

ever were its limits, seems to have been the chief dwelling-place of the Goths (rather, however, of the Visigoths than the Ostrogoths) during the hundred years which elapsed between Aurelian and Valens.

THOS. HODGKIN.

MOLMEN AND MOLLAND.

I SEND a few notes in confirmation of the views expressed by Professor Vinogradoff in his communication on the subject of 'Molmen and Molland' (ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW, vol. i. p. 794). The earliest mention (*eo nomine*) of this tenure seems to be found in the important cartulary of Burton, which purports to be of the early date 1100-1118. Here the holdings are divided into two classes, (1) *ad malam* and (2) *ad opus*. This, it will be seen, is exactly parallel to the 'mollond' and 'werkklond' of the St. Paul's inquisition of 1279. Archdeacon Hale has some notes on the latter ('Domesday of St. Paul's,' pp. lxxiv-v), in which he observes that tenants of 'Forland' (at Thorpe, Essex) in 1222 are represented by tenants of 'Mollond' in 1279—a curious point. As the division *ad malam* and *ad opus* corresponds with the division elsewhere *ad censum* and *ad operationem* (as in 'Worcester Registers,' p. xli), I presume that the *censores* or *censarii* of 'Domesday' are molmen. If so, we may have the distinction between *mol* and *gafol*, to which Professor Vinogradoff alludes, represented by the distinction in 'Domesday' between *censarii* and *gablatores*. Though I am not sure that I can follow him in the respective denotations he assigns to the terms *mol* and *gafol*, I may observe that, though eventually 'rent,' *gafol* previously (as Mr. Seebohm expresses it) consisted of 'payments in money, or kind, or work, rendered by way of rent' (p. 78). Thus *gafol*, as a money rent, might represent a commutation for a rent once paid either in labour or in kind. To this may be added that the early sense of *gafol*, as a tributary rent in kind, is well preserved in 'Domesday' itself, where, in Sussex, the *porci de gablo* represent the annual tribute of swine due from the hogward to his lord at slaughter time. It is, of course, important to remember, as Gneist has rightly pointed out, that Kemble and Dr. Stubbs are distinctly in error in speaking of *gafol* as a 'tax.'

It is noteworthy that *mal* (or *mol*) occurs in Wales; as in Anglesey, where we find in the 'Record of Carnarvon' (1858) *Gwir Male* (i.e. Gwyr Mal), or tenants who paid a money rent, opposed to *Gwir Gwaith* (i.e. Gwyr Gwaith), or those who held *ad opus*. (Palmer's 'Tenures of Land in the Marches of North Wales.') Lastly, we have a curious usage of the term in 'Hucstermoll,' a due from which the men of Leicester were freed by charter of 27 Edward III. (Eighth Report, Hist. MSS. Commission, app. i. 411.)

J. H. ROUND.

RANULF FLAMBARD AND HIS SONS.

In the 'Liber de Miraculis sanctæ Mariæ Laudunensis' (ii. c. 6, Migne clvi.) the following passage occurs:

Nos itaque non ex umbra mortis sed ex ipsis faucibus ejus, ut nobis

visum est, liberati gratiarum laudes Domina referentes, assumpto ejus feretro atque reliquiis, Cantuariam venimus ubi tunc erat archiepiscopus dominus Guilelmus, nobis notissimus, quoniam jamdudum, pro audientia [? audienda] lectione magistri Anselmi Laudunum petens, multis diebus in episcopi domo manserat ibique filios Radulphi cancellarii regis Anglorum docuerat.

The work was written by Hermann, a monk of Laon, between the years 1145 and 1149, that is, from thirty to forty years after the events narrated (cf. lib. iii. cc. 6 and 21). On the Thursday following Easter day (1112 A.D.) the cathedral at Laon had been burnt to the ground; and before the arrival of Whitsunday a little band of seven canons—with six laymen to assist in carrying the relics of their patron Lady—started on a tour through the northern parts of France to collect alms for the rebuilding of their church. At this time Laon was the most important ecclesiastical school in western Europe, owing its temporary fame to the success of its two great masters in scholastic divinity, Anselm and his brother Radulph. It was probably owing to the numerous English pupils, who had in previous years attended Laon for the sake of studying under these teachers, that, in the following Lent, a second company was despatched to England on a similar errand. On landing they made their way to Canterbury, where their kindly reception is described in the passage quoted above.

