A NOTE ON THE MARRIAGE OF RICHARD DUKE OF THE NORMANS WITH ADELA OF FRANCE.

In the course of some recent enquiries into the genealogy of the Norman Counts of Rouen, it was observed that modern writers have very generally set forth the statement that the fifth Count or Duke of the Normans, Richard III surnamed the Young or Junior, was married or contracted to Adela, daughter of Robert the Devout, King of France. It seems that this statement is the result of a curious combination of misapprehensions, and that grounds can be found for rejecting the assertion as an impossibility.

There is not much doubt that in this case no small part of the difficulty arises from the fact that very little can be known of these personages. Adela has been the subject of some conjecture and much dispute. She was daughter of King Robert by his second wife Constance of Provence, whom he married soon after, or in, the year 998, when his first wife Bertha was at last separated from him on the ground of the double impediment between them of consanguinity and compaternity. This same wife Constance was mother of Henry I, afterwards King of France, who was at his death in 1060 fifty-five years of age, and was therefore born about the year 1005, and he was not the eldest child of this union. The age of Adela, his sister of the whole blood, is not known; and it has been the subject of most discordant statements. Nothing is known with certainty as to the year of her birth, and in 1026 she is represented as being of marriageable age by some, while others describe her as then "a baby." She founded a convent at Messines (Meschines) near Ypres about the year 1065, and having in her widowhood received the veil from Pope Alexander II, lived there till her death. This occurred in 1071 according to the necrology of the same convent[1] and the Flemish chronicles,[2] but is elsewhere stated to have happened in 1079,[3] and in this house of her foundation she was buried. Leaving any long digression as to her precise age it may be taken, as sufficiently near for the present purpose, that she was born not perhaps very long before, but almost certainly not after, the year 1010.

Adela's marriage is of considerable interest from several points of view, of which not the least is that it has been taken to justify the allegation of consanguinity between William the Conqueror and Matilda of Flanders. To deduce however from Adela's marriage any consanguinity whatever between William and Matilda is simply impossible, and some investigators have given up the whole question as hopeless, denied the fact of any consanguinity either by this or by any line, and have advanced surprising theories, and imagined some mythical affinity to have arisen by Adela, inasmuch as she was mother of William's queen Matilda.

[1] Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*: tom. 209, col. 958, note 73.
[2] de Smet, *Corp: Chron: Flandr:*
[3] De Limiers, *Annales de la Monarchie Françoise*, pt. ii, p. 42, where he quotes Aubert le Mire, *Notice des Eglises de Flandres*, p. 157.

It is unnecessary here to go into the mazes of conjecture which have been offered to explain some of these relationships, but it is impossible to disregard the suggestion of M. François Isidore Licquet, in his *Histoire de Normandie*,[4] that Adela of France mother of Matilda was not the same Adela who married the Norman duke Richard. His ground for this, passing by his contention, doubtless just, that the Norman bride was plainly of marriageable age, is in brief that the marriage covenant of that bride does not specially assert her royal parentage; nor, in words, say anything about her parentage, which is at best only a negative argument. He might have added that the Flemish chroniclers, who are not very easily read, do not apparently mention anywhere that the French Adela Countess of Flanders had been previously married to the Norman, but that is only in accordance with the usual practice of that period, as illustrated by the *Encomium Emmæ*, which amongst other similar flatteries terms that mother of three children "virgo." Lappenberg[5] in a note, which is omitted in Thorpe's translation, under the title *History of England under the Norman Kings*, referring to this passage in Licquet, says:—

Da in jenem Contracte nur Adele, nicht aber ihre Aeltern benannt sind, so will Licquet in der irrigen Voraussetzung, dasz die so benannte Königstochter damals noch nicht geboren gewesen, nicht glauben, dasz hier von ihr die Rede sein könne. Doch wurde diese im Jahre 1028 an den Grafen von Flandern Balduin V, wirklich vermählt, und ihr Sohn heirathete im Jahre 1050. Ist se demselben bereits in der Wiege verlobt, wie Wilh. von Jumièges (lib. vi cap. vi), oder doch sehr jugendlich, wie die Narratio restaurat. Abbat. S. Martini Tornacensis (apud Bouquet; X, 236) sagt so musz also dieses Verlöbnisz sich viel früher ereignet haben, und kann also später eine Auslösung desselben beabsichtigt sein. Es wird in der Urkunde übrigens angeführt, Adele werde juxta nobilitatis suæ lineam dotata, und aus der nicht geschehenen Vollziehung der Ehe nach Ausstellung des Ehezartors darf man auf verwickelte Verhältnisse schliessen.[6]

