and with Doubleday I should be entitled to cry out: 'Procure me better assurance than Bardolph; I will not take his bond; I like not the security.' Mr. Round, I expect, is thoroughly enjoying the humour of the situation he has created. It is, indeed, a masterly situation. Mr. Round gives evidence in favour of the *Quarterly Reviewer*, the *Quarterly Reviewer* in favour of Mr. Round. I have just alluded to 'Henry IV,' and I cannot doubt that as he thinks of the later developments of this controversy Dame Quickly's words, from the same play, are often in Mr. Round's mind, if not actually on his lips: 'I' faith this is excellent sport.' T. A. ARCHER.

PART II.

THERE rises before us, in the twilight, a vision of the hill of battle. As the Conqueror holds high revel among the dying and the dead—

'Mult ont Engleis grant dol eu
Del rei Herant qu'il ont perdu,
E del duc qui aueit vencu,
Qui l'estandart out abatu'—

'Sire,' exclaims his faithful friend, 'beware of the fury of your foes, maddened by their leader's fall: '—

'Mult se quident ainz vengier,
E mult se quident vendre chier.'

But the Conqueror sits unmoved. For us, too, the fight is over; and so, like the duke, as the darkness fell, we sheathe once more our sword, claiming, in the phrase Mr. Freeman loved, that we have possession of the place of slaughter.¹

Students of the history of the Norman conquest of England have indeed in one sense lost their leader. But have they lost him in the other sense which the above-quoted words would imply? Is he really 'fallen'; is the standard indeed overthrown; and has the field which seemed to be his special domain really become the prize of a nameless stranger?

The first attempt to impugn the accuracy of Mr. Freeman's account of the battle of Senlac was published in the *Quarterly Review* in July 1892. The attack was met by Mr. Archer in the *Contemporary Review* for March 1893, and with him the *Quarterly Reviewer* at once opened a fresh discussion, which was continued for some weeks in the columns of the *Athenæum*. The Reviewer declared himself

'ready to answer . . . every question he' [Mr. Archer] 'has put, and every point that he has raised.'² 'In my detailed reply,' he wrote again, 'I shall dispose of *all* the alleged errors—excepting one . . . in turn.'³ 'The answer on the whole case . . . will appear in due course. . . . Mr.

¹ *Quarterly Review*, July 1892, p. 104.

² *Athenæum*, 8 April 1893, p. 441.

³ *Athenæum*, 6 May, p. 574.

Archer may rest assured that my answer will dispose (with the one exception I have dealt with) of all the "errors" he has so ingeniously manufactured.⁴

The article which appeared in the *Quarterly Review* of last July, and of which I have quoted the closing words, is therefore evidently to be regarded as complete and final, so far as the Reviewer's own position with respect to the points at issue is concerned, and as containing every statement and every argument which he deems essential to his case. That article I propose to consider point by point, always, of course, duly bearing in mind its double character of (a) a complement to the article published by the same writer in the same periodical twelve months earlier and (b) a rejoinder to Mr. Archer.

The Reviewer's first two pages are occupied with some general observations on a poem by Baudri, abbot of Bourgueil, to whose value as an authority for the battle he desires to call attention. In connexion with this part of his subject I have only to remark that he has been unfortunate in his printer, who, on each of the three occasions where the name of Baudri's abbey is mentioned—once in the heading of the article and twice afterwards in the first page—has spelt it *Bourgeuil*.

I. The Reviewer then proceeds to discuss Mr. Freeman's account of the opening of the battle.

There is no question that the fight began with an advance of the Norman infantry; William of Poitiers and Bishop Guy are in complete accordance on the fact. But what was the intention of that advance? Mr. Freeman assumed, without hesitation, that 'they were to strive to break down the palisades . . . and so to make ready the way for the charge of the horse' (p. 467); that 'the French infantry had to toil up the hill, and to break down the palisade' (p. 477). But we find, on reference, that the above writers say nothing of any such intention. . . . Moreover the only weapons they speak of are slings and bows and arrows, which are scarcely the tools for pioneers. But William of Poitiers puts us on the track of a very different explanation. . . . We hold . . . on the excellent authority of Baudri and William of Poitiers, that the infantry were used for the definite purpose of galling the English by their missiles, and so enticing them to leave their ranks and become a prey to the horse. As soon as their line had thus been broken, the cavalry were to charge.⁵

The Reviewer's argument here is founded upon three omissions of his own—(1 and 2) the omission in each of his quotations from Mr. Freeman of some words which entirely alter the sense of the passages; (3) the omission to take account of the distinction between light-armed and heavy-armed infantry. This distinction is plainly marked by William of Poitiers: *Pedites in fronte locavit, sagittis armatos et balistis, item pedites in ordine secundo firmiores et*

⁴ *Athenæum*, 20 May, p. 687.

⁵ *Quarterly Review*, pp. 75, 76.

loricatos; *ultimo turmas equitum*.⁶ Mr. Freeman (who quotes William's words in a foot note) writes—

First . . . marched the archers, slingers, and cross-bow men, then the more heavily armed infantry, lastly the horsemen. The reason of this arrangement is clear. *The light-armed were to do what they could with their missiles to annoy the English, and, if possible, to disorder their close array.* On them followed the *heavy infantry*; they were to strive to break down the palisades, &c. (p. 467). *After the first discharge of arrows, the heavier foot followed to the attack, and the real struggle now began.* The French infantry had to toil up the hill, &c. (p. 477).

On the one hand the Reviewer has misread Mr. Freeman as assigning to 'the infantry' as a whole functions which Mr. Freeman carefully limited to its second (the heavy-armed) division; on the other, he has himself extended to 'the infantry' as a whole the functions which belong specially to the first (the light-armed) division, to whom Mr. Freeman no less carefully assigns them.

II. Again the Reviewer writes:—

Baudri's poem suggests a novel view by its definite statement that the Normans in their flight reached the duke's post. Mr. Freeman imagined that the duke himself had been fighting in the front line (pp. 479, 480), but a careful comparison of his authorities, William of Poitiers and Bishop Guy, will show that, on the contrary, they support Baudri's statement. Each speaks of the duke as 'meeting' (*occurrens—occurrit*) the fugitives, a difficulty which Mr. Freeman evaded by writing that 'he met or pursued the fugitives.'⁷

No 'imagination' was required to place the duke in the front at the moment of the first flight of his troops; the fact comes from William of Poitiers. He tells us that when the light-armed had failed to make an impression on the English ranks, '*subveniunt equites, et qui posteriores fuere fiunt primi*'⁸—the duke (whose original post had been, as Mr. Freeman says (p. 463), at 'the innermost centre of the advancing host'—'in the midst of all'—'the immediate leader of that choicest and central division,' the native Norman cavalry) being of course at their head. It was after this advance of the cavalry that first the foot, then the Breton horsemen and other auxiliaries on the left wing, and finally, as William of Poitiers says, *fere cuncta ducis acies*, including the Norman cavalry themselves, were seized with a panic and fled; turning, as it seems, their backs on their leader and leaving him almost alone in face of the foe. It was therefore hardly possible to reconcile this position of affairs with the other statement of William of Poitiers, '*Princeps . . . fugientibus occurrit*,' except by using an alternative word—'met or pursued.' William's real meaning probably was that the duke galloped his horse round from the rear to the front of the fugitives, and thus met them in their flight.

⁶ Duchesne, p. 201 c. ⁷ *Quarterly Review*, p. 77. ⁸ Duchesne, pp. 201 d, 202 a.

III. From his criticism of Mr. Freeman the Reviewer here turns aside to lodge a complaint against Mr. Archer.

We may here conveniently break our narrative to glance at an attempted vindication of Mr. Freeman's 'conception of the battle,' contributed to the *Contemporary Review* for March by Mr. T. A. Archer. Although we impugned the accuracy of the 'Norman Conquest' *passim*, Mr. Archer confined his rejoinder to one point alone, the battle of Hastings. And though, even in the brief space we could then allot to that subject, we enumerated several matters on which we differed from Mr. Freeman, Mr. Archer does not attempt to reply to us on more than one of these matters, the existence of a 'palisade.'⁹

Mr. Archer has stated his reason for limiting his reply to one point: 'In one matter only does the Reviewer so much as attempt to lay hold upon an error of the first magnitude.'¹⁰ That matter was the great battle piece of which the Reviewer had said that he selected it for criticism at the very outset, 'because it may fairly be described as Mr. Freeman's greatest achievement, the point where he is strongest of all.'¹¹ 'It is . . . the very crown and flower of his work; and it is, we venture to assert, mistaken in its essential points.'¹²

Again, Mr. Archer writes—

Let us now . . . read what the Reviewer says about Mr. Freeman's theory, that Harold at Hastings surrounded his camp with palisades.

'Mr. Freeman's fortress . . . incredible though it may sound . . . had absolutely no existence save, as he wrote of his predecessor Thierry, in the pages of romances like his own. Every allusion to this palisade throughout this hard-fought day is imaginary, and imaginary alone. . . . Of course Mr. Freeman's fortress has secured universal acceptance. Its "palisades" and "barricades" figure now in every history. . . . We have fully discussed this statement respecting the "palisades," because it affects, we shall find, the whole story of the battle. It is the very keystone of Mr. Freeman's description, and if removed brings with it the whole edifice to the ground.'

It is clear, from these and similar words, that the Reviewer lays more stress on proving that Mr. Freeman's palisade theory is wrong than on any other part of his paper. It is, indeed, the one definite and important point on which he joins issue. . . . To overthrow the Reviewer here is to render almost all that he says about the battle of Hastings nugatory; for it is all based, more or less, on the presumption that Mr. Freeman is wrong in the matter of the palisades.¹³

As the Reviewer does not assert that his position has here been either misrepresented or misunderstood, his complaint seems to rest upon somewhat insufficient grounds.

IV. The Reviewer proceeds—

We shall now not merely reaffirm our position in this matter—which

⁹ *Quarterly Review*, p. 77.

¹¹ *Quarterly Review*, July 1892, p. 6.

¹³ *Contemporary Review*, p. 888.

¹⁰ *Contemporary Review*, p. 885.

¹² *Ibid.* p. 20.

Mr. Archer, we shall show, has utterly failed to shake—but shall carry our criticism further still, as the best reply to his efforts. Let us, then, glance at the episode described by Mr. Freeman as the ‘great slaughter of the French in the western ravine’ (p. 489). We select this as having been invented by Mr. Freeman alone, and as illustrating the peculiar use he made, at times, of his authorities . . . We turn to the spirited version of Wace. . . . He first tells us (ll. 7869–70, 8103–6) that the English had made a ‘fosse,’ *which the Normans had passed unnoticed in their advance*. These passages Mr. Freeman accepts without question (p. 476).¹⁴

The italics in the above quotation are mine. Before proceeding further I too turn to Wace, and this is what I find in him: Lines 7869–70 (in Andresen’s edition, which is the one used by the Reviewer) run thus:

Vn fosse ont d’une part fait,
Qui parmi(e) la champaigne uait.

I can see no allusion to this passage in Mr. Freeman’s p. 476; doubtless, however, he did ‘accept’ it, as, taken with its context, it is obviously a mere repetition of the statement made in ll. 6991–2 which he had quoted in p. 447, note 2:

Heraut a le leu esgarde,
Closre le fist de boen fosse.

The other passage, ll. 8103–6, Mr. Freeman does quote in p. 476, note 3, and it is this:

En la champaigne out un fosse :
Normanz l’aueient adosse ;
En beluiant l’orent passe,
Ne l’aueient mie esgarde.