The whole of this tour through southern England is worth reading with some attention, more especially for the incidental glimpses it gives of contemporary English life. Thus we have the account of the Flanders merchants crossing over with three hundred marks of silver to purchase English wool for the looms of their native country; the story of the pirate vessel in the straits; the sketch of the twelfth century fair at Christchurch, in connexion with which foundation we read that its head did really bear the title of *decanus* (cf. Freeman, 'William Rufus,' ii. 558); the Devonshire dispute over the legend of Arthur many years before Geoffrey of Monmouth had issued his famous history; and the story of the Irish kidnappers trading to Bristol. But the fact most interesting to note of all is the great number of Englishmen (whether such by birth or residence) that are incidentally revealed to us as having once been Anselm's pupils at Laon. In the course of a few pages no less than seven are distinctly mentioned, and amongst them the two nephews of Henry I's great justiciar, Roger, bishop of Salisbury. The fact that Alexander of Lincoln and Nigel of Ely both received their education under this famous theologian has not, I think, been pointed out before; and it helps to illustrate the more general statement of William of Malmesbury as to Roger's special glory: *quod duos nepotes, suæ educationis opera, honestæ literaturæ et industria viros, effecit episcopos* ('Hist. Nov.' ii. 32).

It is, however, to the passage quoted at the head of this letter that I wish to direct special attention with a view to deciding who this *Radulphus cancellarius regis Anglorum* really was. There is, I believe, no one who will exactly correspond to this description, and the only two likely claimants are Ranulf, who was chancellor from c. 1107–1123 (Eyton; Henry of Huntingdon, p. 244), and his more famous namesake Ranulf Flambard. It would be most natural to assume that Hermann is here alluding to the

former, who was chancellor at the very time of the visit he records; nor does it appear possible to disprove this theory entirely. But, after a careful consideration of the question, there seems so much to be said in favour of Ranulf Flambard that, when we remember that our account of the whole journey was written by a foreigner nearly forty years after the events related, and only written by him at second or third hand, we may well doubt whether the consensus of indirect evidence is not enough to outweigh the few though precise words of Hermann. And here it may be noted, in illustration of this position, that in the very same sentence we have a similar mistake (natural enough in a foreigner), when we are told that in 1113 A.D. the strangers were received at Canterbury by 'William who was then archbishop.' As a matter of fact, William of Corboil, who must be the person here alluded to, was not elected to the see of Canterbury till 1123 (Sim. of Durh. 'Hist. Regum.' *sub an.*)

Before setting forth the reasons for identifying Hermann's *Radulphus cancellarius* with Ranulf Flambard, it will be best to clear the ground of preliminary difficulties. These resolve themselves into two heads: (a) that the name Ranulf is not the same as Radulphus, and (b) that Ranulf Flambard was not, so far as is known, chancellor of England.

To take (a) first: whatever arguments are urged against Ranulf Flambard on this score are equally or rather more applicable to Henry I's chancellor. The real name of each claimant seems to have been Ranulf; but in both cases we find the variants Radulphus and Randulphus. So, for the chancellor of Henry I, Henry of Huntingdon gives us the forms 'Radulphus' (p. 244, R.S.) and 'Randulphus' (p. 308); whereas in the charters the same person nearly always appears as 'Ranulfus' (Dugdale, 'Monast.' i. 488, 629, &c.) In the same manner Ranulf Flambard figures in Henry of Huntingdon as 'Radulfus' (p. 250), 'Randulfus' (p. 316), and 'Ranulfus' (p. 284). In the charters he too is always Ranulf (Dugdale, i. 164, 241). The fact is that, as stated before, in both instances the real name was Ranulf; but in both we have at least one almost contemporary corruption into Radulph. I may notice also that, till the revival of English historical scholarship in the present century, Ranulf Flambard appears to have figured in popular histories as Ralph (i.e. Radulphus) Flambard. I need only specify Hollinshed's 'Rafe, bishop of Durham' (iii. 28, ed. 1586), and Hume's 'Ralph Flambard, the king's minister' (i. c. 5). On the other hand I can find no second instance of the corruption of 'Chancellor Ranulf's' name into Ralph.