The meaning of this passage is far from clear. There is no ground for saying that the 'marriage-indenture' was not followed by consummation, nor for saying that any dissolution was then, or ever, 'contemplated.' Neither point is relevant, and many dissolutions were contemplated which never succeeded in obtaining pontifical recognition. Even on the question of Adela's age, the dates quoted prove nothing beyond the fact that she was alive in 1028. To that however it may be added that whatever may have been the

[4] Vol. ii, p. 5.
[5] *Geschichte von England*, Band ii, p. 43.
[6] The following translation is submitted on account of the difficulty of the text:—As in this contract [the Donatio printed in the *Spicilegium*] only Adela is named, and not her parents, Licquet—on the erroneous assumption that the princess so named was then not yet born—will not believe that it is she to whom reference is made here [there]. Yet the princess was actually married in the year 1028 to Baldwin V [subsequently] Count of Flanders; furthermore her son married in the year 1050. If she was betrothed to Baldwin V [demselben] while still in the cradle according to William of Jumièges . . or while still very young, as Bouquet . . says, then this betrothal must have taken place much earlier, and therefore a dissolution can be [may have been] contemplated later [? therefore a dissolution subsequently can be entertained (as a possible explanation)]. It is moreover set forth in the document [the Donatio] that Adela was "dowered according to the degree of her nobility," and from the fact that the consummation of the marriage did not follow the drawing up of the marriage-indenture some sort of complication in their relations may be inferred.

age of Adela's son Baldwin VI in the year 1050, and however early her own espousals, her daughter Matilda queen of the Conqueror must have been born by about 1030, if there is the slightest truth in the Norman accounts of her personal and intellectual charms in 1049, or earlier, for there is no exact knowledge as to when the Norman duke became aware of her adorable qualities as described by William of Jumièges and William of Poitiers, save only that it was some time before 5 Oct. 1049, when his aspirations were thwarted by the Papal intervention. Leaving however all such digressions, the first step towards disproving the allegation that the Norman Adela was daughter of the French king is to suggest at the least of what other parentage she may have been, and this first step is as yet still to take. Moreover M. Licquet was somewhat fanciful in other of his opinions, and was prepared for example to dispute,[7] without advancing any grounds at all, the perfectly credible statements of Vitalis and others on the illegitimacy of Nicholas Abbot of St. Ouen, son of Richard III.

With the exception of M. Licquet modern historians appear to agree that Adela the Norman bride was Adela daughter of King Robert, and there does not seem to be the least ground for questioning this identity. But why she is so generally called the wife, or the betrothed, of Duke Richard the Third is an extremely puzzling question; because the fact that she was not so plainly appears by the very evidence which is freely quoted as authority for that erroneous assertion. Duke Richard the Third, whom Vitalis generally speaks of as Richard the Young, did not wear the coronal of Rouen for any great length of time. The duration of his tenure is variously stated by early authorities from a few months to something less than two years. The date at which he succeeded his father Richard the Second, surnamed Le Bon and—from his mother Gunnora—Gonnorides, is a matter of some uncertainty; and neither the date nor the manner of his early death is quite free from doubt. That he was involved in disputes with his younger brother Robert Count of the Hiemois, that he died somewhat suddenly after a banquet in celebration of their reconciliation, that Robert was confidently believed to have contrived his brother's death by poison, that the suspicion of this fratricide has fixed upon him the agnomen of Robert the Devil, to the all but total exclusion of his other designations the Magnificent and the Jerusalemite, all these are matters of general information. The principal details are to be found in Vitalis, and in William of Malmesbury, and in various French and Norman chronicles, and although it appears by Vitalis that Richard III had a natural son, we do not find mention of any wife whatever in the authors who lived and wrote near to his times.

Modern historians however seem to be agreed that this hapless prince, cut off in his early manhood, was married or betrothed to Adela of France. The reason for uncertainty as to whether the marriage was actually celebrated or agreed upon only, appears to arise from this, that the alliance is known only upon the evidence

[7] Op. cit.

of a certain marriage contract or deed of gift or dower settlement, "Donatio," preserved in the Cartulary of St. Peter at Aire in Artois, and printed by Dom Luc d'Achery in his *Spicilegium*.

