorabilium*, ed. by John Briscoe, 2 vols, BT (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1998)

Vegetius Renatus, Publius Flavius, *Epitoma rei militaris*, ed. by Michael D. Reeve, OCT (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)

———, *The Earliest English Translation of 'De re militari'*, ed. by Geoffrey Lester (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 1988)

———, *Knyghthode and Bataile: A XVth-Century Verse Paraphrase of 'De re militari'*, ed. by Roman Dyboski and Zygfryd M. Arend, EETSos, 201 (London: Oxford University Press, 1935)

Venette, Jean de, *Chronique*, ed. by Colette Beaune (Paris: Le Livre de poche, 2011)

Vita Edwardi Secundi, ed. by Wendy R. Childs, OMT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005)

Les Voeux du héron: A Middle French Vowing Poem, ed. by John Grigsby and Norris Lacy (New York: Garland, 1992)

Wales, Gerald of, 'Topographia hibernica', in *Opera*, ed. by John S. Brewer, James F. Dimmick, and George F. Warner, RS, 21, 8 vols (London: Longman, 1867), v, 3–204

Walsingham, Thomas, *The St Albans Chronicle, 1406–1420, from Bodley MS 462*, ed. by Vivian H. Galbraith (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937)

———, *The St Albans Chronicle: The Chronica maiora, 1376–1422*, ed. by John Taylor, Wendy R. Childs, and Leslie Watkiss, OMT, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003–11)

The Westminster Chronicle, 1381–1394, ed. by Leonard C. Hector and Barbara F. Harvey, OMT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982)

'A Wigmore Chronicle, 1355–1377', in John Taylor, *English Historical Literature in the Fourteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), pp. 285–300

Woodstock, Edward of, 'La Bataille de Nájera: Le Communiqué du Prince Noir', ed. by Eugène Déprez, *Revue historique*, 136 (1921), 37–59

———, 'Letter to the Bishop of Worcester, 20 October 1356', in *A Chronicle of London, from 1089 to 1483, Written in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. by Nicholas Harris Nicolas (London: Longman, 1827), pp. 206–08

———, 'Letter to the Mayor, Aldermen, and Commonalty of London, 1356', in *A Chronicle of London, from 1089 to 1483, Written in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. by Nicholas Harris Nicolas (London: Longman, 1827), pp. 204–06

'Woodhouse's Roll', in John E. Morris, 'Mounted Infantry in Mediaeval Warfare', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 8 (1914), 101–02

Wright, Thomas, ed., *Political Poems and Songs Relating to English History, Composed during the Period from the Accession of Edw. III to that of Ric. III*, RS, 14, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1859–61)

SECONDARY SOURCES

Abels, Richard, 'Cultural Representations of Warfare in the High Middle Ages: The Morgan Picture Bible', in *Crusading and Warfare in the Middle Ages: Realities and Representations. Essays in Honour of John France*, ed. by Simon John and Nicholas Morton (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), pp. 13–35

Abels, Richard, and Stephen Morillo, 'A Lying Legacy? A Preliminary Discussion of Images of Antiquity and Altered Reality in Medieval Military History', *Journal of Medieval Military History*, 3 (2005), 1–13

Afonso do Paço, Manuel, 'The Battle of Aljubarrota', *Antiquity*, 37 (1963), 264–69

Ainsworth, Peter, 'Contemporary and "Eyewitness" History', in *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Deborah Mauskopf Deliyannis (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 249–76

Albano, Robert A., *Middle English Historiography* (New York: Lang, 1993)

Allmand, Christopher, 'The *De re militari* of Vegetius in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance', in *Writing War: Medieval Literary Responses to Warfare*, ed. by Corinne J. Saunders, Françoise Le Saux, and Neil Thomas (Cambridge: Brewer, 2004), pp. 15–28

———, *The 'De re militari' of Vegetius: The Reception, Transmission and Legacy of a Roman Text in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)

———, 'The English Translations of Vegetius' *De re militari*: What Were their Author's Intentions?', in *The Fifteenth Century XI: Concerns and Preoccupations*, ed. by Linda Clark (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2012), pp. 1–8

———, *The Hundred Years War: England and France at War, c. 1300–c. 1450*, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)

———, 'A Roman Text on War: The *Strategemata* of Frontinus in the Middle Ages', in *Soldiers, Nobles and Gentlemen: Essays in Honour of Maurice Keen*, ed. by Peter Coss and Christopher Tyerman (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2009), pp. 153–68

———, 'Some Writers and the Theme of War in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries', in *Krieg im Mittelalter*, ed. by Hans-Henning Kortüm (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2001), pp. 167–80

———, 'The War and the Non-Combatant', in *The Hundred Years War*, ed. by Kenneth Fowler (London: Macmillan, 1971), pp. 163–83

———, 'War and the Non-Combatant in the Middle Ages', in *Medieval Warfare*, ed. by Maurice Keen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 259–69

Ambühl, Rémy, *Prisoners of War in the Hundred Years War: Ransom Culture in the Late Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013)

Anglo, Sydney, 'Vegetius's *De re militari*: The Triumph of Mediocrity', *Antiquaries Journal*, 82 (2002), 247–67

Armstrong, Dorsey, 'Rewriting the Chronicle Tradition: The Alliterative *Morte Arthure* and Arthur's Sword of Peace', *Parergon*, 25 (2008), 81–101

Armstrong, John A., *Nations before Nationalism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982)

Autrand, Françoise, 'La Déconfiture: La Bataille de Poitiers (1356) à travers quelques textes français des XIV^e^ et XV^e^ siècles', in *Guerre et société en France, en Angleterre et en Bourgogne, XIV^e^–XV^e^ siècles*, ed. by Philippe Contamine, Charles Giry-Deloison, and Maurice Keen (Villeneuve d'Ascq: Centre d'histoire de la région du nord et de l'Europe du nord-ouest, Université Charles de Gaulle-Lille III, 1991), pp. 93–121

Ayton, Andrew, 'Armies and Military Communities in Fourteenth-Century England', in *Soldiers, Nobles and Gentlemen: Essays in Honour of Maurice Keen*, ed. by Peter Coss and Christopher Tyerman (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2009), pp. 215–39

———, 'Arms, Armour, and Horses', in *Medieval Warfare: A History*, ed. by Maurice Keen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 186–208

———, 'Crécy and the Chroniclers', in *The Battle of Crécy, 1346*, ed. by Andrew Ayton and Philip Preston Bart (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005), pp. 287–350

———, 'The Crécy Campaign', in *The Battle of Crécy, 1346*, ed. by Andrew Ayton and Philip Preston (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005), pp. 35–107

———, 'English Armies in the Fourteenth Century', in *Arms, Armies and Fortifications in the Hundred Years War*, ed. by Anne Curry and Michael Hughes (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1994), pp. 21–38

———, 'The English Army at Crécy', in *The Battle of Crécy, 1346*, ed. by Andrew Ayton and Philip Preston (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005), pp. 159–251

———, *Knights and Warhorses: Military Service and the English Aristocracy under Edward III* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1994)

Bachrach, Bernard S., '*Caballus et caballarius* in Medieval Warfare', in *The Study of Chivalry: Resources and Approaches*, ed. by Howell Chickering and Thomas H. Seiler (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University, 1988), pp. 173–211

———, 'Is the *Song of Roland*'s Roncevalles a Military Satire?', in *Prowess, Piety, and Public Order in Medieval Society: Studies in Honor of Richard W. Kaeuper*, ed. by Craig M. Nakashian and Daniel P. Franke (Leiden: Brill, 2017), pp. 15–35

———, 'Medieval Siege Warfare: A Reconnaissance', *Journal of Military History*, 58 (1994), 119–33

Bachrach, Bernard S., 'The Practical Use of Vegetius' *De re militari* during the Early Middle Ages', *The Historian*, 47 (1985), 239–55

———, 'Writing Military History from Narrative Sources: Norman Battlefield Tactics, *c.* 1000', in *Understanding Medieval Primary Sources: Using Historical Sources to Discover Medieval Europe*, ed. by Joel T. Rosenthal (London: Routledge, 2012), pp. 86–97

Bachrach, Bernard S., and David S. Bachrach, *Warfare in Medieval Europe, c. 400–c. 1453* (London: Routledge, 2017)

Baden-Daintree, Anne, 'Visualising War: The Aesthetics of Violence in the Alliterative *Morte Arthure*', in *Representing War and Violence, 1250–1600*, ed. by Joanna Bellis and Laura Slater (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2016), pp. 56–75

Bainton, Roland H., *Christian Attitudes toward War and Peace: A Historical Survey and Critical Re-Evaluation* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1960)

Bak, János M., and Ivan Jurković, eds, *Chronicon: Medieval Narrative Sources* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013)

Baker, Denise N., ed., *Inscribing the Hundred Years' War in French and English Cultures* (New York: State University of New York Press, 2000)

Baraz, Daniel, *Medieval Cruelty: Changing Perceptions, Late Antiquity to the Early Modern Period* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003)

———, 'Violence or Cruelty? An Intercultural Perspective', in *'A Great Effusion of Blood'? Interpreting Medieval Violence*, ed. by Mark D. Meyerson, Daniel Thiery, and Oren Falk (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), pp. 164–89

Barber, Richard, *Edward III and the Triumph of England: The Battle of Crécy and the Company of the Garter* (London: Lane, 2013)

———, *Edward, Prince of Wales and Aquitaine: A Biography of the Black Prince* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1978)

Barnes, Jonathan, 'The Just War', in *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy*, ed. by Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny, and Jan Pinborg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 771–84

Barnes, Timothy D., *Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998)

Barnie, John, *War in Medieval Society: Social Values and the Hundred Years War, 1337–99* (London: Weidenfeld, 1974)

Barron, William R. J., 'Knighthood on Trial: The Acid Test of Irony', *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 17 (1981), 181–97

Barrow, Geoffrey W. S., *Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm of Scotland*, 4th edn (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005)

Beaune, Colette, *The Birth of an Ideology: Myths and Symbols of Nation in Late Medieval France*, trans. by Susan Ross Huston, ed. by Fredric L. Cheyette (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991)

Bell, Adrian R., 'Medieval Chroniclers as War Correspondents during the Hundred Years' War: The Earl of Arundel's Campaign of 1387', in *Fourteenth-Century England VI*, ed. by Chris Given-Wilson (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2010), pp. 171–84

Bell, Adrian R., and others, *The Soldier in Later Medieval England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)

Bellis, Joanna, *The Hundred Years War in Literature, 1377–1600* (Woodbridge: Brewer, 2016)

———, '"I was enforced to become an eyed witnes": Documenting War in Medieval and Early Modern Literature', in *Emotions and War: Medieval to Romantic Literature*, ed. by Stephanie Downes, Andrew Lynch, and Katrina O'Loughlin (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), pp. 133–51

———, 'Propaganda or Parody? Latin Abuse Poetry from the Hundred Years War', in *Crossing Borders in the Insular Middle Ages*, ed. by Victoria Flood and Aisling Byrne (Turnhout: Brepols, 2018 forthcoming)

———, '"The reader myghte lamente": The Sieges of Calais (1346) and Rouen (1418) in Chronicle, Poem and Play', in *War and Literature*, ed. by Laura Ashe and Ian Patterson (Woodbridge: Brewer, 2014), pp. 84–106

Bennett, Matthew, 'Warrior Narratives and Hostageship Ethos: Old French Literature and "Reality" in the Twelfth Century', in *Medieval Hostageship, c. 700–c. 1500: Hostage, Captive, Prisoner of War, Guarantee, Peacemaker*, ed. by Matthew Bennett and Katherine Weikert (New York: Routledge, 2017), pp. 79–91