The words in which the Reviewer refers to this last line—‘a fosse which the Normans had passed unnoticed’—can only mean one of two things:—(1) ‘a fosse which the Normans had passed without noticing it,’ or (2) ‘a fosse which the Normans had passed without being themselves noticed by the English.’ If we regard only the grammar of the Reviewer’s words, irrespective of their sense and of the French words which they represent, they are patient of the latter construction; but it would be an insult to his intelligence and his scholarship to suppose he could imagine *l’* to stand for *les*, and could go out of his way to invent a nominative for *auient* when it has an obvious one ready made. If, on the other hand, he takes l. 8106 to mean that the Normans had passed the ditch without noticing it, I venture to think this rendering open to question. The passage in Wace is rendered obscure by the word *beluiant*, which the manuscripts give in four different spellings, and of which

¹⁴ *Quarterly Review*, pp. 77, 78.

only two writers, M. Pluquet and Dr. Andresen, have even suggested an interpretation. Pluquet printed it *belliant*, and added a note: 'En combattant. *Ce mot vient de bellare; il ne se trouve point dans le Glossaire de M. de Roquefort.*'¹⁵ "*En belinant,*" MSS. de Duchesne. *C'est-à-dire en usant de ruse, en trompant.*'¹⁶ Dr. Andresen notes on l. 8105, *Sie waren in schräger Richtung an ihm [scil. dem Graben] vorbeigegangen. Beliver=obliquer.* This would imply that the Normans had avoided the ditch, by going in a slanting direction past [one end of] it. Now it is obvious that they could not have actually crossed it, either 'fighting' or 'by a stratagem,' without noticing its existence. If, however, they avoided it, this also would imply that they had noticed it; for such avoidance could not have been accidental unless the ditch were a covered one, which there is nothing in Wace to indicate; and even in such a case it was much more likely to be intentional and owing to a timely discovery of the trap. The true meaning of Wace's lines is simply this: 'In the field was a ditch; the Normans had put it behind them; they had passed it'—whether 'fighting,' 'by stratagem,' or 'obliquely' is no matter; '*they had heeded it not*'—i.e. cared not for it; in other words, it had failed to check them.

To return, however, to the Reviewer's general argument as to the 'slaughter in the western ravine.' His contention throughout pp. 78-9, if I understand him rightly, is that the first break in the English line was made immediately, or very shortly, after the Normans had crossed the above-mentioned 'fosse,' by the English rushing forward and driving them back; that what Mr. Freeman called 'the great slaughter in the western ravine' was really a slaughter of both French and English in this fosse, and that it was followed by Bishop Odo's rally of the French. This view he bases on the tapestry and Wace, referring, first, to the four lines of Wace which have just been discussed and the thirty-two lines following them (ll. 8103-38) as being 'in curiously close agreement with the tapestry'—describing, in fact, 'two successive scenes' thereof, which are thus entitled: *Hic ceciderunt simul Angli et Franci in proelio. Hic Odo Episcopus baculum tenens confortat pueros.*

Actual comparison alone [says the Reviewer] can show how close the agreement is. Henry of Huntingdon, we may add, independently confirms the statement that English as well as French perished in the fatal fosse. Now all this is quite opposed to Mr. Freeman's 'conception of the battle.' He had therefore to adapt, with no gentle hand, his authorities to his requirements. . . . Wace's evidence he simply suppressed; Henry of Huntingdon's he ignored.¹⁷

¹⁵ Godefroy gives the word in its various spellings, and quotes the line from Wace among instances of its use, but without offering any explanation at all of its meaning.

¹⁶ *Roman de Rou*, ii. 218.

¹⁷ *Quarterly Review*, p. 78.

An important part of the evidence of Henry of Huntingdon has here been overlooked—I will not say ‘suppressed’ or ‘ignored’—by the Reviewer himself. The whole passage runs thus:—

*Docuit igitur dux Willelmus genti suae fugam simulare; fugientes autem, ad quandam foveam magnam dolose protectam devenerunt: ubi multus numerus eorum corruens oppressus est. Dum igitur Angli insequendo persistunt, acies principalis Normannorum mediam Anglorum catervam pertransiit. Quod videntes qui persequabantur per foveam praedictam, redire compulsi ibidem ex magna parte perierunt.*¹⁸

The words which I have italicised show that, in Henry’s belief at least, the slaughter in the fosse which he is here describing took place *after the feigned flight* of the Normans, which Wace does not bring in till l. 8203 *et seqq.*, and therefore that this slaughter is quite another thing from the earlier struggle described in Wace’s lines 8103–38 and in Mr. Freeman’s pp. 480–3. If Mr. Freeman in those pages made no use of Wace, it was probably because the poet here furnished him with no special information which he could not find in other and, as he may have considered them, better sources. If in pp. 489–90 he ‘ignored’ Henry of Huntingdon, it was probably for a like reason.

The Reviewer proceeds to observe that the evidence of the Bayeux tapestry could not be so easily disposed of. We invite particular attention to his [*i.e.* Mr. Freeman’s] treatment of this, his ‘highest authority.’ Retaining in its natural place (pp. 481–2) the second of the two scenes we have described, he threw forward the one preceding it to a later stage of the battle (p. 490). Nor did his vigorous adaptation stop even here. The scene thus wrenched from its place depicts a single incident . . . yet the professor treats this scene as a description of two quite separate events happening at a distance from each other. . . . Our criticism here is twofold. In the first place Mr. Freeman endeavoured to conceal the liberties he had taken with his leading authority. No one would gather from his narrative of the battle that any such violence had been used; nor would any one who read of the ‘hill’ episode that ‘the scene is vividly shown in the tapestry’ (p. 489), and, subsequently, of the ‘ravine’ disaster, that ‘this scene is most vividly shown in the tapestry’ (p. 490), imagine that ‘the incidents of the ravine and the little hill’ (p. 768) are in the tapestry one and the same. In the second place the large part which the writer’s own imagination plays in his narrative of the fight is here clearly seen.¹⁹

My criticism here is fourfold.

1. The Reviewer has overlooked—again I will not say ‘suppressed’ or ‘ignored’—the evidence of William of Malmesbury, quoted in full by Mr. Freeman in the foot notes to his pp. 489 and 490. On this subject Mr. Freeman observes in his appendix (p. 770)—

¹⁸ Henry of Huntingdon, l. vi. c. 80, ed. Arnold, p. 203.

¹⁹ *Quarterly Review*, p. 79.

I must leave it to the reader to judge whether the words of William of Malmesbury and the representation in the tapestry, when taken together, bear out the meaning which I have put upon them. The hill is very distinctly marked in the tapestry, and it seems impossible that the words *occupato tumulo* in William's account can mean the general occupation of the hill of Senlac itself by the English army.

On comparison of the whole passage of William of Malmesbury with the tapestry, indeed, no other interpretation than that of Mr. Freeman seems possible. The picture (*Hic ceciderunt*, &c.) suits William's words, as if drawn to illustrate them; the words suit the picture as if written to describe it. Now, those words follow immediately on William's account of the feigned flight. It appears, therefore, that William's description of the 'little hill' incident belongs to a later stage of the battle than what the Reviewer—for once in agreement with Mr. Freeman—holds to be the natural place of its companion picture (*Odo . . . confortat pueros*); unless, indeed, we are to adopt, in the teeth of other authorities, the version of Guy of Amiens, and place the feigned flight at the beginning of the action. I do not understand that the Reviewer proposes to do this; but

2. Even if he does he is not thereby justified in asserting that Mr. Freeman 'endeavoured to conceal the liberties he had taken with his leading authority.' On this very point as to the feigned flight Mr. Freeman says—

The account . . . of Guy may be thought to be confirmed by the tapestry, which places (pl. 15) the scene of William and Odo recalling the troops both after the death of Gyrrh and Leofwine (pl. 14) and after the incidents of the ravine and the little hill.²⁰

3. Mr. Freeman's justification for 'taking liberties' with the tapestry by changing, when, from a comparison with other authorities, he saw reason to do so, the sequence of the incidents which it depicts, lies in words almost immediately following those which I have just quoted from him: 'In the nature of things exact chronological order is not its strongest point' (p. 768). And, whether he was right or wrong in treating the first of the two divided scenes (*Hic ceciderunt*) 'as a description of two quite separate events happening at a distance from each other,' he certainly, so far from 'endeavouring to conceal' what he had done, gave his readers full opportunity to see for themselves that the incidents 'are in the tapestry one and the same;' for in each case he gives the reference to 'the tapestry, pl. 15' (pp. 489, note 2, 490, note 1).

4. The Reviewer seeks to demonstrate 'the large part which the writer's own imagination plays in his narrative of the fight'

²⁰ Appendix NN, p. 768.

by a discussion of the relative positions of the 'western ravine' and the 'fosse,' 'fossatum,' or 'fovea.' His argument goes on the assumption that Wace's *fosse*, William of Malmesbury's *fossatum*, and Henry of Huntingdon's *fovea* must all necessarily represent one and the same ditch, a ditch which lay 'to the south of the hill' occupied by the English host.²¹ On this I will only observe that, thus far, this assumption appears to me not proven, and I will recall the Reviewer's own words respecting what he himself designates (p. 80) 'the fosse disaster.'

It is not strange . . . that some writers should have held that there was but one such incident: Mr. Freeman, however, holds that there were two; and we expressly disclaim questioning his view, *the matter being one of opinion*.²²

V. The Reviewer now turns again to Mr. Archer, and brings against this gentleman charges even more serious—at any rate couched in stronger terms—than those which he has brought against Mr. Freeman. I will quote a few passages.

Mr. Archer himself betrays the weakness of his cause by the tactics to which he has recourse. . . . He . . . endeavours to eke out his case by misrepresenting or suppressing what Mr. Freeman says. . . . If our would-be critic had been honest or straightforward in his tactics, and if he had not had the effrontery to lament 'errors' and 'blunders' [in the *Quarterly Reviewer's* first article] of his own invention, we should have dealt gently with him. . . . Is it not Mr. Lang who has said that 'it is not hard to confute an opponent, if it may be done by attributing to him a theory which he does not hold, and disproving that'? This, as might be expected, is Mr. Archer's device.²³

This is strong language. Let us see how the Reviewer justifies it. He first runs through the list of 'errors' which were pointed out in his original article by Mr. Archer, but which, he asserts, 'with one solitary exception . . . have no existence in fact' (p. 81). The exception is the date given to the battle—'that September day.'²⁴ The remaining errors are—

²¹ *Quarterly Review*, pp. 79, 80.

²² *Ibid.* p. 78.

²³ *Ibid.* pp. 80, 81.

²⁴ *Ibid.* July 1892, p. 20. The Reviewer observes that this error 'in no way affected our arguments, and was wholly irrelevant to the issue.' But it is not irrelevant to his own character for accuracy and carefulness in writing; and the like may be said of two other mistakes which occur in his first article, and which have also nothing to do with his arguments—(1) where he writes (July 1892, p. 2), 'An exquisite parody of *Calverley's* rises irresistibly to one's mind: "For I hold the grey barbarian lower than the Christian cad,"' forgetting that the line is not from Calverley, but from one of the Bon Gaultier ballads; (2) where he observes (*ib.* p. 15), 'We grasp the dangers of realism in art when we find a Tennyson striving to secure the correctness of his work by taking his details straight from the pages of the *Norman Conquest*,' and proceeds to quote from Tennyson's *Harold* sundry mentions of the 'palisade,' forgetting Tennyson's own statement in his dedication of the drama, that 'after old-world records—such as the Bayeux tapestry and the *Roman de Rou*—Edward Freeman's *History*' and Lord Lytton's romance had been 'mainly helpful' to him in writing it. So, too, when in

(1) Our alleged 'opinion that Mr. Freeman invented the palisade theory.'