To sum up the foregoing remarks, the false form of the name, as it appears in Hermann of Laon, must be held to rule out both claimants alike if pressed rigidly. But the mistake is an extremely likely one for either writer or copyist to have fallen into; and, this once granted, there is, if anything (so far as mere spelling is concerned), rather more to be said in favour of Ranulf Flambard than of the other Ranulf.

(b) More important, however, is Mr. Foss's statement that Ranulf Flambard was never chancellor—a statement which seems to have the tacit approval of Professor Freeman and Dr. Stubbs (cf. Foss, i. 56, 57; Stubbs, 'Const. Hist.' i. 324, 376; Freeman, 'William Rufus,' ii. 557–562). As I shall show further on, I believe that Mr. Foss, in his eagerness to convict Lord Campbell of inaccuracy, has considerably under-estimated

the little evidence that exists in favour of the latter's position. It is, however, more to the purpose to observe that the allusion to Ranulf Flambard may yet hold good even though it should be clearly demonstrated that this statesman was never theoretically in possession of the chancellorship. It must be remembered that we are dealing with the words of an author writing from thirty to fifty years after the events to which he refers; and, more than this, the author is a foreigner, who in the very same sentence has already committed one flagrant blunder (see above). These are sufficient grounds for admitting the possibility of a second.

I. In the first place Ranulf Flambard, as we learn from the 'Continuatio Historiæ Turgoti' (Wharton, 'Anglia Sacra,' i. 706), had originally been in the service of a former chancellor, Maurice, bishop of London. This would at least create a presumption that he was familiar with chancery work, and would render it highly probable that, at the period of his greatest power, he should have kept as firm a hand on this department of government as he seems to have on all others. Again, the very vagueness of the terms in which his office is spoken of by the historians of the next generation suggests a power that was irregularly present everywhere—the masterful dealings of a strong man whose acts were not limited by any very tender regard for the rights of his colleagues or subordinates. These historians have no single term by which they can describe so anomalous and arbitrary an authority. Directly they touch on this subject their language becomes hazy and wanting in precision; and, in one instance at least, the spirit of the rhetorician has supplanted that of the historian. Surely no very definite constitutional office is implied in Henry of Huntingdon's *placitator sed perversor, exactor sed exustor totius Angliæ* (p. 232); or Orderic's *summus regiarum procurator opum et iustitiarius* (ap. Migne, clxxx. 758); or Florence of Worcester's *negotiorum totius regni exactor* and *placitator ac totius regni exactor* (ii. 46, E.H.S.) Still more to the point is Orderic's phrase *super omnes regios officiales . . . magistratum a rege consecutus est* (p. 580); and again, *super omnes regni optimates ab illo (sc. rege) sublimatus est* (p. 578). The 'king's chaplain,' to give him what appears to have been his most general title, seems to have been possessed of large and undefined powers, for which his contemporaries could find no exact legal equivalent; and it is very easy to understand how in the course of fifty years he might, considering his undoubted connexion with the chancery, be called *cancellarius* by a foreigner, especially if we allow for a little confusion with the actual chancellor in 1118, whose name was likewise Ranulf.¹

It is, however, by no means impossible that Ranulf did hold this office at one period of his life. Even Mr. Foss is constrained to admit that the names of the chancellors between 1093 and 1098 are extremely obscure. We have seen that Ranulf's early connexion with the chancellor Maurice creates a presumption in favour of this theory. His name has, from some cause or other, crept into the early lists of English chancellors;²

¹ See the passages all collected in Freeman's *William Rufus*.

² Hardy's *Chancellors*, p. 2.