Berdyaev, Nikolai, *The Divine and the Human*, trans. by Reginald M. French (London: Bles, 1949)

Berg, Jason, 'How Monstrosity and Geography Were Used to Define the Other in Early Medieval Europe' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Leeds, 2015)

Bieler, Ludwig, 'The Text Tradition of Dicui's *Liber de mensura orbis terrae*', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, Section C*, 64 (1965), 1–31

Bischoff, Berhard, 'Über gefaltete Handschriften, vornehmlich hagiographischen Inhalts', in *Mittelalterliche Studien: Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte*, 3 vols (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1966–81), I, 93–100

Blair, Claude, *European Armour, circa 1066 to circa 1700* (London: Batsford, 1958)

Bliese, John R. E., 'Rhetoric Goes to War: The Doctrine of Ancient and Medieval Military Manuals', *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 24 (1994), 105–30

Blockley, Roger C., *Ammianus Marcellinus: A Study of his Historiography and Political Thought* (Bruxelles: Latomus, 1975)

Bloxam, Jim, 'The Beast, the Book and the Belt: An Introduction to the Study of Girdle or Belt Books from the Medieval Period', in *Breaking and Shaping Beastly Bodies: Animals as Material Culture in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Aleksander Pluskowski (Oxford: Oxbow, 2007), pp. 80–97

Bouchard, Constance Brittain, *'Strong of Body, Brave and Noble': Chivalry and Society in Medieval France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998)

Boulton, D'Arcy Jonathan Dacre, *The Knights of the Crown: The Monarchical Orders of Knighthood in Later Medieval Europe, 1325–1520* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1987)

Bourke, Paul, David Whetham, and Kelly DeVries, 'A Report of the Findings of the Defence Academy Warbow Trials, Part 1, Summer 2005', *Arms and Armour*, 4 (2007), 53–81

Boutruche, Robert, 'La Dévastation des campagnes pendant la guerre de Cent Ans et la reconstruction agricole de la France', in *Mélanges 1945. III, études historiques*, ed. by Prosper Alfaric, Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, 106 (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1947), pp. 127–63

Boyle, Leonard E., 'William of Pagula and the *Speculum regis Edwardi III*', *Mediaeval Studies*, 32 (1970), 329–36

Bradbury, Jim, *The Medieval Archer* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1985)

———, *The Medieval Siege* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1992)

Bratu, Cristian, '"Je, aucteur de ce livre": Authorial Persona and Authority in French Medieval Histories and Chronicles', in *Authorities in the Middle Ages: Influence, Legitimacy, and Power in Medieval Society*, ed. by Sini Kangas, Mia Korpiola, and Tuija Ainonen (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013), pp. 183–204

Brewer, Derek, 'Understanding Chivalry in Earlier English Literature', in *Rethinking Middle English: Linguistic and Literary Approaches*, ed. by Nikolaus Ritt and Herbert Schendl (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2005), pp. 1–16

Bridbury, Anthony R., 'Before the Black Death', *Economic History Review*, 30 (1977), 393–410

———, 'The Hundred Years' War: Costs and Profits', in *Trade, Government and Economy in Pre-Industrial England: Essays Presented to F. J. Fisher*, ed. by Donald C. Coleman and Arthur H. John (London: Weidenfeld, 1976), pp. 19–34

Brie, Friedrich W. D., *Geschichte und Quellen der mittelenglischen Prosachronik 'The Brute of England' oder 'The Chronicles of England'* (Marburg: Friedrich, 1905)

Brie, Friedrich W. D., 'Recovery of an Anglo-Norman Chronicle', *Notes and Queries,* 10th ser., 2 (1904), 41

Briggs, Charles F., *Giles of Rome's 'De regimine principum': Reading and Writing Politics at Court and University, c. 1275–c. 1525* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

Brown, Peter, 'Higden's Britain', in *Medieval Europeans: Studies in Ethnic Identity and National Perspectives in Medieval Europe*, ed. by Alfred P. Smyth (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002), pp. 103–18

Brown, R. Allen, *Rochester Castle* (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1969)

Brown, Warren, *Violence in Medieval Europe* (Harlow: Longman, 2011)

Burman, Barbara, and Ariane Fennetaux, *The Artful Pocket: A Social History of an Everyday Object in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Britain* (London: Routledge, forthcoming)

Butterfield, Ardis, *The Familiar Enemy: Chaucer, Language, and Nation in the Hundred Years War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)

Campbell, James, 'England, Scotland and the Hundred Years War in the Fourteenth Century', in *Europe in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. by John R. Hale, John R. L. Highfield, and Beryl Smalley (London: Faber, 1965), pp. 184–216

Carlson, David R., *John Gower: Poetry and Propaganda in Fourteenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2012)

Carolus-Barre, Louis, 'Benoit XII et la mission charitable de Bertrand Carit dans les pays dévastatés du nord de la France (Cambrésis, Vermandois, Thiérache)', *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, 62 (1950), 165–232

Cary, George, *The Medieval Alexander*, ed. by David J. A. Ross (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956)

Chandler, Jed, 'Eunuchs of the Grail', in *Castration and Culture in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Larissa Tracy (Woodbridge: Brewer, 2013), pp. 229–54

Chareyron, Nicole, *Jean le Bel: Le Maître de Froissart, grand imagier de la guerre de Cent Ans* (Bruxelles: De Boeck Université, 1996)

———, 'La Sauvage Ecosse dans la *Chronique* de Jean le Bel', in *Nouveaux Mondes et mondes nouveaux au Moyen Âge*, ed. by Danielle Buschinger and Wolfgang Spiewok (Greifswald: Reineke-Verlag, 1994), pp. 19–27

Christoph, Siegfried, 'Violence Stylized', in *Violence in Medieval Courtly Literature: A Casebook*, ed. by Albrecht Classen (New York: Routledge, 2004), pp. 110–19

Chroust, Anton-Hermann, 'The Corporate Idea and the Body Politic in the Middle Ages', *Review of Politics*, 9 (1947), 423–52

Clarke, Catherine A. M., 'Crossing the Rublicon: History, Authority and Civil War in Twelfth-Century England', in *War and Literature*, ed. by Laura Ashe and Ian Patterson (Cambridge: Brewer, 2014), pp. 61–83

Clarke, Maude V., and Vivian H. Galbraith, 'The Deposition of Richard II', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 14 (1930), 125–81

Clasper, Jon, 'The Management of Military Wounds in the Middle Ages', in *Wounds in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Anne Kirkham and Cordelia Warr (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), pp. 17–39

Classen, Albrecht, 'Introduction', in *War and Peace: Critical Issues in European Societies and Literature, 800–1800*, ed. by Albrecht Classen and Nadia Margolis (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), pp. 1–78

Clinton, Susan M., 'The Latin Manuscript Tradition in England of the *De proprietatibus rerum* of Bartholomaeus Anglicus: An Analysis Based on Book Ten' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1982)

Coates, Anthony J., *The Ethics of War*, 2nd edn (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016)

Cohen, Esther, 'The Expression of Pain in the Later Middle Ages: Deliverance, Acceptance and Infamy', in *Bodily Extremities: Preoccupations with the Human Body in Early Modern European Culture*, ed. by Florike Egmond and Robert Zwijnenberg (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2013), pp. 195–219

———, 'The Meaning of the Head in High Medieval Literature', in *Disembodied Heads in Medieval and Early Modern Culture*, ed. by Catrien Santing, Barbara Baert, and Traninger Anita (Leiden: Brill, 2013), pp. 59–76

———, *The Modulated Scream: Pain in Late Medieval Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009)

Cohen, Philip, 'Textual Instability, Literary Studies, and Recent Developments in Textual Scholarship', in *Texts and Textuality: Textual Instability, Theory, and Interpretation*, ed. by Philip Cohen (New York: Garland, 1997), pp. xi–xxxiv

Coleman, Janet, *English Literature in History, 1350–1400: Medieval Readers and Writers* (London: Hutchinson, 1981)

Contamine, Philippe, 'Froissart: Art militaire, pratique et conception de la guerre', in *Froissart, Historian*, ed. by John J. N. Palmer (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1981), pp. 132–44, 180–81

———, *La Guerre au Moyen Âge*, 6th edn (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2003)

———, 'Guerre et paix à la fin du Moyen Âge: L'Action et la pensée de Philippe de Mézières (1327–1405)', in *Krieg im Mittelalter*, ed. by Hans-Henning Kortüm (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2001), pp. 181–96

Contamine, Philippe, *Guerre, état et société à la fin du Moyen Âge: Études sur les armées des rois de France, 1337–1494* (Paris: Mouton, 1972)

———, 'L'Idée de guerre à la fin du Moyen Âge: Aspects juridiques et éthiques', *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres*, 123 (1979), 70–86

———, 'Penser la guerre et la paix à la fin du XIV^e^ siècle: Honoré Bouvet (v. 1345–v. 1410)', *Quaestiones Medii Aevi novae*, 4 (1999), 3–19

Colker, Marvin L., 'A Previously Unknown Manuscript of the *Gesta Henrici Quinti*', *Revue d'histoire des textes*, 12–13 (1985), 401–05

Cooper, Helen, 'Speaking for the Victim', in *Writing War: Medieval Literary Responses to Warfare*, ed. by Corinne J. Saunders, Françoise Le Saux, and Neil Thomas (Cambridge: Brewer, 2004), pp. 213–31

Coote, Lesley A., *Prophecy and Public Affairs in Later Medieval England* (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2000)

Cormier, Raymond, 'Brutality and Violence in Medieval French Romance and its Consequences', in *Violence in Medieval Courtly Literature: A Casebook*, ed. by Albrecht Classen (New York: Routledge, 2004), pp. 65–79

Coulson, Charles L. H., *Castles in Medieval Society: Fortresses in England, France, and Ireland in the Central Middle Ages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)

Courroux, Pierre, *L'Écriture de l'histoire dans les chroniques françaises (XII^e^–XV^e^ siècle)* (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2016)

———, 'Remarks on the Use of Numbers during Battles in Medieval Chronicles', in *The Medieval Chronicle XIII* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, forthcoming)

van Court, Elisa Narin, 'The *Siege of Jerusalem* and Augustinian Historians: Writing about Jews in Fourteenth-Century England', *Chaucer Review*, 29 (1995), 227–48

Cowan, Edward J., *'For freedom alone': The Declaration of Arbroath, 1320* (East Linton: Tuckwell, 2003)

———, 'Myth and Identity in Early Medieval Scotland', *Scottish Historical Review*, 63 (1984), 111–35

Cowdrey, Herbert E. J., 'The Peace and the Truce of God in the Eleventh Century', *Past & Present*, 46 (1970), 42–67

Cox, Rory, 'Asymmetric Warfare and Military Conduct in the Middle Ages', *Journal of Medieval History*, 38 (2012), 100–25

———, *John Wyclif on War and Peace* (London: Royal Historical Society, 2014)

———, 'A Law of War? English Protection and Destruction of Ecclesiastical Property during the Fourteenth Century', *English Historical Review*, 128 (2013), 1381–1417

Crane, Conrad C., '"Contrary to our National Ideals": American Strategic Bombing of Civilians in World War II', in *Civilians in the Path of War*, ed. by Mark Grimsley and Clifford J. Rogers (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002), pp. 219–49

Crick, Julia, 'Two Newly Located Manuscripts of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia regum Britanniae*', *Arthurian Literature*, 13 (1995), 151–56