(2) That the hill of battle, being 'an open down,' could not supply the timber for the alleged palisade.

(3) Our statements that *palis* is used for palisade . . . or *mairrien* for timber, in Wace, or our assertion that 'neither of these terms is found in his account of the battle.'²⁵

1. On the first point I will simply give my own personal experience. The Reviewer's first article left me under a distinct impression that Mr. Freeman was the first (modern) historian who had ever spoken of a palisade at Senlac. Of earlier writers on the battle I then knew nothing, save what I had gathered at second hand from Mr. Freeman's foot notes and appendices. P. 339 of Mr. Archer's paper, tracing the history of the 'palisade theory' from Pluquet in 1827 through Thierry, Taylor, Lappenberg, Palgrave, and Malet down to Mr. Freeman himself, came to me as a wholly unexpected revelation. I cannot but regret that the *Quarterly Reviewer*, in his earlier article, should have given no hint of the fact that the first public appearance of the 'palisade theory' was not made in the 'Norman Conquest;' and I regret still more the explanation which he now gives of his omission:—

So far were we from holding the 'opinion' Mr. Archer assigns to us that in the first draft of our article (which we hold) we had discussed the influence, in this matter, on Mr. Freeman of Taylor's Wace, which he is known to have used. The reason of our striking out the passage was that we deemed it unjust to Mr. Freeman to suggest that he was merely misled by others, instead of going to the original sources and forming his own opinion.²⁶

It will be noticed that even now the Reviewer gives no explanation whatever of his silence as to the fact that the 'palisade theory' was adopted by Thierry, Lappenberg, Michelet, Martin, and Palgrave, as well as by Taylor. From this unexplained silence readers can but draw their own conclusions. If, however, the

the last page of his second article the Reviewer quoted, as a parallel to the 'tactics' which he ascribed to Mr. Archer, the lines put by Milton into the mouth of Satan after his defeat, it must of course have entirely escaped his notice that in so doing he was, by implication, likening himself to Satan's Almighty Conqueror. An oversight more closely connected with the subject of his arguments occurs in p. 20 of his first article. He there says, in reference to the feigned flight of the Normans, 'The best account of it is that which is found in the *Battle Chronicle*, and which we now quote because Mr. Freeman did not: "Tandem strenuissimus Boloniae Comes Eustachius clam, callida praemeditata arte, fugam cum exercitu duce simulante, super Anglos sparsim agiliter insequentes cum manu valida a tergo irruit, sicque et duce hostes ferociter invadente, ipsis interclusis utrinque prosternuntur innumeri." The italics are mine. I use them because the only parts of this passage which 'Mr. Freeman did not' quote are the first word (*tandem*) and the last eleven words (*sicque . . . innumeri*). All the rest of it is printed in the *Norman Conquest*, vol. iii. 2nd ed., appendix NN, p. 768.

²⁵ *Quarterly Review*, pp. 81, 82.

²⁶ *Ibid.* p. 81.

Reviewer 'deems it unjust' to give an historical scholar credit for having carefully studied and respectfully considered the writings of earlier, even though less illustrious, labourers in his special department of the historic field; if, on the other hand, he deems it just to lay upon one man the whole responsibility for a delusion—if delusion it be—which, as he says, 'forms the linch pin' of that man's narrative, and which had stood unchallenged in the pages of every historian of the Norman conquest for forty years before that narrative saw the light—then I have only to say that the Reviewer's ideas of justice and injustice differ *toto caelo* from mine.

2. As to the alleged lack of timber for the palisade, the Reviewer complains—

Carefully refraining from quoting our words (pp. 341, 343), which were specially limited to the hill itself, Mr. Archer informs us that there were woods *near*—which we well knew and never denied—and claims thus to produce another 'error.'²⁷

Certainly the Reviewer never 'denied,' in so many words, that there were woods near the scene of the battle; but his original article took no account of the fact of their existence—a fact which, since he was aware of it, he was bound to face and to grapple with. If he knew or remembered, before they were pointed out to him by Mr. Archer,²⁸ the passages in Guy of Amiens and William of Poitiers stating the proximity of woods to the place of battle, he was bound to suggest some way of reconciling those passages with his argument—an argument which, in truth, they are sufficient to bring to the ground. For, if there were woods near, the question at once presents and answers itself: Could not Harold, who 'must have known Sussex well, and had clearly, from the very beginning, chosen in his own mind the spot on which he would give battle,'²⁹ have collected his timber as he went along, and carried it with him, so that when he reached the chosen spot he had only to set it up there? It was to this flaw in the Reviewer's reasoning that Mr. Archer directed his reply;³⁰ and of that reply the Reviewer's present argument simply misses the point.

3. Respecting the use of the words *paliz* and *mairrien* in Wace, the Reviewer asserts that Mr. Archer has not only failed to 'disprove our statements,' but has made two statements of his own which 'are directly contrary to fact' (p. 82). For the vast majority of readers this is simply a case of one writer's word against another's. Few indeed are the students who can undertake to read through the whole 'Roman de Rou,' to verify the accuracy of either of the two opposing sets of statements; fewer still are they who, if they did attempt such an investigation, would at its close be any nearer a

²⁷ *Quarterly Review*, p. 82.

²⁸ *Norman Conquest*, iii. 443.

²⁹ *Contemporary Review*, pp. 341-2.

³⁰ *Contemporary Review*, pp. 341-2.

settlement of the question. The many must be content to accept the verdict of whichever of the two writers may, on other grounds, appear the more worthy of their confidence; and in any case the *onus probandi* now lies with the *Quarterly* Reviewer.

One thing, however, may be noticed by the most unlearned reader—that of the exact meaning of Mr. Archer's statements on this point (setting aside the question as to their correctness) there can be no doubt whatever, while the case is quite otherwise with those of the Reviewer. The Reviewer in his first article wrote—

A palisade in Wace is *paliz*, and the timber of which it was formed *mairrien*, but neither of these terms is found in his account of the battle. It is, moreover, so obvious that '*escuz de fenestres e d'altres fuz*' refers to shields, and not (as Mr. Freeman renders it) to 'firm barricades of ash and other timber,' that one is led to wonder how he can have so misread it. Here, then, we venture to think, we have at length a clue to his 'triple palisade.' He obtained the sole authorities that he could adduce for its existence, in the one case by mistranslating his French, and in the other by misconstruing his Latin.³¹

To this Mr. Archer replied—

At its best the argument here is somewhat obscure and difficult to follow. But it seems to imply three things: first, that *paliz* is Wace's invariable word for palisade, to the exclusion of all others; secondly, that *mairrien* is his invariable word for the timber of which the palisade is constructed; and thirdly, that the Reviewer is furnished with at least a few instances where the two words occur in combination. For, if Wace ever uses another word for palisade, he may do so in the passage to which the Reviewer refers. So, too, with *mairrien*. Whereas, if the Reviewer cannot adduce some passages where the two words occur in combination, he has no right even to assume that in Wace the two words bear any relation to one another.

And now for the facts of the case.

Wace does indeed use the word *paliz* occasionally, but, after a careful examination of the whole of the '*Roman de Rou*,' I have only found the word twice. In both of these cases it is connected—and closely connected too—with '*fosse*,' never once with *mairrien*. . . . As for *mairrien*, Wace uses this word in the '*Roman de Rou*' only three times, all in the same passage, and always of the same thing. . . . Lastly, altogether apart from the above consideration, in the absence of a single passage where the words *paliz* and *mairrien* occur together, the Reviewer has absolutely no ground for his assertion that *mairrien* is Wace's term for the 'timber of which it (i.e. the palisade) was formed.'³²

Mr. Archer here makes it perfectly plain that his statements respecting *paliz* and *mairrien*, and the argument based on them, relate solely to the '*Roman de Rou*.' From the Reviewer's words—'neither of these terms is found in his (Wace's) account of the battle'—he doubtless gathered (as I venture to think that ninety-

³¹ July 1892, p. 14.

³² *Contemporary Review*, pp. 342-3.

nine readers out of a hundred would have gathered) that the Reviewer's statement had special reference to the '*Roman de Rou*, Wace's greatest work, and the only one mentioned in the Reviewer's article. Now, however, the Reviewer protests that

our critic addresses himself, as usual, to what our argument 'seems to imply,' or 'seems to assume,' in his own opinion. And in proceeding to impugn that, he promptly falls himself into the double 'error' of stating that Wace only uses the word *palis* twice, and that he only uses *mairrien* for the special timber 'which Duke William had prepared in Normandy' for his *chastel* on the English coast (p. 849). Both these statements, on which Mr. Archer founds, are directly contrary to fact.³³

1. Mr. Archer found the Reviewer's original argument respecting *palis* and *mairrien* 'somewhat obscure and difficult to follow.' He could, therefore, do no more than endeavour to form some opinion as to what it 'seemed to imply,' and address himself to that.

2. As to the alleged 'double error,' (a) if the Reviewer means that Wace in the '*Roman de Rou*' uses *palis* more than twice,³⁴ and in the '*Roman de Rou*' uses *mairrien* for something else besides the timber of William's castle at Pevensey, he ought to do what Mr. Archer did—give the instances. (b) If he did not originally intend his words '*in Wace*' to refer to the '*Roman de Rou*,' he ought to have said so at the time; he ought at least, for his own sake, to say so now, and to give his references; for, as he has expressly disclaimed any intention of 'dealing gently with' Mr. Archer, and has threatened him with the full 'consequences of the line he has chosen to adopt' (p. 80), his silence on this matter is calculated to awaken in his readers' minds a misgiving as to his own confidence in the strength of his case.

VI. 'And now,' proceeds the Reviewer (p. 82), 'let us recapitulate our arguments in the matter of the palisade.'

³³ July 1893, p. 82.

³⁴ It is only right to quote here Mr. Archer's foot-note to his letter in the *Academy* of 28 Sept., p. 256: 'I have mislaid my original notes on Wace's use of *palis* in the *Roman de Rou*; probably, if I could lay hands on them, I should find that I ought to have written "three times" instead of "twice."' This is, however, a detail which makes no difference to the force of Mr. Archer's argument, of which the *Quarterly Reviewer* has here missed the point. The Reviewer—as Mr. Archer understood him—had argued that *palis* was Wace's (sole or usual) word for 'palisade' [or 'barricade']; that *palis* did not occur in Wace's account of the battle of Hastings; and that, therefore, this account did not include a palisade [or 'barricade']. Mr. Archer replied that—at all events so far as the *Roman de Rou* (Wace's greatest poem, and the only poem mentioned or even alluded to by the Reviewer) is concerned—*palis* was not Wace's sole or even most usual word for 'palisade'; that, in the *Roman de Rou*, Wace's favourite word for 'palisade' was *pel*; that *pel* did occur in Wace's account of the battle, and unquestionably in the sense of 'palisade'; and that, therefore, Wace's account of the battle did include a palisade. For the way in which the Reviewer now endeavours to meet the difficulty here presented to him, I would ask my readers to look at sec. viii. below, p. 65.