and it would, to say the least, be somewhat singular that a mere clerk should at one step mount to so supreme an office as the justiciarship—which all authorities who deny his chancellorship admit him practically to have held—without having previously occupied some intermediate post. Such an office might be conferred at once on a great noble, like William Fitz-Osbern, or a royal bishop, like Odo of Bayeux; but hardly on an obscure clerk such as Ranulf. The case of Roger of Salisbury, his great contemporary and successor in the justiciarship, is exactly analogous; for he, like Ranulf Flambard, originally a simple clerk and king's chaplain, was chancellor for a short time before being made justiciar and bishop. However, putting all speculations aside, what is the plain interpretation of the following passage from the 'Continuatio Hist. Turgoti' ('Anglia Sacra,' i. 707)? Gerold has just enticed Ranulf on board his ship for the purpose of destroying him, by means of a false message from Bishop Maurice. Then we read: *Jam nulla uspiam evadendi spes. Ipse annulum quem digito gestabat et Notarius suus sigillum illius medium projecerunt in flumen ne per hæc ubique locorum per Angliam cognita simulata præcepta hostibus decipientibus transmissa rerum perturbarent statum.* What can this seal have been, the abuse of which would have thrown the whole kingdom into disorder, if not the *regis sigillum*, in casting which away Ranulf (to borrow an illustration from Mr. Freeman) would but have been forestalling the conduct of a later English king, a fugitive on the same river some six hundred years afterwards; or that of a more modern chancellor who, in a time of confusion, buried the great seal in his own garden? If it was not the great seal, but Ranulf's, which could work such havoc in the kingdom, we might almost say that Flambard was his own rather than the king's chancellor.³

On the whole, then, there seem to be sufficient grounds for admitting that Ranulf Flambard *may* have been spoken of as chancellor of England by a foreigner writing some fifty years after his fall even if he never held this office definitely; and, further than this, there are at least plausible reasons for holding him to have had control over the great seal, whether he ever held the precise title of chancellor or not. Further than this we cannot proceed as yet; and it is perhaps impossible to settle the question absolutely at this distance of time. But whether the claims of Ranulf Flambard or Ranulf, the chancellor of Henry I, are to be preferred in the passage quoted above depends upon a very different kind of argument—one that is purely cumulative.

It will perhaps be well to state briefly the position supported in the following remarks, viz. that the *Radulphus cancellarius* of the passage in question is Ranulf Flambard, and that the residence of the *filius Radulphi* at Laon is to be dated about the years 1097-8 A.D.; though this last proposition is not so uncertain, and, for some reasons, it would be preferable to assign the Laon visit to a period some five years later.

³ These are not the only occasions on which the great *sigillum regis* has been in the water. On Richard I's journey from Messina to Acre two of his vessels were wrecked just outside the harbour of Limasol in Cyprus. Amongst those who were drowned was 'Rogerus Malus Catulus,' the vice-chancellor; but the seal *quod gestabat in collo suspensum* was washed ashore (Rog. of Hoveden, iv. 105-6).

II. The arguments in favour of Ranulf Flambard may be divided into six or perhaps seven heads.

(1) In the first place the *fili Radulphi* of the text are clearly stated to have been educated by William (of Corboil), archbishop of Canterbury. Now we know from Simeon of Durham that William of Corboil was in early life a clerk to Ranulf Flambard. *Fuerat antea primo Dunelmensis ecclesie episcopi Ranulfi clericus* (Simeon, ii. 269 R.S.) Here, then, is proof positive of an early connexion between Ranulf Flambard and William of Corboil. But there is no proof of a similar connexion between William of Corboil and Henry I's chancellor.

(2) On his escape from the Tower, Ranulf Flambard made his way to Normandy, where he became one of the leading councillors of Robert. By his influence his brother Fulcher was preferred to the see of Lisieux, on whose death we learn from Orderic that Ranulf, being deprived of his own bishopric at Durham through the enmity of King Henry, *Lexoviensem pontificatum filio suo Thoma puero suscepit et, per triennium, non ut præsul, sed ut præsides gubernavit* (lib. iii. c. 16, ap. Migne, vol. clxxxviii. 768). In the very beginning of 1102 (January), then, Ranulf had at least one son whom he meditated bringing up as a bishop, and this son was still a boy. But we can go further than this. Ivo of Chartres tells us of the horror with which this act was regarded by all respectable churchmen of the age. It is *spurcitia puerorum* and *nova et inaudita neophytorum hæresis* (Epp. Ivonis, ap. Migne, vol. clxii. ep. 149). The phrase *spurcitia puerorum* requires explanation. A line or two further on we learn that Flambard had more than one child whom he intruded on the church of Lisieux: *flammigeros pueros prædictæ ecclesie*. More precise still is letter 157: *Quod in ecclesia Lexoviensi paternitas vestra poterit agnoscere quam jam per plures annos Ranulfus agnomine Flammardus, Dunelmensis episcopus, inaudito invasionis genere occupavit qui duos filios suos vix duodennes, accepto pastoralis baculo a comite Northmannorum, prædictæ ecclesie intrudi fecit, eâ conditione ut si primogenitus moreretur Judaico more in episcopatum alteri alteri subrogaretur*. Ranulf then, about the year 1102, had two sons aged some twelve years, both of whom he evidently intended to bring up for the church. Such children might very naturally attend the schools of Anselm at Laon; for these schools were pre-eminently theological rather than civil in their highest teaching (cf. Poole, 'Illustr. of Med. Thought,' 144-5). On the other hand it does not appear that any of the children of Henry I's chancellor were destined for the church; and, indeed, I can only find one allusion to any son of this Ranulf's. This is the *filius Ranulfi* who occurs in Leland's 'Collectanea' (i. 68) among the benefactors of Reading Abbey. So far, then, as the question of 'clerical children' is concerned, Ranulf Flambard fulfils the conditions of the problem, while the other Ranulf does not.