Croenen, Godfried, 'La Guerre en Normandie au XIV^e^ siècle et le problème de l'évolution textuelle des *Chroniques* de Jean Froissart', in *La Guerre en Normandie, XI^e^–XV^e^ siècles*, ed. by Anne Curry (Caen: Presses Universitaires de Caen, 2018 forthcoming)

———, 'La Tradition manuscrite du troisième livre des *Chroniques* de Froissart', in *Froissart à la cour de Béarn: L'Écrivain, les arts et le pouvoir*, ed. by Valérie Fasseur (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009), pp. 15–59

Curry, Anne, *The Hundred Years War*, 2nd edn (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003)

———, 'The Military Ordinances of Henry V: Texts and Contexts', in *War, Government and Aristocracy in the British Isles, c. 1150–1500: Essays in Honour of Michael Prestwich*, ed. by Chris Given-Wilson, Ann Kettle, and Len Scales (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008), pp. 214–49

———, 'Snatching Defeat from the Jaws of Victory: French Responses to Agincourt', *Proceedings of the Western Society for French History*, 28 (2002), 177–87

Cushway, Graham, *Edward III and the War at Sea: The English Navy, 1327–1377* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2011)

Cuttler, Simon H., *The Law of Treason and Treason Trials in Later Medieval France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981)

David, Sumithra J., 'Looking East and West: The Reception and Dissemination of the *Topographia Hibernica* and the *Itinerarium ad partes orientales* in England, 1185–*c.* 1500' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of St Andrews, 2009)

Dean, Ruth J., 'The Earliest Known Commentary on Livy Is by Nicholas Trevet', *Medievalia et Humanistica*, 3, 4 (1945, 1946), 86–98, 110

Dean, Ruth J., and Maureen B. M. Boulton, *Anglo-Norman Literature: A Guide to Texts and Manuscripts*, Anglo-Norman Text Society, Occasional Publications Series, 3 (London: Anglo-Norman Text Society, 1999)

Delehanty, William M., '*Milites* in the Narrative Sources of England, 1135–1154' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, 1975)

Denifle, Heinrich, *La Guerre de Cent Ans et la désolation des églises, monastères & hopitaux en France*, 2 vols (Paris: Picard, 1897–99)

DeVries, Kelly, 'Catapults Are Not Atomic Bombs: Towards a Redefinition of "Effectiveness" in Premodern Military Technology', *War in History*, 4 (1997), 454–70

DeVries, Kelly, 'Contemporary Views of Edward III's Failure at the Siege of Tournai, 1340', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 39 (1995), 70–105

———, 'French and English Acceptance of Medieval Gunpowder Weaponry', *Journal of Medieval Military History*, 11 (2013), 259–70

———, 'God, Leadership, Flemings, and Archery: Contemporary Perceptions of Victory and Defeat at the Battle of Sluys, 1340', *American Neptune*, 55 (1995), 223–42

———, 'Hunger, Flemish Participation and the Flight of Philip VI: Contemporary Accounts of the Siege of Calais, 1346–47', *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, n.s., 12 (1991), 129–81

———, 'The Impact of Gunpowder Weaponry on Siege Warfare in the Hundred Years War', in *The Medieval City under Siege*, ed. by Ivy A. Corfis and Michael Wolfe (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1995), pp. 227–44

———, *Infantry Warfare in the Early Fourteenth Century: Discipline, Tactics, and Technology* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1996)

———, 'Technological Determinisms of Victory at the Battle of Agincourt', *British Journal for Military History*, 2 (2015), 2–14

———, 'The Use of Chronicles in Recreating Medieval Military History', *Journal of Medieval Military History*, 2 (2004), 1–16

———, '"The walls come tumbling down": The Campaigns of Philip the Good and the Myth of Fortification Vulnerability to Early Gunpowder Weapons', in *The Hundred Years War: A Wider Focus*, ed. by L. J. Andrew Villalon and Donald J. Kagay (Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 429–46

DeVries, Kelly, and Robert Douglas Smith, *Medieval Military Technology*, 2nd edn (North York: University of Toronto Press, 2012)

Docker, John, 'The Origins of Massacres', in *Theatres of Violence: Massacre, Mass Killing and Atrocity throughout History*, ed. by Philip G. Dwyer and Lyndall Ryan (New York: Berghahn Books, 2012), pp. 3–16

Doig, James A., 'Political Propaganda and Royal Proclamations in Late Medieval England', *Historical Research*, 71 (1998), 253–80

Drukker, Tamar S., 'An Eye-Witness Account or Literary Historicism? John Page's *Siege of Rouen*', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s., 36 (2005), 251–73

———, 'Vision and History: Prophecy in the Middle English Prose *Brut* Chronicle', *Arthuriana*, 12 (2002), 25–49

Duby, Georges, *Les Trois ordres, ou l'imaginaire du féodalisme* (Paris: Gallimard, 1978)

Dunphy, R. Graeme, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle* (Leiden: Brill, 2010–) <referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/encyclopedia-of-the-medieval-chronicle>

Dupuy, Mark, 'A "Clock-and-Bow" Story: Late Medieval Technology from Monastic Evidence', *Journal of Medieval Military History*, 5 (2007), 70–83

Edwards, Anthony S. G., 'The Authorship of the Poems of Laurence Minot: A Reconsideration', *Florilegium*, 23 (2006), 145–53

———, 'Notes on the *Polychronicon*', *Notes and Queries*, 223 (1978), 2–3

Edwards, Anthony S. G., and Daniel Davies, 'A New Manuscript of *Knyghthode and Bataile*', *Medium Ævum*, 87 (2018), 137–41

Edwards, Anthony S. G., and James Freeman, 'Further Manuscripts of Higden's *Polychronicon*', *Notes and Queries*, 2016, 522–24

Fallows, Noel, *Jousting in Medieval and Renaissance Iberia* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2010)

Favret, Mary A., 'A Feeling for Numbers: Representing the Scale of the War Dead', in *War and Literature*, ed. by Laura Ashe and Ian Patterson (Woodbridge: Brewer, 2014), pp. 185–204

Finó, José, *Forteresses de la France médiévale: Construction, attaque, défense*, 3rd edn (Paris: Picard, 1977)

Fisher, David, *Morality and War: Can War Be Just in the Twenty-First Century?* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)

Fleischman, Suzanne, 'On the Representation of History and Fiction in the Middle Ages', *History and Theory*, 22 (1983), 278–310

Flood, Victoria, *Prophecy, Politics and Place in Medieval England: From Geoffrey of Monmouth to Thomas of Erceldoune* (Woodbridge: Brewer, 2016)

Foard, Glenn, and Anne Curry, *Bosworth, 1485: A Battlefield Rediscovered* (Oxford: Oxbow, 2013)

Forrai, Réka, 'Anastasius Bibliotecarius and his Textual Dossiers: Greek Collections and their Latin Transmission in 9th Century Rome', in *L'Antiquité tardive dans les collections médiévales: Textes et représentations, VI^e–XIV^e siècle*, ed. by Stéphane Gioanni and Benoît Grévin (Roma: École française de Rome, 2008), pp. 319–37

Forhan, Kate L., 'Poets and Politics: Just War in Geoffrey Chaucer and Christine de Pizan', in *Ethics, Nationalism, and Just War: Medieval and Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. by Henrik Syse and Gregory M. Reichberg (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2007), pp. 99–116

Freeman, James, 'The Manuscript Dissemination and Readership of the *Polychronicon* of Ranulph Higden, *c*. 1330–*c*. 1500' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge, 2013)

Fuwa, Yuri, 'A "Just War"? A Further Reassessment of the Alliterative *Morte Arthure*', in *War and Peace: Critical Issues in European Societies and Literature, 800–1800*, ed. by Albrecht Classen and Nadia Margolis (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), pp. 349–76

Galbraith, Vivian H., 'An Autograph MS of Ranulph Higden's *Polychronicon*', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 23 (1959), 1–18

———, 'Extracts from the *Historia aurea* and a French "Brut" (1317–47)', *English Historical Review*, 43 (1928), 203–17

———, 'The *Historia aurea* of John, Vicar of Tynemouth, and the Sources of the *St Albans Chronicle* (1327–1377)', in *Essays in History Presented to Reginald Lane Poole*, ed. by Henry W. C. Davis (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927), pp. 379–98

———, 'Nationality and Language in Medieval England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 4th ser., 23 (1941), 113–28

———, 'Thomas Walsingham and the *Saint Albans Chronicle*, 1272–1422', *English Historical Review*, 47 (1932), 12–30

Galderisi, Claudio, ed., *Translations médiévales: Cinq siècles de traductions en français au Moyen Âge, XI^e–XV^e siècles*, 2 vols (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011)

Galloway, Andrew, 'The Borderlands of Satire: Linked, Opposed, and Exchanged Political Poetry during the Scottish and English Wars of the Early Fourteenth Century', in *The Anglo-Scottish Border and the Shaping of Identity, 1300–1600*, ed. by Mark P. Bruce and Katherine H. Terrell (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), pp. 15–31

Geck, John A., 'Chivalry', in *Handbook of Medieval Studies: Terms, Methods, Trends*, ed. by Albrecht Classen, 3 vols (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), pp. 1459–68

Geldof, Mark R., '"And describe the shapes of the dead": Making Sense of the Archaeology of Armed Violence', in *Wounds and Wound Repair in Medieval Culture*, ed. by Larissa Tracy and Kelly DeVries (Leiden: Brill, 2015), pp. 57–80

Gilbert, James E., 'A Medieval "Rosie the Riveter"? Women in France and Southern England during the Hundred Years War', in *The Hundred Years War: A Wider Focus*, ed. by L. J. Andrew Villalon and Donald J. Kagay (Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 333–63

Gillingham, John, '1066 and the Introduction of Chivalry into England', in *Law and Government in Medieval England and Normandy: Essays in Honour of Sir James Holt*, ed. by George Garnett and John Hudson (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 31–55

———, 'Conquering the Barbarians: War and Chivalry in Twelfth-Century Britain', *Haskins Society Journal*, 4 (1992), 67–84

Gillingham, John, 'Killing and Mutilating Political Enemies in the British Isles from the Late Twelfth to the Early Fourteenth Century: A Comparative Study', in *Britain and Ireland, 900–1300: Insular Responses to Medieval European Change*, ed. by Brendan Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 114–34

———, 'Richard I and the Science of War', in *War and Government in the Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of J. O. Prestwich*, ed. by John Gillingham and James C. Holt (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1984), pp. 78–91

———, 'Surrender in Medieval Europe: An Indirect Approach', in *How Fighting Ends: A History of Surrender*, ed. by Holger Afflerbach and Hew Strachan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 55–72

———, '"Up with Orthodoxy!" In Defense of Vegetian Warfare', *Journal of Medieval Military History*, 2 (2004), 149–58

Gist, Margaret Adlum, *Love and War in the Middle English Romances* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1947)

Given-Wilson, Chris, 'Chronicles of the Mortimer Family, *c.* 1250–1450', in *Family and Dynasty in Late Medieval England: Proceedings of the 1997 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. by Richard Eales and Shaun Tyas (Donington: Tyas, 2003), pp. 67–86

———, *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England* (London: Hambledon, 2004)

———, 'Official and Semi-Official History in the Later Middle Ages: The English Evidence in Context', in *The Medieval Chronicle V*, ed. by Erik Kooper (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2008), pp. 1–16

Goldstein, R. James, *The Matter of Scotland: Historical Narrative in Medieval Scotland* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993)