Those arguments are—

(1) That the existence of a palisade at Senlac was a 'delusion,' for which, 'dismissing the "Roman de Rou," in no chronicle or poem, among all Mr. Freeman's authorities, could he find any ground.'³⁵ 'On this passage we take our stand; it is the very essence of our case.'³⁶

(2) That 'he [Mr. Freeman] obtained the sole authorities that he could adduce for its existence, in the one case by mistranslating his French, and in the other by misconstruing his Latin.'³⁷

The first argument—although the Reviewer declares it to be 'the very essence of our case'—is, when taken by itself, absolutely inconclusive. If the existence of a palisade is actually stated in the 'Roman de Rou,' and not contradicted, explicitly or implicitly, by any of the other authorities, Mr. Freeman was entitled to accept it on the testimony of Wace alone, until either that testimony was proved to be worthless or the statement proved to be intrinsically impossible. Whether or not there is another authority who implicitly supports the statement is a secondary question which links the Reviewer's first argument to his second; for the charge of 'misconstruing Latin' relates to a passage of Henry of Huntingdon, 'to whose words Mr. Freeman appealed as the sole evidence' (i.e. sole evidence outside the 'Roman de Rou') 'for Harold's fortification of the hill.' The Reviewer asserts that Mr. Archer 'carefully ignores' this count in the indictment against Mr. Freeman. 'Lacking the courage to rebut or the honesty to admit it, he transfers our charge of "misconstruing" to Wace, and on our real charge is absolutely, significantly silent' (p. 85). On the preceding page the Reviewer has printed his own words side by side with Mr. Archer's. To me the comparison does not appear to bear out his complaint that Mr. Archer has 'garbled' his statement, for I can see nothing to indicate that Mr. Archer had here any intention of quoting the exact words of the Reviewer at all; from the absence of quotation marks I should suppose that he was merely using in his own person a somewhat similar phrase. Whether his silence as to the charge of 'misconstruing Latin' means that he regards the Reviewer's rendering of the passage in Henry of Huntingdon with perfect or even approximate satisfaction, I know not; but the question as to the rendering of that passage is a question solely for scholars, and to their decision, or to their silence, I leave it.

The other charge—that of 'mistranslating his French'—was, the Reviewer now says, 'based solely and explicitly on Mr. Freeman rendering *escuz* as "barriades," not as "shields" (p. 15).'³⁸ This charge, as originally made, was intimately connected with a third, that of having attempted to use, as an authority for the

³⁵ July 1892, p. 15; July 1893, p. 83.

³⁶ July 1893, p. 84.

³⁷ July 1892, p. 15; 1893, p. 84.

³⁸ *Quarterly Review*, July 1893, p. 85.

palisade, another passage of Wace which, the Reviewer maintains, alludes to nothing of the kind.

Every allusion to this palisade, throughout the hard-fought day, is imaginary, and imaginary alone. Indeed, in only two instances is there even an attempt made to give any authority. In one, 'the triple gate of entrance' is based on a passage in the 'Roman de Rou' referring not to a palisade crowning the summit of the hill, but to a ditch (*boen fossé*) which Mr. Freeman places at its foot; in the other the description of the palisade . . . is taken from a passage in the same poem referring not to a palisade, but to the 'shield wall.'³⁹

In his second article (pp. 82-3) the writer quotes these words of his own, and adds, 'These statements are unassailable; we can prove them up to the hilt.' He then quotes 'the only allusions that Mr. Freeman makes to "the" fosse,' and declares 'they show that he placed it not on the summit, but "to the south" of "the foot of the hill." *It could have, therefore, nothing to do with the alleged "palisade."*' I have italicised this last sentence, because, 'unassailable' as it may appear to its writer, I intend to assail it when I come to his fuller discussion of the relations between fosse and palisade in pp. 86-8 of his article. For the present I pass on to his second statement, that 'the description of the palisade' in p. 471 of the third volume of the 'Norman Conquest' (2nd edition) 'is taken from a passage . . . referring not to a palisade, but to the shield wall.' The passage in question is this:—

Fait orent deuant els escuz
De fenestres e d'altres fuz,
Deuant els les orent leuez,
Comme cleies ioinz e serrez;
Fait en orent deuant closture,
N'i laisserent nule iointure
Par onc Normant entr'els uenist
Qui desconfire les uolsist.
D'escuz e d'ais s'auironoent;
Issi deffendre se quidoent;
Et s'il se fussent bien tenu,
La ne fussent le ior uencu.⁴⁰

It is with reference to these lines that the Reviewer accused Mr. Freeman of 'mistranslating his French.' 'Our charge . . . was based, solely and explicitly, on Mr. Freeman rendering *escuz* as "barricades," not as "shields."' Here he again suddenly turns upon Mr. Archer.

With characteristic recklessness Mr. Archer scornfully observes, 'The literary Rhadamanthus should assess the heaviest penalty to M. Pluquet, the originator of the blunder, who, as a Frenchman, should have

³⁹ *Quarterly Review*, July 1892, p. 14. ⁴⁰ *Roman de Rou*, ll. 7815-26, ed. Andresen.

known better than to mistranslate his own language' (p. 840). But how does M. Pluquet render *escuz*? Why, as we learn from Mr. Archer himself (p. 839), by *boucliers*; that is, by 'shields.' Sir Alexander Malet, he also reminds us, rendered it 'bucklers;' while Taylor, whose work Mr. Freeman used, translated it 'shields.' It was obviously, therefore, incumbent on Mr. Archer to vindicate the rendering by 'barricades' of a term which is one of the commonest in Wace, and which, as every one knows, invariably means 'shield.' Yet he does not even attempt to produce a single instance in his favour, but contents himself with the ludicrous rendering 'shield-[like defence]s' (p. 848)! Even for himself such a travesty must have proved too great, since we find him later (p. 851) rendering the word simply as 'shields.'⁴¹

The Reviewer here fails to grasp the real nature of the question at issue. That question turns on the meaning, not of the single word *escuz*, but of the whole phrase *fait orent devant elz escuz de fenestres e d'altres fuz*, and the significance of Pluquet's note lies not in his rendering of a single word, but in its demonstration of the meaning which that French scholar attached to Wace's whole phrase—a significance which becomes evident when the note is quoted in its integrity as Mr. Archer quoted it: '*Les Anglais se retranchent au moyen de boucliers et de palissades.*'⁴² In other words, he sees in these lines not only a shield wall, but also a wooden fortification.'⁴³ So too with Mr. Archer's quotation from Sir A. Malet: 'They made them a fence of bucklers and wattle-work well interlaced.'⁴⁴ And Mr. Taylor is no less precise: 'They had built up a fence before them with their shields and with ash and other wood'⁴⁵ . . . and thus they had a *barricade* in their front.'⁴⁶

In other words, what Mr. Archer had to vindicate was not 'the rendering by "barricades" of a term'—to wit, the word *escuz*—'which is one of the commonest in Wace, and which, as every one knows, invariably means "shield."' Neither Mr. Archer nor Mr. Freeman had ever proposed 'barricade' as a translation of *escuz*. Their proposition was simply that the two lines—

⁴¹ *Quarterly Review*, July 1898, p. 85.

⁴² Pluquet, ii. 205.

⁴³ *Contemporary Review*, p. 839.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵ I must leave the Reviewer to reconcile his own statements on pp. 81 and 82 of his second article. On the former page he declares that in the first draft of his [first] article he had discussed the influence in this matter [of the palisade] on Mr. Freeman of Taylor's Wace. On the next page he asserts that Mr. Freeman 'did invent in support of it [the palisade] two original misrenderings;' and from the next page again (88) it is evident that one of these 'original misrenderings' is no other than the 'palisade' rendering of the 'crucial passage.' Since Edgar Taylor, thirty years before Mr. Freeman, had rendered that passage as describing a 'fence' or 'barricade'; since the Reviewer 'had discussed the influence in this matter on Mr. Freeman of Taylor's Wace, which he is known to have used;' his only chance of maintaining the 'palisade' interpretation to be an 'original misrendering' on Mr. Freeman's part would be to draw a distinction between a fence and a palisade—a distinction which, I venture to think, most readers would regard as a distinction without a difference.

⁴⁶ *Master Wace*, p. 176.

Fait orent denant elz escuz
De fenestres e d'altres fuz—

implied a barricade of some kind or other. In l. 7823, on the other hand—

D'escuz e d'ais s'auironoent—

there is ample scope for an alternative rendering of *escuz*. Looking at the passage as a whole, it seems natural to take this line as a kind of summing-up of those which precede it, and to interpret its 'shields' in the sense of cover or defence—'these hurdle-like shields'⁴⁷ which have just been described. But there is no reason, either in the nature of things or in the construction of the sentence, why it should not be taken independently and literally, and understood as stating that the English surrounded themselves with actual shields, as well as with planks. Mr. Archer might expect that his readers would interpret his words in p. 351 ('surrounding themselves with "planks" and shields') by the light of those which he had used in p. 348 ('with [these hurdle-like] shields, and with planks, were the English encompassed round'). But the suggestion of an alternative rendering—the literal rendering—involved him in no self-contradiction; for such a rendering in no way contradicts the 'barricade' interpretation of l. 7815-6; and *this* was the 'barricade'—real or imaginary—over which the paper war was in fact being waged. Mr. Archer, in fact, virtually appealed to the common sense of his opponent and his readers as to whether it were possible—even granting that the 'shields' and (so-called) 'ash-wood' of ll. 7815-6 referred to a shield wall pure and simple—to explain away the 'shields and planks' (*ais*) of l. 7823. One of the most startling things in the Reviewer's first article was the way in which he met the difficulty of disposing, on the 'no-barricade' theory, of the *planks* in l. 7823. In his p. 12 he put forth what looked like an equation of *d'escuz e d'ais* with the Old English *mid scyldum and bordum*. It was difficult to believe that a scholar could seriously make this suggestion; but the Reviewer, it seems, did intend to make it, and adheres to it still; for Mr. Archer's criticism upon it in the *Academy* of 2 Sept. has received no answer but silence.

The Reviewer proceeds—

The actual reply to our case, in the matter of the palisade, will be found on pp. 844-52 of Mr. Archer's article. And the four principal devices on which it rests are these: (1) he represents us as relying specially on Wace, which is the exact converse of the truth . . . (4) he 'mainly' relies on Wace. . . . We may conveniently combine the first and fourth points, because Mr. Archer, having falsely charged us with 'mainly' relying upon Wace, makes that his excuse for doing so himself.⁴⁸

⁴⁷ *Contemporary Review*, p. 348.

⁴⁸ *Quarterly Review*, pp. 85-6.

1. The passage in Mr. Archer's paper here referred to is as follows :—

Like the Reviewer, it is upon Wace that we shall mainly rely. The Reviewer's charge is that Mr. Freeman has mistranslated Wace; that Wace's passage refers to the shield wall and not to a palisade. There is not even an attempt to discredit Wace as an authority; were this the point, we should have much to say; but the contention is that Wace does not speak of a palisade, but of the shield wall, and that Mr. Freeman has misapprehended the old Norman poet's meaning.⁴⁹

The first sentence is, perhaps, not very happily worded. The Reviewer, however, does not dispute that his 'charge,' his 'contention,' is correctly represented in the rest of the passage. If this be so, he does, in a sense, 'mainly rely upon Wace;' for it is on Wace's words, interpreted according to what he regards as their true meaning, that he relies for a refutation of the theory based upon what he holds to be a mistranslation of them. It could not be otherwise; for nobody has ever professed to see an actual mention of a palisade at Senlac in any chronicler of the battle except Wace; and therefore the 'palisade theory' could be combated only in one of two ways—either by discrediting Wace's authority, which the Reviewer did not set himself to do, or by maintaining that Wace had been misinterpreted, which is what he did. On Wace the whole question turned; and Mr. Archer needed no 'excuse' for recognising that fact, and acting upon it accordingly.