The authors of later times who have mentioned this marriage are fairly unanimous about it. Sir Francis Palgrave, whose *History of Normandy and England* was, one must remember, left unfinished, has the point hopelessly confused in the expression[8] "Richard le Bon, Duke of Normandy, uncle of William." Richard II, le Bon, it must be quite needless to remark, was grandfather not uncle of William the Conqueror, and Richard the uncle of William was Richard III, Richard the Young or Junior, Juvenis of Vitalis. Elsewhere[9] Palgrave represented Adela as contracted to Richard III after the death of Richard II, for which there is no recognisable authority. Thorpe in his *History of England under the Norman Kings*,[10] translated with improvements from Lappenberg's work, says of Richard III that he "appears to have flattered himself with the idea that the King of France, Robert, would give him to wife his daughter, Adela, who had previously been promised to Baldwin Count of Flanders." This alleged sequence again has no recognisable basis, and would be a difficulty, but for the fact that no authority for this interesting assertion is vouchsafed; besides which, perhaps a detail, Baldwin V was not yet Count of Flanders, since his father Baldwin IV the Bearded, survived till 1034. Lappenberg's own words are to the same effect[11]—"und er scheint sich damit geschmeichelt zu haben, dasz der König von Frankreich, Robert, ihm seine früher dem Grafen Balduin von Flandern verheissen Tochter, Adele, zur Gemahlinn geben würde." The expression "flattered himself" used of Richard III is extremely non-committal, limited as it is to a statement of his private hopes, of which we have no knowledge, and seems to suggest that the authors who use this expression may have had their doubts upon some point. Mr. Freeman,[12] speaking of Adela and "Richard the Third," hesitates, with Palgrave, between a marriage and a betrothal, and Mr. Cobbe[13] says nothing of any wife of Richard III but, as may be thought, assumes her existence when he says of Robert's accession "He or his Council set aside Richard's infant" meaning presumably the aforementioned Nicholas, whom Mr. Cobbe thus apparently conceived to have had legitimate claims.

M. Auguste Le Prévost has a note to Pluquet's edition of Wace's *Roman de Rou*,[14] saying Adela married Richard III in the passage wherein, as it seems, he first invented the affinity obstacle which Mr. Freeman, howbeit dubiously, elected to adopt, failing anything better, notwithstanding it was at once novel and inconsistent not only with the facts but with the meaning of the word in its

[8] Vol. iii, p. 264.
[9] Vol. iii, p. 137.
[10] p. 41; see also p. 49.
[11] *Geschichte von England*, Band ii, p. 43.
[12] *Norman Conquest of England*, vol. iii, p. 651, note N.
[13] *History of the Norman Kings of England*, 1869, p. lxij.
[14] Vol. ii, p. 60.

canonical usage. M. Licquet, although he would have her to be some other Adela, makes her wife of this Richard III, and quotes the beforementioned marriage covenant from the *Spicilegium* in extenso.[15] One historian indeed, M. Henri Philippe de Limiers,[16] quotes the same authority for the statement that Adela married Richard the Second, that is le Bon, and this it seems must certainly have been the case.

This marriage contract as printed in the *Spicilegium* is thus the ultimate authority upon which all these statements rest. It is a curious record, and with its quaint jumble of Scripture and law resembles a marriage-service quite as much as it does a legal settlement; for it recites the teachings of the New Testament, and the rights attaching to the dower lands, in most incongruous juxtaposition. It is headed "Ricardi Nortmannorum Ducis III Donatio propter nuptias Adelæ facta"; and the instrument ends "Datum mense Januario anno Incarnationis Domini millesimo vigesimo sexto Indictione IX"; the parties having been mentioned by name in the body of the instrument in the words "Quibus ego Ricardus Nortmannorum Dux obtemporare contendens, accipio te D. Adela in conjugem . . ." Neither party is further described and, as M. Licquet quite correctly says, Adela's parentage is not set forth. But the form of address "te D. Adela," D. standing for Domina or for Domicella, is nowise inconsistent with her having been of the blood-royal, as is sufficiently demonstrated by the Empress Matilda's usage of the same style; "Domina Anglorum" being her own description of herself, over a hundred years later, when she was claiming the crown in succession to her father. What is even more important, there are no words defining by which Richard this Donatio was granted, for the heading is of course no part of the record, and, as may be shewn, is open to dispute, and can be proved inaccurate.