Göller, Karl Heinz, 'Arthurian Chivalry and War in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries: History and Fiction', in *Spätmittelalterliche Artusliteratur: Ein Symposion der neusprachlichen Philologien auf der Generalversammlung der Görres-Gesellschaft Bonn, 25.–29. September 1982*, ed. by Karl Heinz Göller (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1984), pp. 53–68

———, 'Reality versus Romance: A Reassessment of the Alliterative *Morte Arthur*', in *The Alliterative 'Morte Arthure': A Reassessment of the Poem*, ed. by Karl Heinz Göller (Cambridge: Brewer, 1981), pp. 15–29, 157–59

———, 'War and Peace in the Middle English Romances and Chaucer', in *War and Peace in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Brian Patrick McGuire (København: Reitzel, 1987), pp. 118–45

———, 'War and Peace in the Works of Chaucer and his Contemporaries', in *Die Geisteswissenschaften stellen sich vor*, ed. by Wolfram Krömer and Osmund Menghin (Innsbruck: Kommissionsverlag der Österreichischen Kommissionsbuchhandlung, 1983), pp. 213–22

Goodich, Michael E., *Violence and Miracle in the Fourteenth Century: Private Grief and Public Salvation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995)

Gransden, Antonia, *Historical Writing in England*, 2 vols (London: Routledge, 1974–82)

———, 'Prologues in the Historiography of Twelfth-Century England', in *England in the Twelfth Century: Proceedings of the 1988 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. by Daniel Williams (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1990), pp. 55–81

———, 'Silent Meanings in Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon* and in Thomas Elmham's *Liber Metricus de Henrico Quinto*', *Medium Ævum*, 46 (1977), 231–40

Grant, Alexander, 'The Death of John Comyn: What Was Going On?', *Scottish Historical Review*, 86 (2007), 176–224

———, 'Disaster at Neville's Cross: The Scottish Point of View', in *The Battle of Neville's Cross, 1346*, ed. by David Rollason and Michael Prestwich (Stamford: Tyas, 1998), pp. 15–35

Green, David, *Edward the Black Prince: Power in Medieval Europe* (Harlow: Longman, 2007)

———, *The Hundred Years War: A People's History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014)

———, 'Masculinity and Medicine: Thomas Walsingham and the Death of the Black Prince', *Journal of Medieval History*, 35 (2009), 34–51

———, 'National Identities and the Hundred Years War', in *Fourteenth-Century England VI*, ed. by Chris Given-Wilson (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2010), pp. 115–30

Green, Richard Firth, *Poets and Princepleasers: Literature and the English Court in the Late Middle Ages* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980)

Gribit, Nicholas A., *Henry of Lancaster's Expedition to Aquitaine, 1345–46: Military Service and Professionalism in the Hundred Years War* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2016)

Grossman, Dave, *On Killing: The Psychological Cost of Learning to Kill in War and Society*, 2nd edn (New York: Back Bay Books, 2009)

Haines, Keith, 'Attitudes and Impediments to Pacifism in Medieval Europe', *Journal of Medieval History*, 7 (1981), 369–88

Hall, Bert S., 'The Changing Face of Siege Warfare: Technology and Tactics in Transition', in *The Medieval City under Siege*, ed. by Ivy A. Corfis and Michael Wolfe (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1995), pp. 257–75

———, *Weapons and Warfare in Renaissance Europe: Gunpowder, Technology, and Tactics* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997)

Halsall, Guy, 'Violence and Society in the Early Medieval West: An Introductory Survey', in *Violence and Society in the Early Medieval West*, ed. by Guy Halsall (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1998), pp. 1–45

Halsall, Guy, *Warfare and Society in the Barbarian West, 450–900* (London: Routledge, 2003)

Hamel, Mary, 'An Anthology for the Armchair Traveller: London, British Library, MS Arundel 123', *Manuscripta*, 41 (1997), 3–18

Handel, Michael I., *Masters of War: Classical Strategic Thought*, 3rd edn (London: Cass, 2001)

Hanley, Catherine, *War and Combat, 1150–1270: The Evidence from Old French Literature* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2003)

Hanly, Michael, 'Philippe de Mézières and the Peace Movement', in *Philippe de Mézières and his Age: Piety and Politics in the Fourteenth Century*, ed. by Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski and Kiril Petkov (Leiden: Brill, 2012), pp. 61–82

Harari, Yuval Noah, 'Inter-Frontal Cooperation in the Fourteenth Century and Edward III's 1346 Campaign', *War in History*, 6 (1999), 379–95

———, *Renaissance Military Memoirs: War, History, and Identity, 1450–1600* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004)

———, 'Scholars, Eyewitnesses, and Flesh-Witnesses of War: A Tense Relationship', *Partial Answers*, 7 (2009), 213–28

———, 'Strategy and Supply in Fourteenth-Century Western European Invasion Campaigns', *Journal of Military History*, 64 (2000), 297–333

Hardy, Robert, 'The Longbow', in *Arms, Armies and Fortifications in the Hundred Years War*, ed. by Anne Curry and Michael Hughes (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1994), pp. 161–82

Hartigan, Richard Shelly, 'Saint Augustine on War and Killing: The Problem of the Innocent', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 27 (1966), 195–204

Hay, David J., '"Collateral Damage?" Civilian Casualties in the Early Ideologies of Chivalry and Crusade', in *Noble Ideals and Bloody Realities: Warfare in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Niall Christie and Maya Yazigi (Leiden: Brill, 2006), pp. 3–25

Hazard, Benjamin, 'A Manuscript Copy of the *Declaration of Arbroath* from the Roman Archives of Fr. Luke Wadding (1588–1657)', *Scottish Historical Review*, 90 (2011), 296–315

Head, Thomas, 'The Development of the Peace of God in Aquitaine, 970–1005', *Speculum*, 74 (1999), 656–86

Heather, Peter, 'The Barbarian in Late Antiquity: Image, Reality and Transformation', in *Constructing Identities in Late Antiquity*, ed. by Richard Miles (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 234–58

Hebron, Malcolm, *The Medieval Siege: Theme and Image in Middle English Romance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997)

Heullant-Donat, Isabelle, 'Les Prologues des chroniques universelles à la fin du Moyen Âge', in *Les Prologues Médiévaux. Actes du colloque international organisé par l'Academia Belgica et l'École française de Rome avec le concours de la F.I.D.E.M. (Rome, 26–28 mars 1998)*, ed. by Jacqueline Hamesse (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), pp. 573–91

Hewitt, Herbert J., *The Black Prince's Expedition of 1355–57* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1958)

———, *The Organization of War under Edward III, 1338–62* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1966)

Hitchin, Paul, 'The Bowman and the Bow', in *The Battle of Agincourt, 1415*, ed. by Anne Curry (Stroud: Tempus, 2000), pp. 37–52

Holladay, Joan A., 'Charting the Past: Visual Configurations of Myth and History and the English Claim to Scotland', in *Representing History, 900–1300: Art, Music, History*, ed. by Robert A. Maxwell (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2010), pp. 115–32, 232–35

Hoskins, Peter, *In the Steps of the Black Prince: The Road to Poitiers, 1355–1356* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2013)

Hosler, John D., *John of Salisbury: Military Authority of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance* (Leiden: Brill, 2013)

———, 'Reframing the Conversation on Medieval Military Strategy', *Journal of Medieval Military History*, 16 (2018 forthcoming)

Hughes, Michael, 'The Fourteenth-Century French Raids on Hampshire and the Isle of Wight', in *Arms, Armies and Fortifications in the Hundred Years War*, ed. by Anne Curry and Michael Hughes (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1994), pp. 121–44

Huizinga, Johan, *The Autumn of the Middle Ages*, trans. by Rodney J. Payton and Ulrich Mammitzsch (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996)

———, 'La Valeur politique et militaire des idées de chevalerie a la fin du Moyen Âge', *Revue d'histoire diplomatique*, 35 (1921), 126–38

Jacobus, Laura, 'Motherhood and Massacre: The Massacre of the Innocents in Late Medieval Art and Drama', in *The Massacre in History*, ed. by Mark Levene and Penny Roberts (Providence: Berghahn Books, 1999), pp. 39–54

Johnson, James Turner, *Ideology, Reason, and the Limitation of War: Religious and Secular Concepts, 1200–1740* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975)

———, *Just War Tradition and the Restraint of War: A Moral and Historical Inquiry* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981)

Johnson, James Turner, 'Maintaining the Protection of Non-Combatants', in *Ethics, Nationalism, and Just War: Medieval and Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. by Henrik Syse and Gregory M. Reichberg (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2007), pp. 151–89

———, 'The Meaning of Non-Combatant Immunity in the Just War/Limited War Tradition', *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 39 (1971), 151–70

Johnson, Lesley, 'Imagining Communities: Medieval and Modern', in *Concepts of National Identity in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Simon Forde, Lesley Johnson, and Alan V. Murray (Leeds: Leeds Studies in English, 1995), pp. 1–19

Jones, Michael C. E., 'War and Fourteenth-Century France', in *Arms, Armies and Fortifications in the Hundred Years War*, ed. by Anne Curry and Michael Hughes (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1994), pp. 103–20

Jones, Michael K., *The Black Prince* (London: Head of Zeus, 2017)

Jones, Richard L. C., 'Fortifications and Sieges in Western Europe, *c*. 800–1450', in *Medieval Warfare: A History*, ed. by Maurice Keen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 163–85

Jones, Terry, *Chaucer's Knight: The Portrait of a Medieval Mercenary*, 1st edn (London: Weidenfeld, 1980)

———, *Chaucer's Knight: The Portrait of a Medieval Mercenary*, 2nd edn (London: Methuen, 1994)

Jones, William R., 'The English Church and Royal Propaganda during the Hundred Years War', *Journal of British Studies*, 19 (1979), 18–30

Jost, Jean, 'Why is Middle English Romance so Violent? The Literary and Aesthetic Purposes of Violence', in *Violence in Medieval Courtly Literature: A Casebook*, ed. by Albrecht Classen (New York: Routledge, 2004), pp. 223–47

Kaeuper, Richard W., *Chivalry and Violence in Medieval Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)

———, *Holy Warriors: The Religious Ideology of Chivalry* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009)

———, *Medieval Chivalry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016)

———, 'Medieval Warfare: Representation Then and Now', in *Representing War and Violence, 1250–1600*, ed. by Joanna Bellis and Laura Slater (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2016), pp. 23–38

———, 'Vengeance and Mercy in Chivalric Mentalité', in *Peace and Protection in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Thomas B. Lambert and David Rollason (Durham: Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, Durham University, 2009), pp. 168–80

Kaiser, Robert E., 'The Medieval English Longbow', *Journal of the Society of Archer-Antiquaries*, 23 (1980), 21–29

Keegan, John, *The Face of Battle* (New York: Viking Press, 1976)

Keeler, Laura, *Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Late Latin Chroniclers, 1300–1500* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1946)

Keen, Maurice, 'Brotherhood in Arms', *History*, 47 (1962), 1–17

———, 'Chaucer and Chivalry Revisited', in *Armies, Chivalry and Warfare in Medieval Britain and France: Proceedings of the 1995 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. by Matthew Strickland (Stamford: Watkins, 1998), pp. 1–12

———, 'Chaucer's Knight, the English Aristocracy and the Crusade', in *English Court Culture in the Later Middle Ages: Papers from the Colston Research Society Symposium, Bristol University, 1981*, ed. by Vincent J. Scattergood and James W. Sherborne (London: Duckworth, 1983), pp. 45–61