2. From Mr. Archer's fourth 'device' the Reviewer goes back to the second. Mr. Archer, he complains, 'assigns to us an "admission" as to the English fosse, which is exactly contrary to our statement, but on which he bases an argument.'⁵⁰

The third section of Mr. Archer's paper is devoted to showing 'how the Reviewer's admission of a "fosse" at Hastings, if rightly understood, involves a palisade;' and he begins by observing, with characteristic confidence, that 'the Reviewer might have avoided this [what?] mistake had he only remembered all that is involved in his own admission that Harold surrounded his camp with a "fosse" or ditch.'⁵¹

Now it is of course plain that Mr. Archer must have here used the word 'surrounded' in a loose sense. He could not possibly mean to represent either the Reviewer, or Mr. Freeman, or Wace, or himself, as 'admitting' that Harold dug a ditch *all round* his camp. If one might hazard a guess as to what was in his mind, I should say it probably was a sentence in Mr. Freeman's p. 447: 'He [Harold] occupied the hill; he *surrounded it on all its accessible sides* by a palisade.' The 'accessible sides' were those on which the palisade is marked in Mr. Freeman's plan of the battle-field—the long southern side or front, and the short eastern and western

⁴⁹ *Contemporary Review*, p. 844. ⁵⁰ *Quarterly Review*, p. 85. ⁵¹ *Ibid.* p. 88.

ends. The north side of the hill—the rear of the camp—could not enter into the question. The front, exposed to the full brunt of the Norman attack, was the only side where anybody could dream of placing a ‘fosse,’ and there was, therefore, no occasion for Mr. Archer to specify its position, which was taken for granted by all parties alike.

But, continues the Reviewer—

we did not even ‘admit’ the existence of any ditch at all. . . . Our article did not admit the existence of the ‘fosse.’⁵²

I may observe that he has, at all events, admitted it now; for in pp. 79–80 of his second article, where he is combating Mr. Freeman’s location of the ‘great slaughter of the French’ in ‘the western ravine’ (see above, p. 46), he says—

Wace’s ‘fosse’ . . . lay . . . to the south of the hill . . . but whether *our ditch* was dug, as he states, expressly or not, *the fact of its existence does not depend on his evidence alone.*’

Whether or not the Reviewer in his first article regarded the fosse as a reality or as an invention of Wace’s, however, makes no difference to Mr. Archer’s argument. For the Reviewer unquestionably acknowledged, as he acknowledges still, that there was a fosse at Hastings *according to Wace*; the subject of discussion was not the correctness of Wace’s statement on this point, but the possibility of legitimately deducing a certain theory from a certain passage in Wace’s account of the battle; and Mr. Archer’s point here was simply this: that, granting the existence of a ‘fosse’ in Wace’s scheme of the English defences (which the Reviewer had granted, and grants still), it followed almost inevitably that that scheme must include a vallum and a palisade as well.

The Reviewer, however, maintains that, if the fosse did exist, it did not necessarily imply even the existence of a vallum. For Mr. Archer’s authority, Wace, describes a precisely similar stratagem (ll. 1787–60), where all the earth from the artificial ditches was carefully and purposely removed.⁵³

Want of space forbids me to quote at length the twenty-four lines of Wace here referred to. Any reader who takes the trouble to look them up, however, may see at a glance that they describe a ‘stratagem,’ not ‘precisely similar’ to, but wholly different from, the simple digging of a single open ditch round the exposed side of a camp—a proceeding which was, in truth, no ‘stratagem’ at all. What they describe is the making of a whole series of ditches or trenches of a particular kind and for a particular purpose—of rows upon rows of *hidden* ditches or pitfalls, such as the Bretons dug to entrap the Angevins at Conquereux, and the Scots to entrap the

⁵² *Quarterly Review*, p. 87.

⁵³ *Ibid.*

English at Bannockburn. The illustration is, therefore, irrelevant to the case under consideration, unless we are to assume that Wace meant his 'ditch' at Senlac to be understood in this special sense; an assumption for which there is no ground in the simple words that he uses.

We next come to the connexion between vallum and palisade. This the Reviewer meets with a simple denial. He then proceeds—

Even if there was a fosse, and if that fosse implied a vallum, and if that vallum was . . . crowned by a palisade, yet this palisade could not be that which Mr. Freeman mentions. It is on this last point that we specially take our stand. The only allusion that we made to the fosse—the allusion to which our critic appeals—was made for the sole and express purpose of insisting that, whatever the fosse might be, it could not, on our author's own showing, have anything to do with his 'palisade.' And yet Mr. Archer, knowing this, knowing that even if this fosse were palisaded (which he cannot prove) it could have nothing to do with Mr. Freeman's palisade on the hill—the only one in question—coolly states that the existence of the latter is 'involved' in an 'admission' that we never made, and in a confusion that we ourselves exposed! That is why we say that he must have known that his arguments were not straightforward.⁵⁴

Now I am going to suggest a possibility that Mr. Archer did *not* 'know'—perhaps does not know to this day—the supposed fact on which the Reviewer insists so strongly, that the fosse at the southern foot of the hill 'could have nothing to do with Mr. Freeman's palisade' on the hill itself. Three times—twice in one page (87) and once in an earlier one (83; see above, p. 55)—does the Reviewer assert this fact; and the third time he adds, 'It is on this last point that we specially take our stand.' I think it can be shown that he has been not quite sufficiently circumspect in his choice of a standing-ground.

In his first article (p. 14) the Reviewer speaks of 'a palisade crowning the summit of the hill.' Now, if this were the position assigned to the palisade by its modern defenders, there might be some reason in the retort that it could have no connexion with a ditch or fosse, which, we need no Freeman to tell us, must have been at the *foot* of the hill. But where does Mr. Freeman—where does Mr. Archer—assert that the palisade was *at the summit*? I have examined all the twenty-one passages in which, as the Reviewer says,⁵⁵ Mr. Freeman mentions or alludes to the barricade. Of these there are only six that can possibly give any sort of clue to the position which Mr. Freeman held the barricade to occupy on the hill. I will quote them.

⁵⁴ *Quarterly Review*, pp. 87–8.

⁵⁵ July 1892, p. 11.

(1) He occupied the hill; he surrounded it on all its accessible sides by a palisade (p. 447).

(2) To charge up the slope . . . with . . . the triple palisade still unbroken, would have been sheer madness (p. 467).

(3) The whole height was alive with warriors; the slopes, strong in themselves, were still further strengthened by the firm barricades. . . . Up the slopes, through the barricades, the enemy had to make their way (p. 471).

(4) The Normans had crossed the English fosse, and were now at the foot of the hill, with the palisades and the axes right before them (p. 476).

(5) The French infantry had to toil up the hill, and to break down the palisade (p. 477).

(6) The main body of the Normans made their way on to the height, no doubt by the gentle slope at the point west of the present buildings. The great advantage of the ground was now lost; the Normans were at last on the hill. Instead of having to cut their way up the slope and through the palisades, they could now charge to the east, &c. (p. 490).

In none of these passages do we hear a word about the *summit* of the hill. In three of them (2, 3, 6) we hear of the *slope*. The statement in (1)—‘he occupied the hill’—is explained in (3), ‘the whole height was alive with warriors;’ whence we must conclude that by ‘he surrounded it . . . by a palisade’ is meant, that not merely the summit, but the whole height, was thus defended. In (4) we are told that the palisade was ‘right before’ the Normans when they were at the foot of the hill, and immediately after they had crossed the fosse. If from Mr. Freeman’s text we turn to his ground plan, we find that it points in the same direction as these passages; the palisade is placed (of course) in front of the whole English array; one-third of the depth of that array is placed in front of the standard; and the standard, Mr. Freeman tells us, was planted ‘just where the ground begins to slope’ (pp. 447, 474). That is, Mr. Freeman placed the standard on the edge of the hill, and the palisade some distance below it, *on the slope*. This interpretation of Mr. Freeman’s words and of his ground plan may, of course, be disputed. My purpose is simply to point out that the Reviewer’s interpretation of them, which represents Mr. Freeman as placing the palisade on the ‘summit’ of the hill, is open to dispute likewise; and in this case, again, it is upon him that the *onus probandi* rests.

3. And now we reach the third count of the Reviewer’s indictment of Mr. Archer:

He suppresses throughout Mr. Freeman’s repeated admission of a ‘shield wall,’ which would be fatal to his argument.⁵⁶

⁵⁶ *Quarterly Review*, p. 86; cf. p. 88.

The critic then proceeds to 'confront Mr. Freeman's champion with Mr. Freeman himself' throughout three pages (88-90), in order to demonstrate that what Mr. Archer called 'the Reviewer's argument,' 'the Reviewer's theory' of the existence of a shield wall at Senlac, is 'no other than Mr. Freeman's own,' and that Mr. Archer 'designedly suppressed Mr. Freeman's allusions to the shield wall,' because he 'found that his only chance of even attempting a reply lay in coolly ignoring a fact in the presence of which his elaborate argument collapses like a house of cards' (p. 88). Now, the Reviewer does not deny that the shield-wall theory combated in pp. 346-8 of the *Contemporary Review*—that of a 'wall' formed by the whole body of fully armed men holding their shields in their hands in a close and unbroken line along the entire extent of the English front—is in one sense his, *i.e.* that it is the theory which he holds. He only urges that it was also Mr. Freeman's. Before he can be justified in imputing to Mr. Archer a dishonest motive for passing over in silence his reference⁵⁷ to Mr. Freeman's appendix NN, he is bound to *prove*, not merely to assert or assume, that the shield wall which Mr. Freeman had in his mind when writing that appendix was of precisely the same character as that which he himself imagines; he is bound to *prove*, not merely to assert, that the 'shield-wall interpretation' of the so-called 'crucial passage' in Wace, *as actually given by Mr. Freeman in his appendix*, is absolutely incompatible with the 'barricade interpretation' which the same writer gave to the passage in his text. If it can with any show of reason be maintained that neither of Mr. Freeman's two interpretations necessarily contradicts or excludes the other, Mr. Freeman's 'champion' could have no motive for 'suppressing' the appendix. Now, the Reviewer, on the other hand, in p. 13 of his first article argued on general grounds that a palisade and a shield wall were in the nature of things incompatible. This supposed incompatibility was the ground of his assertion in p. 14 that Mr. Freeman 'virtually gave himself away' by interpreting Wace's ll. 7815-26 as a description of *both palisade and shield wall*. Mr. Archer summarised the Reviewer's arguments on the first point in his p. 340, and observed in a foot note on p. 341—

A separate article would be required to discuss the alleged incompatibility of a shield wall and a palisade. The question is not what the English ought to have done, but what they actually did. The whole science of medieval poliorcetics was based on the principle of what seems to us unnecessary multiplication of outworks.

After this he was clearly not called upon to turn aside from the main question at issue (the *barricade* rendering of the crucial

⁵⁷ July 1892, p. 14.

passage) in order to discuss a secondary one as to whether or not Mr. Freeman indeed 'virtually gave himself away' by quoting in his appendix that same passage as a description of the shield wall. I understand that Mr. Archer has now, in reply, not to the *Quarterly Reviewer*, but to another and a very different critic of Wace, written a 'separate article' in which he has dealt with this question of shield wall and palisade, and also with the questions raised in connexion with the English axe men as described by William of Malmesbury and as represented in the Bayeux tapestry.⁵⁸ These questions I therefore gladly leave in worthier hands than mine, only noticing one passage in p. 91, where the Reviewer quotes from Mr. Archer :⁵⁹

William of Malmesbury here is in accord with Wace : ' *Pedites omnes cum bipennibus*, ' &c., as the *Quarterly Reviewer* cites the passage.

