

stands at the meeting-point of three intellectual movements, the traditional learning of the French schools, the Greek culture of southern Italy, and the Arabic science of the East; and any new facts which may be brought out concerning his life and writings may be expected to throw light on the general history of learning in the twelfth century.⁵⁰

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

The Order of the Temple at North Ferriby

NOTWITHSTANDING the antecedent improbability of a community of knights templars having escaped the general suppression of their order, Tanner's statement¹ that one of their houses, Ferriby, in Yorkshire, 'seems to have become a priory of Austin canons,' has been generally repeated.² Could this be substantiated it would be a fact of no little interest; but an examination of the evidence makes it quite clear that the canons of North Ferriby had no connexion with the knights of the Temple.

There are two entries relating to North Ferriby in the register of Walter Giffard, archbishop of York; three in the *Calendar of the Patent Rolls*; and two in the *Calendar of Papal Letters*. The first of those in the York register belongs to the year 1270,³ the second to 1272;⁴ and each concerns a prior of Ferriby 'of the order of the Temple of the Lord'. The first entry on the patent rolls is a licence in mortmain granted in 1295 for the alienation of the advowson of the parish church to 'the prior and brethren of North Ferriby of the order of the Temple of Jerusalem'.⁵ In 1316 another licence in mortmain was granted, this time for the appropriation of the parish church by 'the prior and brethren of North Ferriby of the Temple of Jerusalem'.⁶ And three years later letters patent were granted to the 'prior, canons,

⁵⁰ After the proofs of this article had been corrected I received, through the kindness of my colleague Professor R. B. Merriman, photographs of the earlier pages of the Madrid MS. (no. 10016) of the translation of the Khorasman tables, which has this heading: 'Incipit liber ezeig id est chanonum Alghoarizmi per Adelardum bathoniensem ex arabico sumptus et per Rodbertum cestrensem ordine digestus.' Except that the tables are fuller, the text agrees with that of the Chartres and Mazarine MSS., including the passage near the beginning ('Quoniam vero tractatu exigente . . . equatos habebis') which is not found in the Bodleian MS. The Madrid MS. evidently deserves careful study, particularly because of the question raised by the mention of Robertus Cestrensis. I also find that the trigonometrical tables contained in Adelard's translation, which are of much importance for the history of trigonometry in the middle ages, have been edited, but without the use of the Madrid MS., by Björnbo in the *Festskrift til H. G. Zeuthen* (Copenhagen, 1909), pp. 1-17.

¹ *Notitia monastica* (ed. Nasmyth), Yorkshire, xxxviii.

² Abbot Gasquet states it as a positive fact: *English Monastic Life* (2nd ed. 1904), p. 233.

³ p. 251 (Surtees Society).

⁴ *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 23 Edw. I, m. 3.

⁵ *Ibid.* 9 Edw. II, p. 1, m. 5.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 66.

and brethren of the Temple', confirming grants of land made 'to God and the Holy Temple and the canons and brethren thereof dwelling at North Ferriby'.⁷ Of the two papal documents, one was a dispensation granted, on account of illegitimacy, in 1401 to John Marton, 'canon of the priory of North Ferriby of the order of the Temple of our Lord of Jerusalem, under the rule of St. Augustine';⁸ and the other was a dispensation granted in 1442 to Thomas Calton, 'Augustinian canon of the order of canons regular of the Temple of the Lord at Jerusalem.'⁹

The first point to be noticed is that the 1295 licence was granted to the 'prior and brethren' of North Ferriby; but the military order of the Temple was then still in existence, and if the house belonged to it, one would have expected that the licence would have been granted not to the 'prior and brethren' of that house, but to the 'master and brethren of the knights templars in England'. A licence in this form was granted in 1284;¹⁰ and five or six years earlier an action, relating to the advowson of the church of Waterbeach, was tried by the king's justices, the plaintiff being not the head of some particular house, but the *magister milicie Templi in Anglia*.¹¹ Next, a question arises as to whether the knights ever styled any of their officials 'prior'. The ordinary term for a subordinate superior was 'preceptor'; Clement V, for instance, in the letter addressed to the archbishop of Canterbury and his suffragans, preparatory to the suppression of the knights of the Temple, speaks of the *magister, praeceptores, et alii fratres ordinis militiae Templi Ierosolomitani*.¹² Further, it will be noticed that in the York register and in the two Roman documents the canons of Ferriby are styled 'of the order of the Temple of our Lord', that is, both before and after the suppression of the military order. This not only proves conclusively that they did not belong to that order of knights, but indicates who and what they really were.

The knights were properly known as the *militia Templi Salomonis*, the knighthood of the Temple of Solomon. Of this there is no lack of evidence. Their rule, as approved by Honorius III, is headed in Mansi's edition of Labbe's *Concilia: Regula Pauperum Commilitonum Christi Templique Salomonici*; ¹³ and the term *Templi Salomonis* occurs twice in the rule itself, in chapters v¹⁴

⁷ *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 12 Edw. II, p. 2, m. 24.

⁸ *Calendar of Papal Letters*, v. 397.

⁹ *Ibid.* ix. 219. This volume has not yet been published, but I have been permitted to see the proofs at the Public Record Office.

¹⁰ *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 12 Edw. I, m. 12.

¹¹ *Ecclesie de Bernewelle Liber Memorandum*, p. 135; ed. J. W. Clark, Cambridge, 1907.

¹² Recited in letter of the archbishop to his suffragans: Dugdale, *Monast.* vi. ii. 844 (no. lii).