———, *Chivalry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984)

———, 'Chivalry, Heralds, and History', in *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Richard William Southern*, ed. by Ralph H. C. Davis (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), pp. 393–414

———, 'Chivalry, Nobility, and the Man-At-Arms', in *War, Literature and Politics in the Late Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of G. W. Coopland*, ed. by Christopher Allmand (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1976), pp. 32–45

———, 'Huizinga, Kilgour and the Decline of Chivalry', *Medievalia et Humanistica*, 8 (1977), 1–20

———, *The Laws of War in the Late Middle Ages* (London: Routledge, 1965)

———, 'Richard II's Ordinances of War of 1385', in *Rulers and Ruled in Late Medieval England: Essays Presented to Gerald Harriss*, ed. by Rowena E. Archer and Simon Walker (London: Hambledon, 1995), pp. 33–48

Kehnel, Annette, 'The Narrative Tradition of the Medieval Franciscan Friars on the British Isles: Introduction to the Sources', *Franciscan Studies*, 63 (2005), 461–530

Kempshall, Matthew, *Rhetoric and the Writing of History, 400–1500* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011)

Ker, Neil R., and others, *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries*, 5 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969–2002)

Kilgour, Raymond, *The Decline of Chivalry as Shown in the French Literature of the Late Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937)

———, 'Honoré Bonet: A Fourteenth-Century Critic of Chivalry', *PMLA*, 50 (1935), 352–61

King, Andy, '"According to the custom used in French and Scottish wars": Prisoners and Casualties on the Scottish Marches in the Fourteenth Century', *Journal of Medieval History*, 28 (2002), 263–90

———, 'Best of Enemies: Were the Fourteenth-Century Anglo-Scottish Marches a "Frontier Society"?', in *England and Scotland in the Fourteenth Century: New Perspectives*, ed. by Andy King and Michael Penman (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), pp. 116–35

———, '"Then a great misfortune befell them": The Laws of War on Surrender and the Killing of Prisoners on the Battlefield in the Hundred Years War', *Journal of Medieval History*, 43 (2017), 106–17

———, 'War and Peace: A Knight's Tale. The Ethics of War in Sir Thomas Gray's *Scalacronica*', in *War, Government and Aristocracy in the British Isles, c. 1150–1500: Essays in Honour of Michael Prestwich*, ed. by Chris Given-Wilson, Ann Kettle, and Len Scales (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008), pp. 148–62

King, Andy, and Claire Etty, *England and Scotland, 1286–1603* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016)

King, Andy, and Julia Marvin, 'A Warning to the Incurious: M. R. James, the *Scalacronica* and the Anglo-Norman Prose *Brut* Chronicle', in *The Medieval Chronicle V*, ed. by Erik Kooper (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2008), pp. 129–45

Kingsford, Charles, *English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913)

Kinsella, Helen M., *The Image before the Weapon: A Critical History of the Distinction between Combatant and Civilian* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011)

Kittang, Atle, 'Authors, Authorship, and Work: A Brief Theoretical Survey', in *Modes of Authorship in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Slavica Ranković (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2012), pp. 17–29

Knüsel, Christopher, and Anthea Boylston, 'How Has the Towton Project Contributed to our Knowledge of Medieval and Later Warfare?', in *Blood Red Roses: The Archaeology of a Mass Grave from the Battle of Towton, AD 1461*, ed. by Veronica Fiorato, Anthea Boylston, and Christopher Knüsel (Oxford: Oxbow, 2000), pp. 169–88

Kortüm, Hans-Henning, 'Surrender in Medieval Times', in *How Fighting Ends: A History of Surrender*, ed. by Holger Afflerbach and Hew Strachan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 41–54

Kristeller, Paul Oskar, and others, eds, *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum: Medieval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries*, 11 vols so far (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1960–)

Krug, Ilana, 'Complaint Literature: The Voice of the People, or Literary Formulae?', *Medieval Perspectives*, 27 (2012), 125–35

Krug, Ilana, 'Purveyance and Peasants at the Beginning of the Hundred Years War: Maddicott Reexamined', in *The Hundred Years War (Part II): Different Vistas*, ed. by L. J. Andrew Villalon and Donald J. Kagay (Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 345–65

Laborderie, Olivier de, *Histoire, mémoire et pouvoir: Les Généalogies en rouleau des rois d'Angleterre, 1250–1422* (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2013)

Lachaud, Frédérique, 'Un *miroir au prince* méconnu: Le *De nobilitatibus, sapienciis et prudenciis regum* de Walter Milemete (vers 1326–1327)', in *Guerre, pouvoir et noblesse au Moyen Âge: Mélanges en l'honneur de Philippe Contamine*, ed. by Jacques Paviot and Jacques Verger (Paris: Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 2000), pp. 401–10

Lacey, Helen, 'Protection and Immunity in Later Medieval England', in *Peace and Protection in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Thomas B. Lambert and David Rollason (Durham: Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, Durham University, 2009), pp. 78–96

Lambert, Craig L., 'Edward III's Siege of Calais: A Reappraisal', *Journal of Medieval History*, 37 (2011), 245–56

Lavezzo, Kathy, *Angels on the Edge of the World: Geography, Literature, and English Community, 1000–1534* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006)

Le Saux, Françoise, 'War and Knighthood in Christine de Pizan's *Livre des faits d'armes et de chevallerie*', in *Writing War: Medieval Literary Responses to Warfare*, ed. by Corinne J. Saunders, Françoise Le Saux, and Neil Thomas (Cambridge: Brewer, 2004), pp. 93–105

Lee, Dongchoon, 'Church Reformers' Ideas of Warfare and Peace in Fourteenth-Century England: William Langland', *Medieval and Early Modern English Studies*, 14 (2006), 115–37

Leeds, Josiah, *Wiclif's Anti-War Views*, 2nd edn (London: Friends Tract Association, 1902)

Leroux, Alfred, 'Le Sac de la cité de Limoges et son relèvement, 1370–1464', *Bulletin de la société archéologique & historique du Limousin*, 56 (1906), 155–233

Lester, Geoffrey, *Sir John Paston's 'Grete Boke': A Descriptive Catalogue, with an Introduction of British Library, Manuscript Lansdowne 285* (Cambridge: Brewer, 1984)

Little, Andrew G., 'The Authorship of the *Lanercost Chronicle*', *English Historical Review*, 31–32 (1916–17), 269–79, 48–49

———, 'Chronicles of the Mendicant Friars', in *Franciscan Essays II*, ed. by Francis C. Burkitt, Harold E. Goad, and Andrew G. Little, British Society of Franciscan Studies, Extra Series, 3 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1932), pp. 85–103

Livingston, Michael, 'Counting the Dead at Crécy', in *The Battle of Crécy: A Casebook*, ed. by Michael Livingston and Kelly DeVries (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2015), pp. 485–89

Livingston, Michael, '"The depth of six inches": Prince Hal's Head-Wound at the Battle of Shrewsbury', in *Wounds and Wound Repair in Medieval Culture*, ed. by Larissa Tracy and Kelly DeVries (Leiden: Brill, 2015), pp. 215–30

———, 'The Location of the Battle of Crécy', in *The Battle of Crécy: A Casebook*, ed. by Michael Livingston and Kelly DeVries (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2015), pp. 415–38

———, 'Losses Uncountable: The Context of Crécy', in *The Battle of Crécy: A Casebook*, ed. by Michael Livingston and Kelly DeVries (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2015), pp. 1–13

Livingstone, Marilyn, and Morgan Witzel, *The Road to Crécy: The English Invasion of France, 1346* (Harlow: Longman, 2005)

Lomas, Richard A., 'The Durham Landscape and the Battle of Neville's Cross', in *The Battle of Neville's Cross, 1346*, ed. by David Rollason and Michael Prestwich (Stamford: Tyas, 1998), pp. 66–77

Lord, Albert B., *The Singer of Tales*, ed. by Stephen Mitchell and Gregory Nagy, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000)

———, *The Singer Resumes the Tale*, ed. by Mary Louise Lord (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995)

Lowe, Ben, *Imagining Peace: A History of Early English Pacifist Ideas* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997)

Lucas, Robert H., 'Mediaeval French Translations of the Latin Classics to 1500', *Speculum*, 45 (1970), 225–53

Luxford, Julian M., 'A Forgotten Medieval Benedictine Manuscript: The Annals in British Library, Cotton MS Vitellius D IX', *Scriptorium*, 55 (2001), 298–306

Lynch, Andrew, 'Beyond Shame: Chivalric Cowardice and Arthurian Narrative', *Arthurian Literature*, 23 (2006), 1–17

———, 'Emotion and "Violence": The Alliterative *Morte Arthure* and *The Siege of Jerusalem*', in *Writing War in Britain and France, 1370–1854: An Emotional History*, ed. by Stephanie Downes, Andrew Lynch, and Katrina O'Loughlin (London: Routledge, 2019 forthcoming)

Lynn, John, *Battle: A History of Combat and Culture*, 2nd edn (Boulder: Westview, 2004)

Macdonald, Alastair J., 'Two Kinds of War? Brutality and Atrocity in Later Medieval Scotland', in *Killing and Being Killed: Bodies in Battle. Perspectives on Fighters in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Jörg Rogge (Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2017), pp. 199–230

MacInnes, Iain A., *Scotland's Second War of Independence, 1332–57* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2016)

MacInnes, Iain A., '"To be annexed forever to the English Crown": The English Occupation of Southern Scotland, *c.* 1334–37', in *England and Scotland at War: New Perspectives*, ed. by Andy King and David Simpkin (Leiden: Brill, 2012), pp. 183–201

McLaren, Mary-Rose, *The London Chronicles of the Fifteenth Century: A Revolution in English Writing* (Woodbridge: Brewer, 2002)

Macray, William D., 'Robert Baston's Poem on the Battle of Bannockburn', *English Historical Review*, 19 (1904), 507–08

Marchello-Nizia, Christiane, 'L'Historien et son prologue: Forme littéraire et stratégies discursives', in *La Chronique et l'histoire au Moyen Âge. Colloque des 24 et 25 mai 1982*, ed. by Daniel Poirion (Paris: Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 1986), pp. 13–25

Marvin, Julia, 'Arthur Authorized: The Prophecies of the Prose *Brut* Chronicle', *Arthurian Literature*, 22 (2005), 84–99

———, 'Cannibalism as an Aspect of Famine in Two English Chronicles', in *Food and Eating in Medieval Europe*, ed. by Martha Carlin and Joel T. Rosenthal (London: Hambledon, 1998), pp. 73–86

———, *The Construction of Vernacular History in the Anglo-Norman Prose 'Brut' Chronicle: The Manuscript Culture of Late Medieval England* (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2017)

———, 'Narrative, Lineage, and Succession in the Anglo-Norman Prose *Brut* Chronicle', in *Broken Lines: Genealogical Literature in Late Medieval Britain and France*, ed. by Raluca L. Radulescu and Edward Donald Kennedy (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), pp. 205–20

Marvin, Laurence W., 'Atrocity and Massacre in the High and Late Middle Ages', in *Theatres of Violence: Massacre, Mass Killing and Atrocity throughout History*, ed. by Philip G. Dwyer and Lyndall Ryan (New York: Berghahn Books, 2012), pp. 50–62

Matheson, Lister M., *The Prose 'Brut': The Development of a Middle English Chronicle* (Tempe: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1998)

Matthews, David, 'Laurence Minot, Edward III, and Nationalism', *Viator*, 38 (2007), 269–88