Most of the authors already mentioned quote the *Spicilegium* by the reference "vol. iii, p. 390." This refers to an edition dated 1723, which here will be sufficiently described as the "later" edition. But M. de Limiers, also already mentioned, when referring this instrument to Duke Richard II, quoted an "earlier" edition in his reference "tom. vii, p. 203." Of this earlier edition of the *Spicilegium*, which was in thirteen volumes, the British Museum Library does not apparently possess a copy; but it is clear that the earlier edition was correctly quoted by M. de Limiers as his authority for "Richard II." This appears from a table—contained in some unnumbered pages at the beginning of volume i of the later edition—co-ordinating the three-volume with the thirteen-volume edition. In this table it is set forth:—

Vol. vii, p. 203. "MXXVI Ricardi II Nortmannorum Ducis Donatio propter nuptias Adelæ facta" referring to vol. iii, p. 390 "ex tabulario ecclesiæ S. Petri Ariæ urbis in Artesiâ." Consequently the heading Richard III of the later edition is in disagreement

[15] *Histoire de Normandie*, vol. ii, p. 269.
[16] *Annales de la Monarchie Françoise*, pt. ii, p. 42.

with the Richard II which is quoted therein from the earlier edition; whether by emendation, or by clerical error, or by misprint, or however it may be, and independent altogether of which numeral is right, which wrong.

In the absence of any justification for this heading "Richard III" the point must be settled by the date of the Donatio. This instrument, as already observed is printed at length in the *Histoire de Normandie*, and to the date "January one thousand and twenty six, Indiction IX," M. Licquet adds a note initialled D.[17]:— "L'Année commençant à Pâques il faut lire 1027." *Prima facie* that has a specious appearance of accuracy, but a little reflection shows that this must be a misapprehension, and is probably the initial error underlying the whole difficulty, the same idea most likely being responsible for the heading "Richard III." The usage as to the beginning of the year was at this period most unsettled. Sir Harris Nicolas in his *Chronology of History*, speaking of France in general, says that from the time of Charlemagne the custom was to begin the year on Christmas-day, and later the greatest divergence and confusion existed all over France. In the present case it is not a question of French, but of Norman practice, which is quite another matter; and this particular record is evidence that in this particular instance the year was reckoned as beginning with the Nativity, or with the Circumcision. This is demonstrable by the Indiction.

The Indictions themselves were subject to much variation, and were computed from dates which not only differed in different countries, but also differed in the same country at different periods. Four Indictions are commonly recognised. The Greek or Constantine Indiction began on the first of September, and the Imperial or Cæsarian began on the twenty-fourth of September. The Roman or Pontifical began on the twenty-fifth of December or the first of January, "accordingly as either of these days was considered the first of the year." In the register of the Parliaments of Paris an Indiction was used which began variably in October, or September, or January. The usage beginning in or from September obtained under the Merovingian dynasty. The Carlovingians used the Greek and also the Roman reckoning. This particular instrument is in the fortieth year of the Capetingian dynasty under which, again quoting Sir Harris Nicolas, "great variation prevailed," but the choice usually lay between the Greek and the Roman style, the Greek being the more frequently employed. These details have to be mentioned in order to shew that in this case, whichever Indiction was used, it fixes this date beyond any possible doubt, because the month January is named. The period from Christmas to Easter is a fearful stumbling block to the unwary, but happily that period fell within one precise Indiction, from whatever date the Indiction was reckoned to begin. Under any kind of Indiction January of the Indiction IX was January before Easter of the ninth Indiction, that is to say in this case

[17] M. Deville.

January before Easter Sunday 10 April 1026, namely January 1025 Old Style, or 1026 New Style, otherwise called historical year, the present usage throughout Christendom as represented by the Western Church. Therefore on this occasion the year was reckoned as beginning, not at Easter nor at Easter Eve, nor at the Annunciation; but either from the Nativity or as at present from the Circumcision, inasmuch as this is the only possible way of including January, or any day in January, at once in the year 1026 and also in the ninth Indiction. Consequently there is no room for doubting that the author of this footnote was betrayed into a very natural error in saying, 'The year beginning at Easter one must read 1027'—an error which probably arose from omitting to notice the Indiction, and from a momentary forgetting that the "Old Style" was then still so new as to be yet far from general in any country, or even in any province.