Here [comments the Reviewer], it will be seen, Mr. Archer proves that the axe men were 'shieldless,' by simply omitting and *suppressing* the words which describe their 'shield wall' ! . . . So too he appeals to this passage from Wace :

' *al col l'escu.*

Granz haches tinrent en lor cols

Done il quident ferir granz cols ;

A pie furent *serrement* ' (ll. 7996-9).

But the only words he quotes from it are (we keep his own quotation marks) 'great hatchets on their necks, with which they could strike doughty blows' (p. 347).

(1) As to the passage from William of Malmesbury. Considering that Mr. Archer put '&c.' after *bipennibus* ; that he expressly referred to the passage 'as the *Quarterly Reviewer* cites' it ; and that the Reviewer had cited it thus (the italics are his own)—

' *Pedites omnes cum bipennibus, conserta ante se scutorum testudine, impenetrabilem cuneum faciunt* ' ⁶⁰—

the charge of '*suppressing* the words which describe their shield wall' is scarcely borne out by the facts of the case.

(2) As to the passage from Wace.

The Reviewer has overlooked half of Mr. Archer's sentence, the half which precedes the quotation marks. The whole sentence runs thus :

Harold's own special friends—the *corps d'élite* of the English army—are accoutred with sword and SHIELD ; and in addition to this they have hung '*great hatchets on their necks*, ' &c.

VII. The Reviewer now devotes a page and a half (94-5) to a discussion of Mr. Archer's references to Wace's use of the word *lices*. There are here two points to be noticed.

⁵⁸ *Quarterly Review*, July 1893, pp. 91-4.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.* July 1892, p. 15.

⁶⁰ *Contemporary Review*, p. 347.

1. Mr. Archer [says the Reviewer] devotes his fourth section to 'four passages where Wace speaks distinctly of a *lice*, i.e. a palisade.' In spite of the large print in which this announcement was made, we find that only *three* instances can actually be adduced (p. 94).

For the answer to this criticism I have only to refer my readers to the *Academy* of 28 Sept., p. 256, where Mr. Archer has answered it for himself.

2. Mr. Archer [says the Reviewer] . . . compels us to point out that the passage on which he specially relies—

'E cil ont les espees traïtes,
Les lices ont totes desfaites,
E li Engleis par grant dehait
Se sunt a l'estandart retrait' (ll. 8589-92)—

is, so far from confirmatory, destructive of Mr. Freeman's views. On no point is he more positive than that the standard, with Harold at its foot, stood, throughout the day, in the very forefront of the fight (pp. 447, 474, 475, 476, 488, 484, 487, 492), and that Harold fought at the 'barricade' like 'a private soldier.' To suggest that he and his standard remained in the rear, while his followers fought and died for him at the front—till forced to retreat to the standard—would have seemed to Harold's champion little short of blasphemy. We have, we hope, now shown that Mr. Archer can only appeal to Wace's mention of *lices* (ll. 8585-92) at the cost of throwing over Mr. Freeman's 'conception of the battle.' . . . We may add that, according to the professor (p. 495), 'there was no artificial defence' left between the English and their foes at a stage of the battle earlier by 800 lines than that at which alone these *lices* appear.⁶¹

The last objection is irrelevant; the question is not *when* the *lices* were broken down, but whether there were any *lices* to break down. If Wace tells us that they were broken down, no matter at what stage of the fight, he clearly wishes us to understand that they had previously been set up, even though (apart from the 'crucial passage') he may not have stated that fact in so many words—a point which, I venture to think, the Reviewer has not finally settled yet. Nor is there more force in the argument that Wace's words—*li Engleis . . . se sunt a l'estandart retrait*—are 'destructive of Mr. Freeman's views.' For, in the first place, it is not certain that *retrait* necessarily implies 'going back.' Pluquet glosses these lines, *Les Anglais se rallient autour de leur étendard*. His gloss may by later scholars be ruled incorrect; in that case I shall be tempted to make a new application of Mr. Archer's words—'The literary Rhadamanthus should assess the heaviest penalty to M. Pluquet, the originator of the blunder, who, as a Frenchman, should have known better than to mistranslate his own language.'

But, further, granting that l. 8592 does mean 'they retreated'

⁶¹ *Quarterly Review*, pp. 95-6.

or 'fell back to the standard,' I deny that it in any way contradicts Mr. Freeman's 'conception of the battle;' for I hold that, as regards the position of the standard and of the king, that conception is wholly misunderstood by the Reviewer. I do not hesitate to assert that 'on no point is' Mr. Freeman 'more positive than that the standard . . . stood, throughout the day,' *not* 'in the very forefront,' but in the *centre* of the host. I am guided by the references which the Reviewer himself gives to Mr. Freeman's pp. 447 and 474, in which, as we have seen already (p. 61, above), the standard is placed 'just where the ground begins to slope,' while in the ground plan a full third of the depth of the array is on the slope in front of it. I look on to the next reference, and find that 'there, as the *inner circle* of the host, were ranged the fated warriors of the house of Godwine. . . . There . . . *the innermost centre* of that glorious ring, stood the kingly three. . . . And *there*'—*not* at the front—'sharing the toils and dangers of his meanest soldier . . . stood Harold, king of the English' (pp. 474–5). I nowhere find a statement—certainly the Reviewer does not point to one—that Harold remained all through the day as if rooted to the spot on which he had posted himself at its beginning, and therefore I am neither surprised nor puzzled to see him represented in p. 484 as close to 'the barricade,' *i.e.* no longer in the centre, but at the front; nor, again, at the close of the 'long agony' (after, as Wace says, *li Engleis . . . se sunt a l'estandart retrait*), to be shown the last glimpse of him once more at his original post, 'the foot of the standard' (p. 497). Neither do I recognise, nor see any ground for supposing that Mr. Freeman recognised, any impossibility, or even difficulty, in Harold's 'sharing the toils and dangers of his meanest soldier' (p. 475), 'playing the part alike of a general and of a private soldier' (p. 492), just as well at the centre as in the front. In a word, I do not see the 'blasphemy' of the suggestion that Harold, during the greater part (not the whole) of the day, was not at the front; and I do not believe that 'Harold's champion' would have seen it either.

VIII. From the *lices* the Reviewer goes to the *pel*, quoted by Mr. Archer from Wace's l. 8499, and denounces it as irrelevant to the palisade question, because Mr. Archer 'himself renders the word not 'palisade,' but 'stake' (p. 345). . . . Indeed, the *granz pels* (l. 7727) which the rustics fought with in the battle are rightly rendered by Mr. Freeman 'sharp stakes.'⁶²

Certainly. But the Reviewer must, as Mr. Archer has pointed out,⁶³ have forgotten the context of l. 8499 if he can seriously propose to take *pel*, in that line, in the sense of a stake held in the hand of a rustic; he must have overlooked the still closer and

⁶² *Quarterly Review*, p. 98.

⁶³ *Academy*, 2 Sept. 1893, p. 193.

equally significant context of *pel* and *fosse* in the line itself; he must have forgotten that a stake is just as much a stake when stuck in the ground as when held in the hand, and that a row of stakes, or upright pieces of wood, thus planted in the earth is usually the first element in the construction of a palisade.

IX. Of Mr. Archer's 'corroborative evidence from other sources' the Reviewer declines to take any notice. On the passages from Wace's 'Brut' adduced by Mr. Archer as a parallel to the same poet's account of Senlac he scornfully remarks—

It must be obvious to any rational being that if Wace could thus minutely describe the operations of mythical Britons, it only shows how free a scope he gave to the inventive faculty; while the parallel Mr. Archer relies on can, of course, only prove, not that the descriptions were both true, but that they were equally worthless.⁶⁴

Now what is 'obvious' to me here is that Wace in the 'Brut' did what was almost invariably done by medieval romancers—transferred to his mythical battles the colouring of the actual battles of his own day. If I had met with his account of King Arthur's palisade without knowing that a similar mode of entrenchment was described in the records of some real battles in the middle ages, I should have regarded it, not as 'worthless,' but as an important indication that such a practice was, at any rate, not unknown in the warfare of Wace's own fellow-countrymen and contemporaries. Had I afterwards met with his account of the real battle at Senlac, I should have welcomed it as a confirmation of my inference. I am aware that by making this avowal I am putting myself outside the pale of 'rational beings' in the opinion of the *Quarterly Reviewer*; but I trust there may yet be some who do not share that opinion.

X. The Reviewer now proceeds to 'sum up the case as regards the "Roman de Rou."' ⁶⁵ Having dealt with the details of the case, I need say nothing about the summary; but I have to notice two additional criticisms appended to it.

1. The Reviewer observes that—

in the opening scene, where it [the palisade] ought to have been specially prominent, when 'the French infantry,' in Mr. Freeman's words, 'had to toil up the hill, and to break down the palisade' (p. 477), there is no mention in Wace of any defence of the kind. On the contrary, indeed, he here describes the English as at times retreating before the Normans, and the Normans, in turn, as pursued by the English (ll. 8075-8), which is incompatible with the opposing forces being divided by 'wooden walls,' behind which, on the English side, 'not a man,' says Mr. Freeman, 'had swerved' (p. 480).⁶⁶

⁶⁴ *Quarterly Review*, July 1893, p. 96.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶ *Ibid.* p. 97.

I submit that the Reviewer's rendering of the four lines here referred to—

A la feie[e] Engleis rusoent,
 A la feie[e] recouroent,
 E cil d'oltre mer assailleient
 E bien souent se retraient—

is incorrect. Here is not a word about 'pursuing.' What Wace says is simply this: 'At times the English drew back; at times they disengaged themselves [from their antagonists]; and those from over sea assailed [the English], and very often retreated. Mr. Freeman had very justly assumed (p. 447) that the 'wooden wall,' like the ditch below it, had three carefully guarded entrances. Through these entrances the English might, now and again, make actual sallies from, and again retire within, their enclosure. Such movements, executed under orders, would be perfectly consistent with the statement that 'not a man had swerved' from his post. Moreover, it appears to me that ll. 8075-8 do not necessarily refer, in any special way, to 'the opening scene' of the battle, but are rather part of a sort of general sketch of the varying fortunes of the day.

2. The Reviewer continues—

It is true that the historian supports his view by thus paraphrasing Wace: 'The Normans shouted "God help us!" the English, from behind their barricades, mocked with cries of "Out, out!" every foe who entered or strove to enter' (p. 478). But, in the original, we only read—

'Normant escrient: "Deus aie!"
 La gent englesche "ut, ut!" escrie.
 Co est l'enseigne que io di,
 Quant Engleis saillent hors a cri.' (ll. 8079-82.)

Mr. Freeman has simply interpolated the words 'from behind their barricades;' and this is an instance of what we meant when we spoke of his 'imaginary' allusions to the palisade. But this is by no means all. The gloss which he has put on the *Ut! ut!* of the English is at direct variance with Wace's own explanation. The last two lines of the quatrain, which Mr. Freeman omitted, tell us that this was the cry which the English raised when in pursuit. It was, in short, their old *hutesium* (or *uthesium*), which they raised, as Wace states, when in pursuit of criminals. The writ for providing watch and ward, issued in 1252, gives us excellent examples of its use.⁶⁷

It is to be observed that the two lines which Mr. Freeman 'omitted' never formed part of the printed text of the '*Roman de Rou*' till Dr. Andresen's second volume appeared in 1879, four years after the last edition of Mr. Freeman's third volume was published. They were, however, quoted by Edgar Taylor in a foot-note to his

⁶⁷ *Quarterly Review*, July 1893, p. 97.