———, *Writing to the King: Nation, Kingship and Literature in England, 1250–1350* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010)

Matthews, Williams, *The Tragedy of Arthur: A Study of the Alliterative 'Morte Arthure'* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960)

Mattox, John Mark, 'The Moral Limits of Military Deception', *Journal of Military Ethics*, 1 (2002), 4–15

McCall, John P., 'The Writings of John of Legnano, with a List of Manuscripts', *Traditio*, 23 (1967), 415–37

McGlynn, Sean, *By Sword and Fire: Cruelty and Atrocity in Medieval Warfare* (London: Weidenfeld, 2008)

———, '"Sheer Terror" and the Black Prince's Grand Chevauchee of 1355', in *The Hundred Years War (Part III): Further Considerations*, ed. by L. J. Andrew Villalon and Donald J. Kagay (Leiden: Brill, 2013), pp. 317–32

McHardy, Alison K., 'Some Reflections on Edward III's Use of Propaganda', in *The Age of Edward III*, ed. by James S. Bothwell (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2001), pp. 171–92

McNab, Bruce, 'Obligations of the Church in English Society: Military Arrays of the Clergy, 1369–1418', in *Order and Innovation in the Middle Ages: Essays in Honor of Joseph R. Strayer*, ed. by William C. Jordan, Bruce McNab, and Teofilo F. Ruiz (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976), pp. 293–314, 516–22

McVaugh, Michael, *The Rational Surgery of the Middle Ages* (Tavarnuzze: SISMEL, Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2006)

Medeiros, Marie-Thérèse de, 'De l'Ourthe a la Tyne: Jean le Bel, un précurseur de la destruction des mythes?', in *Et c'est la fin pour quoy sommes ensemble: Hommage à Jean Dufournet*, ed. by Jean-Claude Aubailly, 3 vols (Paris: Champion, 1993), II, 949–53

Merback, Mitchell B., *The Thief, the Cross and the Wheel: Pain and the Spectacle of Punishment in Medieval and Renaissance Europe* (London: Reaktion, 1999)

Meyer, Heinz, *Die Enzyklopädie des Bartholomäus Anglicus. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungs- und Rezeptionsgeschichte von 'De proprietatibus rerum'* (München: Fink, 2000)

Meyer, Paul, 'De quelques chroniques anglo-normandes qui ont porté le nom de *Brut*', *Bulletin de la Société des anciens textes français*, 4 (1878), 104–45

Minnis, Alastair, *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*, 2nd edn (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010)

Moeglin, Jean-Marie, 'Edouard III et les six bourgeois de Calais', *Revue historique*, 292 (1994), 230–67

Moffat, Ralph, 'The Importance of Being Harnest: Armour, Heraldry and Recognition in the Melee', in *Battle and Bloodshed: The Medieval World at War*, ed. by Lorna Bleach and Keira Borrill (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013), pp. 5–24

Moore, Samuel, 'Lawrence Minot', *Modern Language Notes*, 35 (1920), 78–81

Morillo, Stephen, 'Battle Seeking: The Contexts and Limits of Vegetian Strategy', *Journal of Medieval Military History*, 1 (2002), 21–42

———, 'Contrary Winds: Theories of History and the Limits of *Sachkritik*', in *The Medieval Way of War: Studies in Medieval Military History in Honor of Bernard S. Bachrach*, ed. by Gregory I. Halfond (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), pp. 205–22

Morillo, Stephen, 'Expecting Cowardice: Medieval Battle Tactics Reconsidered', *Journal of Medieval Military History*, 4 (2006), 65–73

———, 'A General Typology of Transcultural Wars: The Early Middle Ages and Beyond', in *Transcultural Wars from the Middle Ages to the 21st Century*, ed. by Hans-Henning Kortüm (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2006), pp. 29–42

———, '*Milites*, Knights and Samurai: Military Terminology, Comparative History, and the Problem of Translation', in *The Normans and their Adversaries at War: Essays in Memory of C. Warren Hollister*, ed. by Richard Abels and Bernard S. Bachrach (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2001), pp. 167–84

———, *Warfare under the Anglo-Norman Kings, 1066–1135* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1994)

Morosini, Giulia, 'The Body of the Condottiero: A Link between Physical Pain and Military Virtue as It Was Interpreted in Renaissance Italy', in *Killing and Being Killed: Bodies in Battle. Perspectives on Fighters in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Jörg Rogge (Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2017), pp. 165–97

Morris, John E., *Bannockburn* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914)

Mossé, Fernand, *A Handbook of Middle English*, trans. by James A. Walker (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1952)

Murray, Alan V., 'Biblical Quotations and Formulaic Language in the *Chronicle* of William of Tyre', in *Deeds Done beyond the Sea: Essays on William of Tyre, Cyprus and the Military Orders Presented to Peter Edbury*, ed. by Susan B. Edgington and Helen J. Nicholson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2014), pp. 25–34

———, 'Warriors and Civilians in the Crusade Movement: Military Identities and Status in the Liberation and Defence of the Holy Land (1096–1204)', *Millars: Espai i història*, 43 (2017), 97–127

Murray, Alexander, *Reason and Society in the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978)

Nall, Catherine, *Reading and War in Fifteenth-Century England: From Lydgate to Malory* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2012)

Neat, Helen L. M., 'Depictions of Violence in *Floriant et Florete*: Inter- and Intratextual Patterns', in *Battle and Bloodshed: The Medieval World at War*, ed. by Lorna Bleach and Keira Borrill (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013), pp. 177–97

Nicholson, Helen J., *Medieval Warfare: Theory and Practice of War in Europe, 300–1500* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004)

Nicholson, Ranald, *Edward III and the Scots: The Formative Years of a Military Career, 1327–1335* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965)

Normore, Christina, 'Depicting Defeat in the *Grandes Chroniques de France*', in *Representing War and Violence, 1250–1600*, ed. by Joanna Bellis and Laura Slater (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2016), pp. 39–55

Nossov, Konstantin, *Ancient and Medieval Siege Weapons: A Fully Illustrated Guide to Siege Weapons and Tactics* (Guilford: Lyons Press, 2012)

Offler, Hilary S., 'A Note on the Northern Franciscan Chronicle', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 28 (1984), 45–59

Orme, Nicholas, *From Childhood to Chivalry: The Education of the English Kings and Aristocracy, 1066–1530* (London: Methuen, 1984)

Ormrod, W. Mark, 'The Personal Religion of Edward III', *Speculum*, 64 (1989), 849–77

Otter, Monika, 'Functions of Fiction in Historical Writing', in *Writing Medieval History*, ed. by Nancy Partner (London: Hodder Arnold, 2005), pp. 109–30

Ouy, Gilbert, 'Honoré Bouvet (appelé à tort Bonet), prieur de Selonnet', *Romania*, 95 (1959), 255–59

Oxford English Dictionary Online (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000–) <oed.com>

Pagan, Heather, 'Trevet's *Les Cronicles*: Manuscripts, Owners and Readers', in *The Prose 'Brut' and Other Late Medieval Chronicles: Books Have their Histories. Essays in Honour of Lister M. Matheson*, ed. by Jaclyn Rajsic, Erik Kooper, and Dominique Hoche (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2016), pp. 149–64

Palmer, John J. N., 'The War Aims of the Protagonists and the Negotiations for Peace', in *The Hundred Years War*, ed. by Kenneth Fowler (London: Macmillan, 1971), pp. 51–74

Parrott, David, 'From Military Enterprise to Standing Armies: War, State, and Society in Western Europe, 1600–1700', in *European Warfare, 1350–1750*, ed. by Frank Tallett and David J. B. Trim (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 74–95

Partner, Nancy, 'The Hidden Self: Psychoanalysis and the Textual Unconscious', in *Writing Medieval History*, ed. by Nancy Partner (London: Hodder Arnold, 2005), pp. 42–64

Le Patourel, John, 'The Origins of the War', in *The Hundred Years War*, ed. by Kenneth Fowler (London: Macmillan, 1971), pp. 28–50

Pepper, Simon, 'The Underground Siege', *Fort*, 10 (1982), 31–38

Phillips, Joanna, 'The Experience of Sickness and Health during Crusader Campaigns to the Eastern Mediterranean, 1095–1274' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Leeds, 2017)

Poellinger, Michele, 'Violence in Later Middle English Arthurian Romance' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Leeds, 2013)

Pollard, Albert F., 'The Authorship and Value of the *Anonimalle Chronicle*', *English Historical Review*, 53 (1938), 577–605

Porter, Elizabeth, 'Chaucer's Knight, the Alliterative *Morte Arthure*, and the Medieval Laws of War: A Reconsideration', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 27 (1983), 56–78

Porter, Pamela, 'The Ways of War in Medieval Manuscript Illumination: Tracing and Assessing the Evidence', in *Armies, Chivalry and Warfare in Medieval Britain and France: Proceedings of the 1995 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. by Matthew Strickland (Stamford: Watkins, 1998), pp. 100–14

Pounds, Norman J. G., *The Medieval Castle in England and Wales: A Social and Political History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990)

Pratt, John H., *Chaucer and War* (Lanham: University Press of America, 2000)

———, 'The Middle English Historical Battle Poem' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1976)

Prestwich, Michael, *Armies and Warfare in the Middle Ages: The English Experience* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996)

———, 'The Battle of Crécy', in *The Battle of Crécy, 1346*, ed. by Andrew Ayton and Philip Preston Bart (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005), pp. 139–57

———, 'England and Scotland during the Wars of Independence', in *England and her Neighbours, 1066–1453: Essays in Honour of Pierre Chaplais*, ed. by Michael C. E. Jones and Malcolm Vale (London: Hambledon, 1989), pp. 181–97

———, 'The English at the Battle of Neville's Cross', in *The Battle of Neville's Cross, 1346*, ed. by David Rollason and Michael Prestwich (Stamford: Tyas, 1998), pp. 1–14

———, 'Transcultural Warfare: The Later Middle Ages', in *Transcultural Wars from the Middle Ages to the 21st Century*, ed. by Hans-Henning Kortüm (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2006), pp. 43–56

Prince, Albert E., 'A Letter of Edward the Black Prince Describing the Battle of Nájera in 1367', *English Historical Review*, 41 (1926), 415–18

Pronay, Nicholas, and John Taylor, *Parliamentary Texts of the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980)

Purton, Peter F., *A History of the Late Medieval Siege, 1200–1500* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2010)

———, *The Medieval Military Engineer: From the Roman Empire to the Sixteenth Century* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2018)

Quinn, William A., 'The "Silly" Pacifism of Geoffrey Chaucer and Terry Jones', in *The Medieval Python: The Purposive and Provocative Work of Terry Jones*, ed. by Robert F. Yeager and Toshiyuki Takamiya (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), pp. 167–79

Racine, Félix, 'Herodotus' Reputation in Latin Literature, from Cicero to the 12th Century', in *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Herodotus in Antiquity and Beyond*, ed. by Jessica Priestley and Vasiliki Zali (Leiden: Brill, 2016), pp. 193–121

Raymo, Robert R., 'Works of Religious and Philosophical Instruction', in *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050–1500*, ed. by Burke J. Severs, Albert E. Hartung, and Ludwig Bieler, 11 vols so far (New Haven: Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1967–), VII, 2255–2378, 2467–2582

Raynaud, Christiane, *La Violence au Moyen Âge, XIII^e–XV^e siècle: D'après les livres d'histoire en français* (Paris: Leopard d'or, 1990)

Reichberg, Gregory M., *Thomas Aquinas on War and Peace* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017)