(3) The words of Hermann are very striking: *Archiepiscopus dominus Guilelmus nobis notissimus quoniam jamdudum pro audienda lectione magistri Anselmi Laudunum petens multis diebus in episcopi domo manserat ibique filios Radulphi cancellarii regis Anglorum docuerat*. Although Hermann mentions no less than eight of Anselm's pupils, all of whom were at this time residing in England, yet this is the only occa-

sion on which he remarks that the visit took place 'a long while ago.' This seems to point to the fact that the *fili Radulphi* were remembered in Laon tradition as being among the earliest of Anselm's English pupils—perhaps, we might even venture to surmise, belonging to the days when he first set up his school at Laon towards the end of the preceding century. At all events the word *jamdudum* throws back the period of William's visit to a date long anterior to 1113; and the six years, which are the utmost that can be allowed to have elapsed since the appointment of the second Ranulf to the chancellorship, can hardly be considered as justifying so strong an expression. So that here again the words of our author tend towards fixing the date of this visit in the time of Ranulf Flambard's power rather than in the chancellorship of Ranulf II.

(4) Again, it may be asked what period was the most likely one to find English boys staying at Laon in the bishop's house. The list of the bishops of Laon about this time runs as follows:

Heliland	c. 1052–c. 1098.
Enguerrand	c. 1098–1104.
Two years' interim.	
Gaudricus	1107–Easter 1112.
Hugo	Aug. 1112–Feb. 1118
Bartholomew	1112–1151 (?). ⁴

Of these bishops the first and the third are known to have been connected with England; and it is with one of these two that we should most naturally expect to find English boys staying in the episcopal house. The claims of Bartholomew and Hugo are shut out first by the word *jamdudum*, and secondly by the fact that, since the murder of Gaudric, there had been no *domus episcopi* at all, for it had been burnt down in the riots of 1112, as we are expressly told by Hermann (i. c. 1, cf. Guibert iii. c. 10). Now it must be noted that Ranulf does not appear as chancellor before August 1107 (Eyton's Itinerary of William II, Add. MSS. British Museum), and his predecessor Waldric is perhaps found signing in 1106 (Dugdale, ii. 66). From this it may be inferred that Ranulf did not enter upon the office before 1107; a theory which may be still further strengthened by examining the movements of Paschal II at this time, from which it will appear that Gaudric or Waldric cannot well have been consecrated to Laon before the very end of 1106 or, more probably, not before 18 Feb. 1107 (Baronius viii.; Jaffé, 'Regesta Pontif. Rom.' 498). Hence the further back we have to throw William of Corboil's visit in the period anterior to 1108 the less likely are his pupils, the *fili cancellarii*, to have been sons of the second, and the more likely are they to have been sons of the first Ranulf. But the word *jamdudum* seems to put any recent visit out of the question at once; added to which almost the whole of Gaudric's episcopate was occupied with intestine broils or with visits away from his diocese to England and Rome. Again, his character, as described by Guibert of Nogent, was that of a man wholly given up to military exercises—a scorner of books and learning—in short, the very last man to whose house young boys would