It becomes then necessary to determine who was "Richard Duke of the Normans" in the month of January 1025-6, since that is when this Donatio is expressed to be made. In the first place there is some doubt as to when Richard le Bon did die. Next there is the doubt as to whether he ruled the Duchy till the day, or very nearly till the day of his death, a doubt however which appears to be of no particular importance when due consideration has been given to the genesis of the statement that he spent or may have spent some appreciable period of time in a monastic life, resigning the government to his son Richard III. There is some authority for saying that he was shorn a monk of the Abbey of Fécamp, but whether that were actually so or not the argument is little advanced thereby. His surname le Bon, his appellative "the father of the Monks," his large endowments of new religious houses, and his large grants to already existing monastical foundations, all show his strong predilection for monachism in the abstract. On the other hand it was a common thing for men who realised that their days were numbered to seek admission to religious houses, and to take the monastic vows in order to a fitting end. Instances were frequent, and many are on record shewing that the votary lived but two or three days, thus giving a sufficient indication of what the practice was, as embodied in a proverb too familiar for quotation. Duke Richard II might equally have received the tonsure from religious feeling in his graver age, or from ghostly terrors *in extremis*, and therefore it must next be shewn that he was still alive, and not yet a monk, in and after the month of January 1025-6.

First as to the year of his death, the authority for stating that Richard II died in the year 1026 appears to be amply sufficient, and the statements which differ or appear to differ from this, refer his decease to a later, and not to an earlier date. The chronicle of St. Evroult first printed as an appendix to the French text of Vitalis edited by M. le Prévost[18] states:—"1026. Obiit Ricardus secundus dux Normannorum successit Ricardus tercius qui eodem

[18] Ordericus Vitalis (*Société de l'Histoire de la France*), 5 vols. 1833, etc. [*Cartulaire de S. Evroult, Annales Uticensis*] vol. v, p. 156.

anno mortuus est. Robertus frater ejus successit." Several chronicles narrate these events in words so nearly or precisely the same as to leave some doubt which are and which are not original statements, but if it could be shewn that all are mere copyings of one original, then that original is thereby demonstrated to have enjoyed wide credence and authority at very early periods. Labbé[19] gives these particulars from three chronicles. The Rouen Chronicle[20] reads "1026 Obiit Ricardus secundus Dux Normannorum. Succedit Ricardus III qui eodem anno mortuus est. Robertus frater ejus succedit." The chronicle of St. Michael on the Mount[21] reads again "MXXVI Obiit Ricardus II Dux Normannorum, cui successit Ricardus III filius ejus qui eodem anno mortuus est, cui successit Robertus frater ejus." The chronicle of Fécamp as printed in the same collection[22] most mysteriously ignores the death of this Duke, suggested to have been himself a monk there as well as an honoured and munificent patron, for the entry reads "1026 Obiit Ricardus Dux Normannorum succedit frater ejus." But the strong resemblance of what stands suggests that the intervening words relating the succession and death of Richard III may possibly by some means have been dropped out of this sentence at sometime. The text from which it was printed must itself have been a transcript as the next preceding item, the first on page 326, reads:—"1014 Scribe 1024 obijt Henricus Imp." etc. and the necessity for the interpolated correction here may in some degree support the conjecture that the following entry may have been an imperfect reproduction of the original, and possibly the text itself was also a somewhat late copy. Again another account[23] "Quo tempore" [quo anno Sanctonas urbs . . . concremata est] "glorissimus Ricardus Rotomagensis comes obiit, sepultus apud Fescanum Cœnobium in Basilica Sanctæ Trinitatis. Et successit pro eo Ricardus filius eius & ipse non longo post tempore veneno extinctus est succeditque pro eo Robertus frater eius." Yet again the chronicle of Caen, as printed by Duchesne, and reprinted by Baron Maseres, says:—"Anno MXXVI Obit Ricardus secundus, Dux Normannorum. Succedit Ricardus tertius, qui eodem anno mortuus est. Rodbertus frater ejus, succedit."