Reiser, George R., 'Works of Science and Information', in *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050–1500*, ed. by Burke J. Severs, Albert E. Hartung, and Peter G. Beidler, 11 vols so far (New Haven: Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1967–), X, 3593–3952

Reynolds, Leighton D., ed., *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983)

Richardot, Philippe, *Végèce et la culture militaire au Moyen Âge, V^e–XV^e siècles* (Paris: Institut de stratégie comparée EPHE IV-Sorbonne & economica, 1998)

Richardson, Henry G., 'The *Annales paulini*', *Speculum*, 23 (1948), 630–40

Richardson, Thom, *The Tower Armoury in the Fourteenth Century* (Leeds: Royal Armouries, 2016)

Richmond, Colin F., 'The War at Sea', in *The Hundred Years War*, ed. by Kenneth Fowler (London: Macmillan, 1971), pp. 96–121

Rigby, Stephen H., *Wisdom and Chivalry: Chaucer's 'Knight's Tale' and Medieval Political Theory* (Leiden: Brill, 2009)

Rigg, Arthur G., *A History of Anglo-Latin Literature, 1066–1422* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992)

———, 'John of Bridlington's *Prophecy*: A New Look', *Speculum*, 63 (1988), 596–613

Riley-Smith, Jonathan, 'Casualties and the Number of Knights on the First Crusade', *Crusades*, 1 (2002), 13–28

Robbins, Rossell Hope, 'Poems Dealing with Contemporary Conditions', in *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050–1500*, ed. by Burke J. Severs, Albert E. Hartung, and Peter G. Beidler, 11 vols so far (New Haven: Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1967–), V, 1385–1556, 1631–1726

Rogers, Clifford J., '"As if a new sun had arisin": England's Fourteenth-Century RMA', in *The Dynamics of Military Revolution, 1300–2050*, ed. by MacGregor Knox and Williamson Murray (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 15–34

———, 'The Battle of Agincourt', in *The Hundred Years War (Part II): Different Vistas*, ed. by L. J. Andrew Villalon and Donald J. Kagay (Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 37–132

———, 'By Fire and Sword: *Bellum hostile* and "Civilians" in the Hundred Years War', in *Civilians in the Path of War*, ed. by Mark Grimsley and Clifford J. Rogers (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002), pp. 33–78

———, 'Clausewitz, Genius, and the Rules', *Journal of Military History*, 66 (2002), 1167–76

———, 'The Development of the Longbow in Late Medieval England and "Technological Determinism"', *Journal of Medieval History*, 37 (2011), 321–41

———, 'Edward III and the Dialectics of Strategy, 1327–1360', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 6th ser., 4 (1994), 83–102

———, 'The Efficacy of the English Longbow: A Reply to Kelly DeVries', *War in History*, 5 (1998), 233–42

———, 'Henry V's Military Strategy in 1415', in *The Hundred Years War: A Wider Focus*, ed. by L. J. Andrew Villalon and Donald J. Kagay (Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 399–427

———, 'The Offensive/Defensive in Medieval Strategy', in *Von Crécy bis Mohács: Kriegswesen im späten Mittelalter (1346–1526)*, ed. by Leopold Auer, Wolfgang Etschmann, Claudia Ham, Michael Hochedlinger, Lothar Höbelt, Klaus Koch, and others (Wien: Heeresgeschichtliches Museum, 1997), pp. 158–71

———, 'The Vegetian "Science of Warfare" in the Middle Ages', *Journal of Medieval Military History*, 1 (2002), 1–20

———, *War, Cruel and Sharp: English Strategy under Edward III, 1327–1360* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000)

Rogers, Clifford J., ed., *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Medieval Warfare and Military Technology*, 3 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010)

Rogers, Clifford J., and Mark C. Buck, 'The Scottish Invasion of 1346', *Northern History*, 34 (1998), 51–82

Rogers, Randall, *Latin Siege Warfare in the Twelfth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992)

Rose, Susan, *Medieval Naval Warfare, 1000–1500* (London: Routledge, 2002)

Ruddick, Andrea, *English Identity and Political Culture in the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013)

———, 'National Sentiment and Religious Vocabulary in Fourteenth-Century England', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 60 (2009), 1–18

Russell, Frederick H., 'Just War', in *The Cambridge History of Medieval Philosophy*, ed. by Robert Pasnau, 2 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 997–1193

———, *The Just War in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975)

Saul, Nigel, 'A Farewell to Arms? Criticism of Warfare in Late Fourteenth-Century England', in *Fourteenth-Century England II*, ed. by Chris Given-Wilson (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2002), pp. 131–45

———, *For Honour and Fame: Chivalry in England, 1066–1500* (London: Bodley Head, 2011)

Saunders, Corinne J., 'Medieval Warfare', in *The Cambridge Companion to War Writing*, ed. by Kate McLoughlin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 83–97

Scales, Len, 'Bread, Cheese and Genocide: Imagining the Destruction of Peoples in Medieval Western Europe', *History*, 92 (2007), 284–300

Scattergood, Vincent J., 'The Date of Sir John Clanvowe's *The Two Ways* and the "Reinvention of Lollardy"', *Medium Ævum*, 79 (2010), 116–20

Schullian, Dorothy, 'A Revised List of Manuscripts of Valerius Maximus', in *Miscellanea Augusto Campana*, ed. by Augustuo Campana, 2 vols (Padova: Antenore, 1981), II, 695–728

Scully, Terence, *The Art of Cookery in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1995)

Semelin, Jacques, 'Toward a Vocabulary of Massacre and Genocide', *Journal of Genocide Research*, 5 (2003), 193–210

Seymour, Michael C., 'Some Medieval English Owners of *De proprietatibus rerum*', *Bodleian Library Record*, 9 (1973–78), 156–65

Seymour, Michael C., ed., *Bartholomaeus Anglicus and his Encyclopedia* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1992)

Sharpe, Richard, *A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1997)

Sherborne, James W., 'Indentured Retinues and English Expeditions to France, 1369–1380', *English Historical Review*, 79 (1964), 718–46

Sherwood, Foster H., 'Studies in Medieval Uses of Vegetius' *Epitoma rei militaris*' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1980)

Short, Ian, *Manual of Anglo-Norman*, Anglo-Norman Text Society, Occasional Publications Series, 8, 2nd edn (Oxford: Anglo-Norman Text Society, 2013)

Shrader, Charles, 'A Handlist of Extant Manuscripts Containing the *De re militari* of Flavius Vegetius Renatus', *Scriptorium*, 33 (1979), 280–305

———, 'The Influence of Vegetius' *De re militari*', *Military Affairs*, 45 (1981), 167–72

Simpkin, David, *The English Aristocracy at War: From the Welsh Wars of Edward I to the Battle of Bannockburn* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008)

Skoda, Hannah, *Medieval Violence: Physical Brutality in Northern France, 1270–1330* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)

Skorge, Kristel Mari, 'Ideals and Values in Jean Froissart's *Chroniques*' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Bergen, 2006)

Slim, Hugo, 'Civilians, Distinction, and the Compassionate View of War', in *Protection of Civilians*, ed. by Haidi Willmot, Ralph Mamiya, Scott Sheeran, and Marc Weller (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 11–28

———, *Killing Civilians: Method, Madness and Morality in War* (London: Hurst, 2007)

Smail, Raymond C., *Crusading Warfare, 1097–1193* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956)

Smalley, Beryl, 'Sallust in the Middle Ages', in *Classical Influences on European Culture, AD 500–1500*, ed. by Robert R. Bolgar (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), pp. 165–75

Smallwood, Thomas M., 'The Prophecy of the Six Kings', *Speculum*, 60 (1985), 571–92

Smith, Anthony D., 'National Identities: Modern and Medieval?', in *Concepts of National Identity in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Simon Forde, Lesley Johnson, and Alan V. Murray (Leeds: Leeds Studies in English, 1995), pp. 21–46

Smith, Katherine Allen, *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2011)

Smith, Robert Douglas, 'Artillery and the Hundred Years War: Myth and Interpretation', in *Arms, Armies and Fortifications in the Hundred Years War*, ed. by Anne Curry and Michael Hughes (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1994), pp. 151–60

Smith, Trevor Russell, 'Ethics and Representation of War in the *Lanercost Chronicle*, 1327–46', *Bulletin of International Medieval Research*, 20 (2018 forthcoming)

———, 'The Influence of Josephus on Ideas of National Identity and War in Fourteenth-Century England', in *The Latin Josephus in the Western Middle Ages*, ed. by Paul Hilliard and Karen Kletter (Leiden: Brill, 2019 forthcoming)

———, 'Review of: Joanna Bellis, *The Hundred Years War in Literature, 1377–1600* (Woodbridge: Brewer, 2016)', *De re militari*, 2017 <deremilitari.org/2017/12/joanna-bellis-the-hundred-years-war-in-literature-1337-1600-smith>

———, 'Review of: Rory Cox, *John Wyclif on War and Peace* (London: Royal Historical Society, 2014)', in *De re militari*, 2015 <deremilitari.org/2015/10/rory-cox-john-wyclif-on-war-and-peace-smith>

Smith, Trevor Russell, 'Warfare in Jean Froissart's *Chroniques*: Representation and Realism' (unpublished master's thesis, University of York, 2010)

———, 'Willing Body, Willing Mind: Non-Combatant Culpability According to English Combatant Writers, 1327–77', in *Killing and Being Killed: Bodies in Battle. Perspectives on Fighters in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Jörg Rogge (Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2017), pp. 79–107

Spence, John, *Reimagining History in Anglo-Norman Prose Chronicles* (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2013)

Spiegel, Gabrielle, *Romancing the Past: The Rise of Vernacular Prose Historiography in Thirteenth-Century France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993)

Springer, Matthias, 'Vegetius im Mittelalter', *Philologus*, 123 (1979), 85–90

St John, Graham, 'War, the Church, and English Men-at-Arms', in *Fourteenth-Century England VI*, ed. by Chris Given-Wilson (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000), pp. 73–93

St John, Lisa Benz, *Three Medieval Queens: Queenship and the Crown in Fourteenth-Century England* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012)

Steel, Karl, *How to Make a Human: Animals and Violence in the Middle Ages* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2011)

Stein, Robert M., 'Literary Criticism and the Evidence for History', in *Writing Medieval History*, ed. by Nancy Partner (London: Hodder Arnold, 2005), pp. 67–87

Steiner, Emily, 'Collecting, Violence, Literature: Richard of Bury's *Philobiblon* and the Forms of Literary History', in *The Medieval Literary: Beyond Form*, ed. by Robert J. Meyer-Lee and Catherine Sanok (Cambridge: Brewer, 2018), pp. 243–65

Stones, Edward L. G., 'The Appeal to History in Anglo-Scottish Relations between 1291 and 1401', *Archives*, 9 (1969), 10–21, 80–83

———, 'The Treaty of Northampton, 1328', *History*, 37 (1953), 54–61

Strickland, Matthew, 'Killing or Clemency? Ransom, Chivalry and Changing Attitudes to Defeated Opponents in Britain and Northern France, 7–12th Centuries', in *Krieg im Mittelalter*, ed. by Hans-Henning Kortüm (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2001), pp. 93–122

———, 'Provoking or Avoiding Battle? Challenge, Judicial Duel, and Single Combat in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century Warfare', in *Armies, Chivalry and Warfare in Medieval Britain and France: Proceedings of the 1995 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. by Matthew Strickland (Stamford: Watkins, 1998), pp. 317–43