'Master Wace,' with this remark : 'An addition to the text, which is found in the MS. 6987 of the Bib. Royale at Paris, seems to determine what word is meant,' i.e. by *ut*. A 'plain man' (if I may borrow a favourite expression of Mr. Freeman's) is really tempted to wonder how any English-speaking person can ever have needed foreign assistance to 'determine what word is meant' by *ut* in the mouths of his own forefathers. At any rate, before Mr. Freeman's 'gloss' is admitted to be 'at direct variance with Wace's own explanation,' it must be proved that Wace's explanation is rightly interpreted by the Reviewer ; and this is open to question. Again I submit that *saillir hors* does not mean 'to pursue ;' it means simply 'to sally forth,' for any purpose whatever—to attack an enemy just as much as to chase a criminal. The Reviewer says that the cry of the English at Senlæ was '*their old hutesium* . . . which they raised, as Wace states, when in pursuit of criminals.' If it were so, there would be here nothing inconsistent with the statement that they 'mocked' their foes with the cry ; to suggest that the flower of the Norman knighthood were criminals worthy only to be hunted down would surely have been to 'mock' them. But as a matter of fact Wace says nothing about criminals, and nothing about pursuit ; nothing, in short, to imply any allusion to the 'hue and cry' or 'hutesium' of later days. It is, in fact, extremely questionable whether *hutesium* and its undoubted French original, *huée*, *hu*, have anything in common with the Teutonic *ut*. The best modern lexicographers give no countenance to such an idea. Even if such a connexion be granted, however, the Reviewer is no nearer proving his case ; for the examples cited by Godefroy plainly show that at the date of the 'Roman de Rou,' as well as both before and after, the primary meaning of *hu* was a cry or noise of any kind ; that its secondary meaning was a war-cry ; and that the very phrase, *li hus e li cris*, was commonly used by French writers in a purely military sense, without any notion of the special significance implied in the technical English use of 'hue and cry' or 'hutesium.' But, as the Reviewer says, 'this is by no means all.' He adds : 'It was . . . their' [i.e. the Englishmen's] '*old hutesium* (or *uthesium*).' In his view, then, the *hutesium* or *uthesium*, *eo nomine*, was a recognised English institution before the coming of the Normans. It is strange that, under these circumstances, he brings forward no instance of it earlier than A.D. 1252. All scholars are, of course, aware that earlier instances exist ; but if the Reviewer desires to maintain his assertion that the *hutesium* was already 'old' in England in 1066, he must be prepared to produce some instance very much earlier than any that are as yet generally known ; and until he does produce it, his assertion must be considered not proven.

The main point of the Reviewer's argument here, however, is

doubtless not the connexion between *ut* and *hutesium*, but the fact, unquestionably stated by Wace, that *ut* was the cry habitually used by the English *when they sallied forth shouting*; a cry, therefore, which meant, not 'get out!' but 'come out!' and this fact he holds to be 'at direct variance with' Mr. Freeman's rendering of the exclamation. I answer: The one rendering points to the existence of a barricade or palisade as surely as the other. *Saillir hors* implies an enclosure of some sort. Whether men are called *out* to hunt down a criminal, or to chase an enemy in the battle-field, they are called to 'sally forth,' in the one case from their houses, in the other from their camp; in either case, from something which is enclosed in one way or another. Otherwise the call would have no meaning. The Reviewer has, in fact, gone too far afield in his endeavours to paraphrase a very simple word. While for his parallel to the use of *ut* at Senlac he looks forward through two hundred years to a writ issued in 1252, he fails to notice that, in the very page from which he has just been quoting, Mr. Freeman glances back through a like space of time to 'compare the dying words of Lewis the Pious in the Astronomer's Life (64, Pertz, ii. 648); *Bis dixit, Hutz, hutz, quod significat foras*' &c.⁶⁸ This quotation shows that, as far back as the middle of the ninth century, the Teutonic word *out*, *aus*—*ut*, *hutz*, no matter how spelt—taken by itself, meant exactly what it means to this day. What more natural than that the men who on Senlac hill 'had to drive out less ghostly foes' than those who disturbed the dying emperor, should have used the exclamation in a double sense, at once roughly bidding their assailants 'get out' of the camp which for the moment was the Englishman's castle, and stirring each other up to 'come out' and chase the invaders from the land which was his lawful possession?

XI. The Reviewer now turns to what in his original article he called 'our second point, the disposition of the English forces.'⁶⁹ He observes, 'As we are charged with having "quite misapprehended Mr. Freeman's ideas," it becomes necessary to quote *in extenso* the actual words we used;' ⁷⁰ and I therefore, although reluctant to occupy so much space with quotations, feel bound in justice to do the same.

The one and only point that is certain is that 'on the very crown of the hill,' the site of the high altar in the future, was erected the standard of Harold. This, then, the centre of the hill, was the centre of the English host. But the ground to which our attention is directed, as having 'really played the most decisive part in the great event of the place,' lay to the west of this, 'where the slope is gentlest of all, where the access to the natural citadel is least difficult.' Mr. Freeman assumes that this

⁶⁸ *Norm. Conq.* iii. 478, note 2.

⁶⁹ July 1892, p. 16.

⁷⁰ July 1893, p. 97.

ground—the 'English right,' as he terms it—where 'the ascent is easiest in itself,' was allotted to 'the least trustworthy portion of the English army,' to 'the sudden levies of the southern shires.' For this assumption, we hasten to add, there is no authority whatever. He further assumes that the first English to leave their post, in pursuit of the enemy, 'were, of course, some of the defenders of the English right.' William, he holds, at the crisis of the battle, resolved to draw them again from their post by a partial feigned retreat, that 'meanwhile another division might reach the summit through the gap thus left open.' Accordingly, tempted by this stratagem, 'the English on the right wing rushed down and pursued,' and their error proved 'fatal to England.'

'The duke's great object was now gained: the main end of Harold's skilful tactics had been frustrated by the inconsiderate ardour of the least valuable portion of his troops. Through the rash descent of the light-armed on the right, the whole English army lost its vantage ground. The pursuing English had left the most easily accessible portion of the hill open to the approach of the enemy. . . . The main body of the Normans made their way on to the hill, no doubt by the gentle slope at the point west of the present buildings. The great advantage of the ground was now lost; the Normans were at last on the hill.'

Such is Mr. Freeman's explanation of how the battle was lost; for in this episode he discovers the decisive turning-point of the day.⁷¹

If [the Reviewer now adds] they [*scil.* his readers] should still consider the closing words too strong, we confront them with his [Mr. Freeman's] own summary of the battle, in which we find this sentence: 'The battle was lost [*sic*] through the error of those light-armed troops, who, in disobedience to the king's orders, broke their line to pursue' (p. 505). Yet Mr. Archer (the italics are his own) coolly replies that 'the battle was not *won* at this part of the field, but at the centre.' To say that the battle was 'lost' is also to say that it was won; and it was 'lost,' according to Mr. Freeman himself, exactly as he wrote.⁷²

I am bold enough to question this last assertion, and to think that the Reviewer does, as Mr. Archer said,⁷³ 'seem to have quite misapprehended Mr. Freeman's ideas' as to *where* and *when* (I do not say *how*) the battle was lost and won. Mr. Freeman unquestionably held—he has stated it in so many words (p. 505)—that 'the battle was lost *through* the error of the light-armed,' *i.e.* in consequence of that error; but he has nowhere suggested that that consequence followed immediately and inevitably and on the same spot, and that the battle was lost irretrievably then and there, as soon as the error was committed. On the contrary, he marks the error as having probably been committed before 8 P.M. (p. 490, margin; p. 492, note 2). He then tells us that 'still the battle was far from being over' (p. 490)—'the fight was still far from being over. It was by no means clear that some new chance of warfare might not again turn the balance in favour of England' (pp.

⁷¹ *Quarterly Review*, July 1892, pp. 16-7.

⁷² July 1893, p. 98.

⁷³ *Contemporary Review*, p. 353.

491-2) ; 'the fight had already been raging for six hours, and as yet its result was far from certain' (p. 492) ; 'still even now the fate of the battle seemed doubtful' (p. 495). Lastly, he tells us where and when it really was decided ; it was at the foot of the standard, three hours—according to his reckoning—after the light-armed had made their error. Then, and not till then, 'the men who fought upon the hill of Senlac . . . knew . . . that with their king's death that day's battle was lost' (p. 499)—and won.

XII. Next follows a criticism of Mr. Archer's statements that

we are assured on very good authority that the Reviewer seems to have quite misapprehended Mr. Freeman's ideas as to the position of the un-armed troops. . . . Harold, according to Mr. Freeman, did not leave his rude levies on the right exposed to the full fury of the Norman onset. Mr. Freeman distinctly states that these raw levies were protected by a small hill on which Harold had set (regular) troops, and by a ravine. So that the Reviewer's remarks on Harold's incapable generalship fall to the ground.⁷⁴

'Light-armed (not "unarmed") : ' the Reviewer, of course quite rightly, corrects an obvious slip of the pen. He then declares, 'This passage contains what we fear can only be described as two separate misstatements,' viz.—

(1) That Mr. Freeman mentions the ravine as defending the western approach to the (main) hill.

(2) That Mr. Freeman represents Harold as having 'set *regular* troops' on the small hill.⁷⁵

1. Mr. Freeman, says the critic, 'does *not* mention the "ravine" as defending this approach' (*i.e.* the western slope, where 'the ascent is easiest ;' see above, p. 70), 'for the excellent reason that it did not do so, lying as it did, according to him, not in front of the English, but in their right rear (see his ground plan).' To this I reply, first, that the fact of the ravine being not in front, but in what the Reviewer calls the 'right rear' of the English right wing, does not prevent it from being a defence to them, since it might protect them from being taken in flank and turned ; and, secondly, that such a connexion as Mr. Archer suggests between the ravine and western approach seems to me clearly indicated in Mr. Freeman's p. 445, where the description of the ravine follows immediately upon, and in the closest connexion with, the first mention of that 'part of the ground' which 'really played the most decisive part in the great event of the place,' *i.e.*, as we have seen the Reviewer take special pains to insist, the western slope. This difference of opinion as to the possible functions or uses of the ravine, however, is clearly in great measure

⁷⁴ *Contemporary Review*, p. 353. Cf. Freeman, iii. 445, 446, 489, and ground plan.

⁷⁵ *Quarterly Review*, p. 99.

dependent on a difference, about which enough has been said already, as to what actually did or did not happen there. The Reviewer holds that nothing is recorded to have happened in the ravine at all, but that the 'great slaughter' located in it by Mr. Freeman is really placed by the original authorities in quite another quarter. On this matter I can only refer my readers to sect. VI. above, and leave each one to form his own judgment.