Vitalis as a monk of St. Evroult must have known the chronicle quoted under that name if it was in existence during his time, but in his Ecclesiastical History he makes an entirely equivalent statement in totally different form. He says in two passages[24] that Richard II reigned thirty years, and he reckoned that period from 996. This date presumably he took from Dudo of St. Quintin, who says himself that he wrote at the request of Duke Richard II, and certainly he must have known the date of his patron's accession. Dudo says quite definitely that Richard I died in 996

[19] Philippe Labbé, *Novæ Bibliothecæ Manuscript.* . . . Paris, 1657.
[20] *Chronicon Rothomagense*, vol. i, p. 366.
[21] *Chronicon Duplex S. Michaelis in Periculo Maris*, vol. i, p. 348.
[22] *Chronicon Fiscannense*, vol. i, p. 326.
[23] *Chronicon Ademari Chabannensis monachi Sancti Eparchii Engolismensis.* Ibid. vol. ii, p. 182.
[24] Lib. iii, cap. j, and lib. v, cap. xj.

in December, and appended is a note "aged 64 years of apoplexy." Returning to Vitalis, he says in a third passage[25] "Anno ab incarnatione Domini MII° Otto Imperator obiit eique Henricus successit. Dein MXXIV° Cono Augustus imperavit, cujus iij° anno Richardus II obiit qui pro studio religionis pater monachorum appellari meruit."

The quoted chronicles then say with more or less originality that Richard II died in 1026. Vitalis says he ruled for thirty years; which, as this period must have been reckoned from December 996, could not have been actually completed till December 1026; and in January 1025-6 would have been only twenty-nine years and one month. Further Vitalis enables us to test his calculation by comparing his statement that Richard II died in the third year of Cono. By Cono is meant Conrad II the Salian. He succeeded Henry II the Saint, otherwise the Lame, Duke of Bavaria, who died 13 July 1024. Conrad was crowned King of Germany 8 Sep. 1024[26] at Mayence, by the Archbishop of Mayence on the Nativity of the Virgin, as appears on the authority of Conrad's own chaplain. On the same authority[27] Conrad was not consecrated Emperor till Easter 1027 namely 26 March that year, and in his own instrument before that date he describes himself as 'Conrad King, designated to the Empire.' But the meaning of Vitalis is perfectly plain, and cannot be misunderstood. The third year of Conrad's Imperium is within a day the year 1029 Old Style, and it is impossible to think that Vitalis supposed Richard II to have lived till 1029, or he would not thrice have said he reigned thirty years; moreover his words, already quoted,[25] do not justify such a reading. His meaning is that Richard died in the third year of Conrad's reign.

What precise dates Vitalis intended that expression to cover it may be somewhat difficult to decide; but Conrad seems plainly to have reckoned his regnal years from his coronation, 8 Sep. 1024. Migne's *Patrologia*[28] quotes a number of dated instruments from Erhard and Muratori, and Bouquet quotes an instrument from Mabillon[28] leading to such a deduction. Some of these dates contain misprints, or are otherwise erroneous, as is shewn by their inconsistencies; but others agree throughout with themselves, and with each other. By these it appears that 12 January 1025 [1024-5] and 23 April 1025 were in the first year of Conrad's reign. The 2nd of May 1028 was in the fourth, 1 June 1030 was in the sixth, and 3 August 1031 was in the seventh year of his reign, and all these correspond with his imperial years, and with the Indictions. It follows therefore that 3 August 1025 was still in Conrad's first regnal year. One instrument is dated

[25] Lib. i, cap. xxiv: Duchesne, p. 371. Le Prévost, vol. i, pp. 175, 176.

[26] Bouquet; xi, p. 617, quoting Joh: Pistorius, p. 423. Inter rerum German. Veteres Scriptores VI, viz. "Ex vita Chunradi Salici Imperatoris" auctore Wippone ipsius & filii Henrici capellano.

[27] Ibidem; Bouquet; xi, p. 3. And again, p. 557.

[28] *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, tom. 151, coll. 1045, seq.—Erhard, *Cod. Westphal.* pp. 87, seq.—Muratori, *Rer. Ital. Script.* and *Antiq. Ital.*—Bouquet, xi, 558.—Mabillon, iv, 716.

xij kal. Septembris, indict. xv, A.D. 1031, anno reg. viij, anno imp. vj. Here 1031 must be meant for 1032, which is the year indicated by the other three statements, and this carries on Conrad's first year to 21 August 1025, namely within seventeen days of the anniversary of his coronation. By the "third year of Cono" then Vitalis meant a year which he reckoned probably from 8 September, but possibly from 13 July, 1026, and his statement is thus consistent with the chronicles.