———, 'Rules of War or War without Rules? Some Reflections on Conduct and the Treatment of Non-Combatants in Medieval Transcultural Wars', in *Transcultural Wars from the Middle Ages to the 21st Century*, ed. by Hans-Henning Kortüm (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2006), pp. 107–40

Strickland, Matthew, *War and Chivalry: The Conduct and Perception of War in England and Normandy, 1066–1217* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

Strickland, Matthew, and Robert Hardy, *The Great Warbow: From Hastings to the Mary Rose* (Thrupp: Sutton, 2005)

Sue-Lo Twu, Krista, 'The *Awntyrs off Arthure at the Terne Wathelyne*: Reliquary for Romance', *Arthurian Literature*, 20 (2003), 103–22

Sutherland, Tim, 'The Battle of Agincourt: An Alternative Location', *Journal of Conflict Archaeology*, 1 (2005), 245–63

Tahkokallio, Jaakko, 'Update to the List of Manuscripts of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia regum Britanniae*', *Arthurian Literature*, 32 (2015), 187–203

Taylor, Andrew, 'Chivalric Conversation and the Denial of Male Fear', in *Conflicted Identities and Multiple Masculinities: Men in the Medieval West*, ed. by Jacqueline Murray (New York: Garland, 1999), pp. 169–88

Taylor, Craig, *Chivalry and the Ideals of Knighthood in France during the Hundred Years War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013)

———, 'Edward III and the Plantagenet Claim to the French Throne', in *The Age of Edward III*, ed. by James S. Bothwell (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2001), pp. 155–69

———, 'English Writings on Chivalry and Warfare during the Hundred Years War', in *Soldiers, Nobles and Gentlemen: Essays in Honour of Maurice Keen*, ed. by Peter Coss and Christopher Tyerman (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2009), pp. 64–84

———, 'Henry V, Flower of Chivalry', in *Henry V: New Interpretations*, ed. by Gwilym Dodd (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2013), pp. 217–47

———, 'Military Courage and Fear in the Late Medieval French Chivalric Imagination', *Cahiers de recherches medievales et humanistes*, 24 (2012), 129–47

———, 'Review of: David Whetham, *Just Wars and Moral Victories: Surprise, Deception and the Normative Framework of European War in the Later Middle Ages* (Leiden: Brill, 2009)', *English Historical Review*, 126 (2011), 918–19

———, 'The Salic Law and the Valois Succession to the French Crown', *French History*, 15 (2001), 358–77

Taylor, John, *English Historical Literature in the Fourteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987)

———, 'The French *Brut* and the Reign of Edward II', *English Historical Review*, 72 (1957), 423–37

Taylor, John, 'The French Prose *Brut*: Popular History in Fourteenth-Century England', in *England in the Fourteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1985 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. by W. Mark Ormrod (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1986), pp. 247–54

———, *The Kirkstall Abbey Chronicles*, Thoresby Society, 42 (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1952)

———, 'The Origins of the *Anonimalle Chronicle*', *Northern History*, 31 (1995), 45–64

———, *The Universal Chronicle of Ranulf Higden* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966)

Taylor, Rupert, *The Political Prophecy in England* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1911)

Thordeman, Bengt Johan Nerén, Bo Eric Ingelmark, and Poul Nørlund, *Armour from the Battle of Wisby, 1361*, 2 vols (Stockholm: Kungl, 1939)

Titterton, James, 'Deception and Trickery in Medieval Warfare, 1050–1320' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Leeds, 2019 forthcoming)

Torres, Sara V., '"In Praise of Peace" in Late Medieval England', in *Representing War and Violence, 1250–1600*, ed. by Joanna Bellis and Laura Slater (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2016), pp. 95–115

Tracy, Larissa, '"Into the hede, throw the helme and creste": Head Wounds and a Question of Kingship in the Stanzaic *Morte Arthur*', in *Wounds and Wound Repair in Medieval Culture*, ed. by Larissa Tracy and Kelly DeVries (Leiden: Brill, 2015), pp. 496–518

Turville-Petre, Thorlac, 'Afterword: The Brutus Prologue to *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*', in *Imagining a Medieval English Nation*, ed. by Kathy Lavezzo (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003), pp. 340–46

———, *England the Nation: Language, Literature, and National Identity, 1290–1340* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995)

———, 'Political Lyrics', in *A Companion to the Middle English Lyric*, ed. by Thomas G. Duncan (Woodbridge: Brewer, 2005), pp. 171–88

Tyson, Diana B., 'Aspects of War in Medieval French Occasional Verse', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 59 (2015), 49–76

———, 'Handlist of Manuscripts Containing the French Prose *Brut* Chronicle', *Scriptorium*, 48 (1994), 333–44

———, 'Three Short Anglo-Norman Texts in Leeds University Library, Brotherton Collection MS 29', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 52 (2008), 81–112

Unsworth, Rebecca, 'Hands Deep in History: Pockets in Men and Women's Dress in Western Europe, *c.* 1480–1630', *Costume*, 51 (2017), 148–70

Vale, Juliet, *Edward III and Chivalry: Chivalric Society and its Context, 1270–1350* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1982)

Vale, Malcolm, 'Aristocratic Violence: Trial by Battle in the Later Middle Ages', in *Violence in Medieval Society*, ed. by Richard W. Kaeuper (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000), pp. 159–81

———, 'England, France, and the Origins of the Hundred Years War', in *England and her Neighbours, 1066–1453: Essays in Honour of Pierre Chaplais*, ed. by Michael C. E. Jones and Malcolm Vale (London: Hambledon, 1989), pp. 199–215

———, 'New Techniques and Old Ideals: The Impact of Artillery on War and Chivalry at the End of the Hundred Years War', in *War, Literature and Politics in the Late Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of G. W. Coopland*, ed. by Christopher Allmand (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1976), pp. 57–72

———, 'Sir John Fastolf's "Report" of 1435: A New Interpretation Reconsidered', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 17 (1973), 78–84

———, *War and Chivalry: Warfare and Aristocratic Culture in England, France and Burgundy at the End of the Middle Ages* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1981)

Varvaro, Alberto, 'Il Libro I delle *Chroniques* de Jean Froissart: Per una filologia integrata dei testi e delle immagini', *Medioevo romanzo*, 19 (1994), 3–36

———, 'Problèmes philologiques du Livre IV des *Chroniques* de Jean Froissart', in *Patrons, Authors and Workshops: Books and Book Production in Paris around 1400*, ed. by Godfried Croenen and Peter Ainsworth (Louvain: Peeters, 2006), pp. 255–77

———, *La Tragédie de l'histoire: La Dernière œvre de Jean Froissart*, trans. into French by Amélie Hanus (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2011)

Verbruggen, Jean F., *The Art of Warfare in Western Europe during the Middle Ages, from the Eighth Century to 1340*, trans. by Sumner Willard and Sheila C. M. Southern (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1998)

Viard, Jules, 'Le Siège de Calais, 4 septembre 1346–4 août 1347', *Le Moyen Âge*, 39 (1929), 129–89

Villalon, L. J. Andrew, 'Battle-Seeking, Battle-Avoiding or Perhaps Just Battle-Willing? Applying the Gillingham Paradigm to Enrique II of Castile', *Journal of Medieval Military History*, 8 (2010), 131–54

Villalon, L. J. Andrew, and Donald J. Kagay, *To Win and Lose a Medieval Battle: Nájera (April 3, 1367), a Pyrrhic Victory for the Black Prince* (Brill: Leiden, 2017)

Vones, Ludwig, 'Un mode de résolution des conflits au bas Moyen Âge: Le Duel des princes', in *La Guerre, la violence et les gens au Moyen Âge I: Guerre et violence*, ed. by Philippe Contamine and Olivier Guyotjeannin (Paris: Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques, 1996), pp. 321–32

Wakelin, Daniel, 'The Occasion, Author and Readers of *Knyghthode and Bataile*', *Medium Ævum*, 73 (2004), 260–72

Walde, Christine, and Brigitte Egger, eds, *The Reception of Classical Literature*, trans. by Duncan Smart and Matthijs H. Wibier, Brill's New Pauly, Supplements, 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2012)

Wallace, David, 'Chaucer, Langland, and the Hundred Years' War', in *The Medieval Python: The Purposive and Provocative Work of Terry Jones*, ed. by Robert F. Yeager and Toshiyuki Takamiya (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), pp. 195–205

Walzer, Michael, *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations*, 5th edn (New York: Basic Books, 2015)

Ward, John O., 'Classical Rhetoric and the Writing of History in Medieval and Renaissance Culture', in *European History and its Historians. Papers from the Conference of Australasian Historians of Medieval and Early Modern Europe, Adelaide, 18–21 May 1976*, ed. by Frank McGregor and Nicholas A. R. Wright (Adelaide: Adelaide University Union Press, 1977), pp. 1–10

Weiler, Björn, 'William of Malmesbury on Kingship', *History*, 90 (2005), 3–22

Whaley, Barton, *Stratagem: Deception and Surprise in War* (London: Artech House, 2007)

Whetham, David, *Just Wars and Moral Victories: Surprise, Deception and the Normative Framework of European War in the Later Middle Ages* (Leiden: Brill, 2009)

Whetter, Kevin S., 'Warfare and Combat in *Le Morte Darthur*', in *Writing War: Medieval Literary Responses to Warfare*, ed. by Corinne J. Saunders, Françoise Le Saux, and Neil Thomas (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004), pp. 169–86

White, Hayden, 'The Fictions of Factual Representation', in *The Literature of Fact: Selected Papers from the English Institute*, ed. by Angus Fletcher (New York: Columbia University Press, 1976), pp. 21–44

———, 'The Historical Text as Literary Artifact', *Clio*, 3 (1974), 277–303

———, 'The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality', *Critical Inquiry*, 7 (1980–81), 5–27

Wilson, James, 'Authorship of the *Chronicle of Lanercost*', in *Chronicle of Lanercost, 1272–1346*, trans. by Herbert Maxwell (Glasgow: Maclehose, 1913), pp. ix–xxxi

Winroth, Anders, 'Codices manuscripti operis Gratiani, repertorium breve', in *History of Medieval Canon Law X* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, forthcoming)

———, *The Making of Gratian's 'Decretum'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Wolfe, Michael, 'Siege Warfare and the *bonnes villes* of France during the Hundred Years War', in *The Medieval City under Siege*, ed. by Ivy A. Corfis and Michael Wolfe (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1995), pp. 49–66

Woosnam-Savage, Robert C., and Kelly DeVries, 'Battle Trauma in Medieval Warfare: Wounds, Weapons and Armor', in *Wounds and Wound Repair in Medieval Culture*, ed. by Larissa Tracy and Kelly DeVries (Leiden: Brill, 2015), pp. 27–56

Wright, Neil, and Julia Crick, eds, *The 'Historia regum Britannie' of Geoffrey of Monmouth*, 5 vols (Cambridge: Brewer, 1985–91)

Wright, Nicholas A. R., *Knights and Peasants: The Hundred Years War in the French Countryside* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1998)

———, '"Pillagers" and "Brigands" in the Hundred Years War', *Journal of Medieval History*, 9 (1983), 15–24

———, 'The *Tree of Battles* of Honoré Bouvet and the Laws of War', in *War, Literature and Politics in the Late Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of G. W. Coopland*, ed. by Christopher Allmand (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1976), pp. 12–31

Yeager, Robert F., '*Pax poetica*: On the Pacifism of Chaucer and Gower', *Studies in the Age of Chaucer*, 9 (1987), 97–121