2. The Reviewer urges that Mr. Freeman, so far from describing the 'small outlying hill' as held by *regular* troops, 'drew no distinction between its defenders and the "light-armed" levies who formed the English right;' and he quotes Mr. Freeman's remark (p. 489, note 2), 'The scene is vividly shown in the tapestry (pl. 15), and the defenders of the little hill are all light-armed.'⁷⁶

Any one who carefully examines the pictures of the Bayeux tapestry will observe that the division of the English troops into heavy-armed and light-armed—or 'regulars' and 'irregulars'—does not fully express, although it may practically cover, the differences of accoutrement therein portrayed. The typical fully armed Englishman of the tapestry is of course the figure which the *Quarterly* Reviewer has described in his p. 92—clad in mail coat and helmet, armed with sword, battle-axe, javelin, and shield. I have very little doubt that this striking figure, this 'first Englishman, thus depicted . . . with his panoply in complete detail,' is, as the Reviewer suggests, meant for a type of the full accoutrement of Harold's very best troops⁷⁷—of his house-carls, of his brothers and kinsmen, doubtless, too, of the king himself. It is clear, however, that we must reckon under the denomination of 'heavy-armed' all the men who are clad in coats of mail. Under the title of 'light-armed' we may group all those who do not wear that attire. Of these the tapestry shows us two classes—(a) mailless warriors bearing axe, sword, javelin, or lance, sometimes also a shield; (b) rustics armed with sticks or stakes. These last are shown in the tapestry only in flight, at the very end of the battle (pl. 16, ed. Bruce). To the former class (a) belong the men on the little hill (pl. 15). While, therefore, Mr. Freeman was undoubtedly right in describing them as 'light-armed,' Mr. Archer is not without just grounds for

⁷⁶ *Quarterly Review*, p. 99.

⁷⁷ *I.e.* of their accoutrement before the actual fight began; for I, like Mr. Archer, believe that before the heavy-armed Englishmen could wield their most important weapon—the two-handed axe—they had to rid themselves, somehow or other, of their shields; and therefore I should hardly call this man a type of the *fighting* Englishman. The fight is, however, just beginning, for he is in the act of hurling his javelin at the advancing Normans. One feels that his next movement will be to lay aside his shield, and thus free both his hands to

'Lift high the mightier weapon,
That mocks at lance and bow,
The axe that cleaves through shield and helm
To the life strings of the foe.'

suggesting (and he does no more than suggest) that they were 'regular' troops, in comparison at least with those who had nothing better than 'such rustic weapons as forks and sharp stakes.'⁷⁸ To the remark that

the existence of an 'outpost' on the hill, even of 'light-armed' rustics, is avowedly nothing but a guess of Mr. Freeman's, a guess which we duly rejected (p. 17), as not merely without foundation but without even probability,⁷⁹

I have only to answer that, since the 'guess' was 'avowedly' such, it was at any rate a harmless one.; that on its 'probability' there is still room for a difference of opinion; and that the occupation of the little hill at *one* stage at least of the battle, not merely by 'rustics,' but by light-armed warriors, whose accoutrement was respectable enough to give them some title to rank as regulars, rests upon the authority of the 'priceless record' to which the Reviewer seems to attach even greater value than did Mr. Freeman himself—the Bayeux tapestry.

8. Lastly, I must observe that the critic has overlooked Mr. Archer's foot note on the word *ravine*, in which he says, 'My remarks about Harold's right wing summarise a friend's opinion—hardly my own.'

XIII. Once more the Reviewer goes on—

Mr. Archer's closing words on this part of the subject are these: 'The culminating point of the battle was not the turning of this [right] wing, which was not turned at all in any special sense, but only shared the general flight after the defeat of the centre' (p. 858). Here, as usual, our critic garbles our words. We did *not* describe the episode on the right as the 'culminating' point of the battle; we wrote (*ut supra*) that in it Mr. Freeman discovers *the decisive turning-point* of the day.⁸⁰

On this I would observe that, as Mr. Archer does not mark the words 'culminating point' as a quotation, he does not appear to have had here any intention of quoting from the Reviewer, and therefore cannot justly be charged with 'garbling his words;' and, thirdly, that by thus insisting—as I hold, quite rightly—on a distinction between the *turning-point* and the *culminating point* of the fight, the Reviewer—in words which he once applied to Mr. Freeman—'virtually gives himself away;' for he thereby concedes all that Mr. Archer urged in his p. 858, viz. that the 'episode on the right,' through (or owing to) which the battle was ultimately lost (and won), and which was thus its decisive turning-point, was *not* its crowning event, for which we must look to a later hour of the day and another part of the field.

The critic adds:

We cannot insist too strongly that, as we originally wrote, 'there is no authority whatever' (p. 16) . . . 'there is absolutely no evidence

⁷⁸ Freeman, p. 472.

⁷⁹ *Quarterly Review*, p. 99.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.* p. 100.

for Mr. Freeman's assumption that the English right was entrusted to the raw levies' (p. 18) . . . When Mr. Freeman wrote that this arrangement [the placing of the light-armed on the two wings] was 'beyond doubt,' he must have forgotten, for the moment, that it was nothing but a guess of his own.⁸¹

Firstly, Mr. Freeman did *not* write that this arrangement *was* beyond doubt. He wrote—as the Reviewer might have remembered, since he had quoted the words in full a few lines above—'The relative position of the different divisions in the two armies *seems* beyond doubt.' To say that a thing *is*, or that it *seems*, may be all one to the Reviewer, but it is not so to those who are as careful in their use of language and as scrupulous in never seeking to be 'wise above that which is written,' as was the late regius professor of modern history. The phrase which he here uses plainly indicates that he intended the disposition assigned to the English troops in his ground plan to be taken not as a statement of a proved fact, but as an inference from the nature of the circumstances and the general indications given by the authorities: an inference which *to him* 'seemed beyond doubt,' but which he was conscious might have a different aspect in the eyes of others. I may, perhaps, venture to add that (to me) the inference seems irresistible if one considers the lines of Guy of Amiens quoted by Mr. Freeman in his p. 488, note 4:

Rustica laetatur gens et superasse putabat,
Post tergum nudis insequitur gladiis.

All parties, wherever they place the struggle to which these lines refer, are agreed that it took place while the great body of fully armed Englishmen in the centre (round the standard) was still unbroken. No one—certainly not the Reviewer—thinks it possible that the light-armed, *rustica gens*, can have been in front of this great body. If they had been in its rear, they could not have forced their way through it to rush down as they did. Where, then, could they be, except on the wings?

This final count of the great indictment winds up with a triumphant reassertion of the 'glaring contradiction' between Mr. Freeman's plan of the battle-field and his comparison of the disposition of Harold's forces at Senlac with that of Eadmund's forces at Sherstone.⁸² I am not eager to deny the contradiction. I do not hold Mr. Freeman to have been infallible, and, therefore, if an apparent or a real self-contradiction on some matter of secondary importance, such as this, be detected here and there in his voluminous works, I regard the discovery just as I should regard it if made in the works of any other writer; I look upon it as an illustration of the truth so well expressed by Mr. Archer:—

⁸¹ *Quarterly Review*, p. 101.

⁸² *Ibid.* p. 102; cf. July 1892, pp. 18, 19.

In history, as in all other human work, we can never hope to attain absolute accuracy, however much we strive for it. Despite all our care, errors *will* creep in; our judgment *will* occasionally go astray: our knowledge *will* be defective. We must put up with these things as incidental to human weakness. . . . It is well that things should be so. They teach us a lesson of humility.

In connexion, however, with this matter of the analogy—or non-analogy—between Senlac and Sherstone, the Reviewer in his first article brings into his argument a comparison between the formation at Senlac and that at the battle of the Standard. After stating, as has been already seen, that ‘there is . . . absolutely no evidence for Mr. Freeman’s assumption that the English right was entrusted to the raw levies,’ he continues—

Against it . . . is all analogy drawn from the study of English tactics. Snorro’s description of Stamfordbridge is evidence, at least, that ‘the fortress of shields’ had a continuous line of bucklers along its whole front: Æthelred gives us the reason in his story of the ‘Battle of the Standard;’ namely, that it was the front line which had to meet the shock (*periculosum dicebant si primo aggressu inermes armatis occurrerent*). It was, therefore, an essential principle of tactics *quatinus armati armatos impeterent, milites congredierentur militibus*. Therefore on Cowton Moor (1188), as (we hold) on the hill of Battle (1066), we find the *strenuissimi milites in prima fronte locati*, and the lighter troops behind them.⁸³

I wish to remind my readers and those of the Reviewer that his first two quotations from Æthelred in this passage are taken from the abbot’s account of the council of war held before the fight *by the Scot king and his barons*; i.e. the ‘essential principle of tactics’ therein set forth is represented by Æthelred as applying not to the party which was standing on its defence (like Harold), but to the attacking force; in other words, that if it is to be applied by analogy to either of the hostile armies at Senlac, it must be to the Normans and not to the English. The third quotation from Æthelred is taken from his account of the English array, the array of the host which does, roughly speaking, stand in the same position as the English host at Senlac, and of this quotation I wish here to give the context.

At Australes, quoniam pauci erant, in unum cuneum sapientissime glomerantur. Nam *strenuissimi milites in prima fronte locati lancearios et sagittarios ita sibi inseruerunt, ut militaribus armis protecti tanto acrius quanto securius vel in hostes irruerent, vel exciperent irruentes*.⁸⁴

I ask my readers, and the Reviewer’s, whether this statement is accurately represented by his words, ‘We find the “*strenuissimi milites in prima fronte locati*” and the lighter troops behind them;’

⁸³ *Quarterly Review*, July 1892, p. 18.

⁸⁴ Æthelred of Rivaux, Howlett, *Chron. Stephen*, vol. iii. p. 191.

and I ask whether an 'analogy' elicited from Æthelred's pages by such a rendering as this, coupled with such a confusion between assailants and defenders as has just been pointed out, can be of any value in a discussion as to the disposition of the English forces on the field of Senlac.

'Of Senlac,' I have said; for it has yet to be proved that the name given to the place by Orderic the Englishman is 'an impossible English name,'⁸⁵ 'a fad of his own,' and that 'the site of the battle had no name at all'⁸⁶ till William built his abbey upon it. The name may be given by Orderic in a corrupt form; he or his informants may have altered the vowel in the last syllable, just as the 'Beoforlic' of the Old English chronicle had suffered corruption by the time when Orderic's contemporary Archbishop Thurstan granted his charter '*hominibus de Beverlaco*;' ⁸⁷ or there may be no corruption at all, for as far back as A.D. 944 we can trace an Old English word *lacu* (lake, pool), which the best philologists tell us is probably not derived from the Latin. The *onus probandi* here rests, once again, not upon the followers of Mr. Freeman and of Orderic, but upon their censor.

In burning words the *Quarterly Reviewer* denounces as a 'libel upon "God's Englishmen"' the suggestion that 'on that awful day,' the day when everything that is dear and sacred in this world was at stake for them and for their native land, they could have stooped to protect themselves with an artificial shelter against the attack of their invaders. Not in defence of self, or of a cause far more sacred than self, against a fierce and formidable assailant, but against a dead man who had given him no provocation and a living one who did but take up, in all frankness, courtesy, and honour, the challenge flung down upon a grave, has the Reviewer been fighting these many months past, from behind an artificial shelter, the shelter of his anonymity. He has certainly not strengthened his cause by deliberately choosing to set it forth in a periodical where the writers are bound to remain strictly anonymous, when any magazine of repute, in which he could have signed his name, would doubtless have gladly opened its columns to an article by a scholar of such attainments, on a subject of so much importance and interest. It is to be regretted, for his own sake, that he had not the courage of his opinions, that he did not scorn for himself a mode of combat which he scorns for the heroes of the great battle. He would have acted more consistently, as well as more honourably, had he followed what he regards as their example, and 'faced' his 'foe, 'standing as man to man.'

KATE NORGATE

⁸⁵ *Quarterly Review*, July 1892, p. 11.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.* p. 9.

⁸⁷ Bymer, i. 10.