¹³ Vol. xxi. col. 359.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* col. 361: *sunt namque milites in domo Dei templique Salomonis, &c.*

and xxx.¹⁵ They are, too, styled *fratres militiae Templi Salomonis*, or *fratres Templi Salomonis*, in sixteen or seventeen of the Temple charters printed in the *Monasticon*.¹⁶ And further proof is furnished by a seal of the order belonging to the end of the twelfth century, on which, round a rough representation of the dome of the Temple, is the legend ✠ MIL·TMPLI·SAL'.¹⁷

The explanation is given by William of Tyre,¹⁸ who says that there were in Jerusalem two buildings called by the name of the Temple: a church known as *Templum Domini* and alongside of it the royal palace 'quae vulgari appellatione *Templum Salomonis* appellatur', and it was in the palace, the Temple of Solomon, that the knights were first lodged. In the thirteenth century, James of Vitry, the canon regular of Oignies who was first bishop of Acre and afterwards cardinal legate in the Holy Land, gave a description of Jerusalem in his *Historia Orientalis*. After speaking of the *Templum Domini*,¹⁹ the church, he goes on to say that there was another temple of immense size, from which the brethren of the knighthood of the Temple were called templars,²⁰ because that building was called the Temple of Solomon, perchance, he says, to distinguish it from the other, which was more especially styled the Temple of the Lord. The *Templum Domini* was served by a chapter of Austin canons, at whose head was a mitred abbot;²¹ and should the convent have had subject houses, or cells, following the ordinary usage, the canons of those houses would have been styled 'of the order of the Temple of the [or our] Lord, of Jerusalem'. The papal documents which have been referred to, and the letters patent of 1295 and 1316, would amply justify the conclusion that the priory of North Ferriby was such a cell; the entry made in the York register in 1270 and the letters patent of 1319 make this conclusion irresistible. For the former concerned a prior of Ferriby who was about to proceed to foreign parts at the command of his abbot; and the latter were a confirmation of grants of land made to 'the prior, canons, and brethren of the Temple' and 'the canons and brethren thereof dwelling at North Ferriby'. Some explanation seems to be required of the head of the order being here called a prior. There was, of course, no longer a

¹⁵ Vol. xxi, col. 365: *eximia paupertas domus Dei templique Salomonis*.

¹⁶ VI. ii, pp. 818, 819, 820, 840, 841, 842, 843.

¹⁷ Reproduced in the *Recueil de Documents*, &c., iv. 156, published by the *Société de Sphragistique de Paris* (1855).

¹⁸ *Hist.* viii. 3, and xii. 7, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cci. 409, 526, 527.

¹⁹ Cap. 62.

²⁰ William of Tyre says that they were so called because of the proximity of the royal palace to the church. Both church and palace were on the site of the Temple.

²¹ James of Vitry, *op. cit.* c. 58. More than one abbot of the Temple is mentioned in the *Chartulaire du Saint-Sépulchre*, ed. by Rozière in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* clv.

monastery in Jerusalem, and there may have been no longer an abbot; possibly 'prior, canons, and brethren of the Temple' was a mere formula, and there was then no house of which Ferriby was a cell.²² Nothing seems to be known of the convent of the Temple after the fall of Jerusalem; and the very existence of the 'order of the Temple' was apparently unknown to Pennotti, a canon regular of the Lateran congregation, the historian of his order.

EGERTON BECK.

Confirmations of Oxford Chancellors in the Lincoln Episcopal Registers

THE subject of dispute between the university of Oxford and the bishops of Lincoln concerning the chancellorship,¹ of which records, extending over nearly a century, exist in the Lincoln Registers, was whether the chancellor elected by the university was bound to go in person to the bishop to receive his confirmation, or whether he might receive it by proxy. The bishops asserted the former, the university the latter. In the Lincoln Episcopal Registers there are twenty-nine entries of confirmation, six being among the Memoranda and twenty-three among the Institutions. No transcripts of the latter are found in the collections of Twyne, and so presumably the documents were unknown to Wood. The earliest date at which a commission is entered in the registers is 1290, when the episcopal records began to be written on quires of parchment instead of membranes stitched together to form a roll. From 1290 the commissions continue almost without a break until the episcopate of Gynwell, whose period of office was marked by the most memorable of all disputes connected with the chancellorship. Having refused persistently to confirm William de Palmorva, the bishop was excommunicated by the archbishop of Canterbury, who himself confirmed the chancellor.² After such a grievous quarrel it is strange to find

²² A century later Ferriby was certainly an independent house or it would have been suppressed as an alien priory.

¹ Wood's *Annals*, i. 326, 329, 346, 451, 481; *Annales Monastici*, iv. 317; *Rel. Parl.* i. 16; Rashdall's *Universities*, ii. 424, 426. The origin of the dispute is nowhere recorded. The chancellorship was created by the bishop of Lincoln in 1214 (*Manimenta Academica*, p. 2; Wood, i. 184; Rashdall, ii. 351), and the dispute began at a date not far removed from the inception of the office if we may judge from Bishop Sutton's statement, 'quod beatus Robertus quondam Lincolnensis Episcopus, qui huiusmodi officium gessit dum in vniversitate predicta regebat, in principio creationis sue in episcopum dixit proximum predecessorem suum episcopum Lincolnensem non permisisset quod idem Robertus vocaretur Cancellarius sed Magister Scholarum' (Sutton's Mem. f. 117; Rashdall, ii. 355). For references to 'Magister scholarum' see *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, Duke of Rutland's MSS. iv. 82; Rashdall, ii. 353.

² Wilkins's *Concilia*, iii, pp. 3-8; *Mun. Acad.* p. 168.