⁴ *Gallia Christiana*, ix. 523–532, with which cf. Sigeberti *Auctarium Laudunense* ap. Pertz, vi. 455.

be sent to acquire a clerical education. Added to this he was a murderer, an extortioner, a liar, and a thief. In fact so notorious was his unfitness for any episcopal duties, that when he was first proposed for the see of Laon a sturdy opposition was commenced against his appointment; and the leader of this opposition was Anselm of Laon, who actually headed a deputation to Pascal II at Langres for the express purpose of counter-working Gaudric's election (Guibert, iii. c. 4). Is it probable that we should find a little body of Englishmen staying at Gaudric's house for the express purpose of attending the lectures of the very Anselm who had well-nigh succeeded in preventing his election? How fiercely Gaudric nursed his old grudges we may see from Guibert's story of his refusal to look at his 'History of the Crusade' because on opening the book he chanced upon the name of his enemy, Lisiard, bishop of Soissons (iii. c. 11). If then, for all these reasons, we decide that William's visit can hardly have taken place while Gaudric was bishop, we at once raise a great obstacle to the theory that the *fili Radulphi* were the sons of Ranulf II. For in this case the visit must have taken place before 1107, i.e. before Ranulf II's chancellorship.

Passing on to the other bishops, Enguerrand appears to have been much such a character as Gaudric, though, perhaps, not quite so profligate and tyrannical; and, in the absence of any special claim, may fairly be dismissed from the field of competition. Very different, however, is the case of Helinand. This bishop, as we learn from Guibert, had in earlier life been one of Edward the Confessor's clerks (iii. 2). Though not a man of learning himself, he was, according to Guibert's testimony, a man of regular life, an orderly and munificent ruler of his church, and an encourager of literature in others; while it was probably under his protection that Anselm and his brother Radulph established their schools at Laon. Lastly, if the story of Ranulf Flambard's presence in England in the days of Edward the Confessor be true, this prelate may have known something of Helinand in his earlier days. On the whole it would seem that the closing years of Helinand's life form the most likely period in which to find English children staying in the bishop's house at Laon.

(5) Some slight evidence regarding the date of the Laon visit may be found from a consideration of the little that is known concerning the early life of William of Corboil. From Simeon of Durham we learn that this prelate entered public life as a clerk in the service of Ranulf Flambard at Durham. *Willielmum de Curbellio . . . utpote cum veneranda memoria Archiepiscopo Anselmo sapissime ac familiariter conversatum. Fuerat autem primo Dunelmensis ecclesie episcopi Ranulfi clericus; postea melioranda vite gratia apud Cice effectus, tandem ad archiepiscopatum promovetur* (ii. 269, R.S.) This fact of William's connexion with Ranulf Flambard is to be found in no contemporary historian excepting in Simeon, and is plainly a local tradition of the church at Durham. The same historian also informs us that William was elected to the see of Canterbury 'because of his frequent and familiar intercourse with Archbishop Anselm of pious memory' (*ibid.*) Now this intimacy can hardly be assigned to any other years than those which intervened between Anselm's return to England late in 1106 and his death 21 April 1109. For it is scarcely possible that one, who had been the familiar friend of

Anselm and was bent (to quote Simeon's words) on bettering his life (*meliorandæ vitæ gratia*), should pass from the sanctity of such a companionship into the service even of a munificent prelate such as Ranulf Flambard was in his later years, and still less into that of a covetous, grasping, and extortionate chancellor such as Ranulf II appears to have been (Henry of Hunt. 244). But if we shut out these years we exclude the only period in which (without doing violence to the word *jamdudum*) William could have been at Laon as tutor to the children of Ranulf II; and this consideration almost forces us to date his visit prior to the rise of this chancellor, i.e. to conclude that he was tutor to the children of Flambard, whose clerk we know him to have been at some time subsequent to 1099.

(6) Again, it may be inferred from Hermann that William's visit was considerably anterior to that of Alexander and Nigel, the nephews of Roger of Salisbury. But their visit can hardly have been later than the end of 1109, when Gaudric's notorious conduct compelled him to leave Laon for Rome; from which date his stay at Laon seems to have been very broken, while the imminence or actual existence of the 'commune' would have a tendency to prevent Englishmen from coming to the city. From this point of view also it seems best to antedate the visit to a period at least a few years previous to 1109, i.e. to assign it to a time previous to the chancellorship of Ranulf II.

(7) Again, looking at the matter in its broadest aspect, which of the two Ranulfs is the more likely to have had children staying in the bishop's house? We do not read that the nephews of Roger of Salisbury, a far more important man than *Ranulfus cancellarius* (who but for the accident of his violent death would have left no mark in history), were so honoured as to be lodged in the episcopal house. Such an honour is, however, much what we should expect to see claimed by Ranulf Flambard with his high ambitions (even for his children), more especially as (to borrow a quotation from Mr. Freeman) we have Anselm's authority for stating of him: *non in Anglia solum sed in exteris regnis longe lateque innotuit*.

These seven arguments seem to me to make up a very good case in favour of Ranulf Flambard. It has been shown (1) that Ranulf Flambard may very well have been mistaken by a foreigner for a chancellor, if indeed he was not once, as there seems some reason to suppose he was, in practical possession of the office; (2) that William of Corboil was undoubtedly at one time a clerk in Ranulf's service; (3) that Ranulf Flambard had two children whom he destined for an ecclesiastical career at exactly the time when from other circumstances we should most plausibly date this visit to Laon; (4) again, we have shown that the word *jamdudum* can hardly bear so narrow an interpretation as merely five or six years; and (5) that if we do narrow its signification to a period of only three or four, even then the years 1107-8-9 are required for those visits of Alexander and Nigel to Laon which seem to have succeeded William of Corboil's; (6) while in William's own life they appear to correspond to the period of his intimacy with Anselm. Lastly, we have seen that, whereas Ranulf II is more or less obscure even in English history, Flambard's name was notorious and potent abroad.

There yet remains one point to be taken into consideration. It does not amount to an argument, and yet it appears to add some weight to the preceding pages. While the Laon priests were in England they seem to have met with the most hospitable treatment wherever they went, except in one place. But this one place—where they were received with the most flagrant insolence and outrage. and where, according to the later version of the story, the wrath of heaven descended at once upon the heads of the perpetrators of the insult—was no other than Christchurch, namely, Twinham, a foundation of which Ranulf Flambard had once been dean, and with whose previous head he had quarrelled some years before owing to his conduct in retaining the prebends as they fell vacant in his own hands. (Dugdale, vi. 303.)

On the other hand it must not be forgotten that there is much to be said in favour of the claims of Ranulf II. (1) The passage would seem most naturally to refer to him. (2) As he was Gaudric's immediate successor in the English chancellorship, it is not unlikely that he should send his children to be educated in the house of a prelate with whom he must have been acquainted. Still, there is no proof that he had more than one son; nor that this one son was destined for the church. That Gaudric was in the habit of visiting England after his elevation to the see of Laon is evident from Guibert's narrative; and we know from the same authority that, on one occasion, Anselm accompanied him (iii. cc. 4, 7). (3) If, for these reasons, we prefer the claims of Ranulf II, the word *jamdulum*, on which so much depends, may perhaps be explained as not forming part of the verbal narrative that Hermann (to judge from his use of the first person plural all through his account of the English visit) seems to have taken down from the lips of one of the survivors of the expedition, but as being his own interpolation derived from an imperfect acquaintance with the chronological order of the events he is narrating.

On the whole the balance of evidence is perhaps in favour of Ranulf Flambard. Could the *fili Radulphi* be proved to be his sons beyond a doubt, it would be interesting as showing that an unscrupulous statesman, who nevertheless somewhat later took so princely a view of his obligations towards his own cathedral church and city, had a little earlier determined that his children should be fitted for the lofty offices for which his paternal ambition destined them by receiving from Anselm of Laon the finest ecclesiastical education that Western Europe could then afford.

T. A. ARCHER.

A BULL OF POPE ALEXANDER VI.

THERE is preserved at Lambeth amongst other documents, entitled 'Fragments,' a broadside which is marked No. 7. Its size is about 16 inches by 10. It is an important document which has escaped the notice of all historians, being a copy of a bull issued by Pope Alexander VI confirming a previous bull of Innocent VIII's, which decreed the succession of the English crown to the descendants of Henry VII whether born from his present queen, Elizabeth of York, or by his marriage with any sub-