If Richard II le Bon died in the third year of Conrad II, and within the year 1026, he was plainly still living on the 13 of July if not on the 8 of September 1026, namely about six if not upwards of seven months after the date of the Donatio in January 1025-6. The actual day of his death as will presently appear has been referred, perhaps on good grounds, to 22-23 August 1026. It has been maintained that he lived till 1027. This is on the authority of certain charters of which it will be sufficient to specify one to the abbey of Bernay. Malet, in his translation of Wace's *Conquest of England*[29] quotes this charter to indicate as much. Malet's reference shows that he relied upon a paper by M. Auguste Le Prévost in the *Memoires Antiquaires de Normandie*.[30] Since therefore he must have read this paper, it is matter of regret that he gave no reasons for ignoring one of its chief points, namely the true date of the charter. M. Le Prévost, after giving the charter to Bernay at length, criticised the date—Anno domini MXXVII indictione octava regnante Roberto rege anno XXXVIII. M. Le Prévost observed that these figures could only refer to the year 1025, not 1027, an observation which appears to be perfectly accurate. There is only one possible way of counting thirty-eight years to King Robert's reign, since he did not live fully thirty-four years after the death of his father Hugh Capet. But Hugh had procured the election of Robert, and caused him to be consecrated at Orleans 1 January 988, 987-8 that is to say. Counting from that date King Robert's thirty-eighth year was the historical year 1025. That was the eighth Indiction, whereas the year 1027 was neither the eighth Indiction nor the thirty-eighth of Robert. Acknowledging then the justice of M. Le Prévost's criticism, the charter to Bernay, done in 1025, not in 1027, is not a sufficient proof that Duke Richard II was alive in 1027, as it appears to assert. Since it was witnessed by his sons Richard and Robert, it is plain this charter was granted by Richard II, le Bon, who was therefore still a reigning Duke and not yet a monk in the year 1025.

Lastly it seems as certain as anything at this remote time can well be that Duke Richard le Bon only entered the abbey to die. First there is the account of William of Jumièges[31]:—

Quod Dux Richardus ad extrema veniens Richardum filium seniorem præfecit suo ducatui.—Richardus dux, quamvis præcellentissimorum actuum prærogativis

[29] pp. 218, 219.

[30] Vol. iv, p. 381, read 5 Dec. 1828.

[31] Lib. v, cap. xvij. Duchesne, p. 257. Migne, tom. 149, col. 833.

longe lateque claruerat perspicuus, tamen Christi cultor extitit assiduus, adeo ut monachorum atque clericorum jure vocetur pater piissimus, et pauperum sustentator indefessus. His et hujusmodi probitatum vigens titulis, cœpit vehementer aggravari ægritudine corporis. Robertum ergo archiepiscopum, et cunctos Normannorum principes apud Fiscannum convocat, eisque se jam omnino resolvi indicat. Illico per cuncta triclinia domus fit omnibus intolerabilis luctus. Lugubre quippe lamentabantur monachi et clerici, pro tanta orbitate patris charissimi. Heroum ora undabant lacrymis pro amissione invictissimi ducis. Lugebant quoque catervæ egenorum per compita oppidi, pro destitutione sui consolatoris et patroni. Novissime autem ascitum Richardum filium suum consultu sapientum præfecit suo ducatui, et Robertum fratrem ejus comitatui Oximensi, ut inde illi persolveret debitum obsequii. Denique omnibus, quæ ad Dei cultum pertinere videbantur, strenue dispositis, millesimo vicesimo sexto anno ab incarnatione Domini hominem exivit, viam ingrediens universæ carnis Regnante eodem Jesu Christo in Deitate paternæ Majestatis, et in unitate Spiritus sancti, per omnia sæcula sæculorum, Amen.

The Bendictine continuators of Bouquet's *Recueuil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France* give,[32] from a manuscript which they assigned to the thirteenth century, in the possession of le Marquis d'Averne, a totally different account, quite consistent with the foregoing.

Comment le Duc Richart chéy en malladie & comment il ordonna que Richart son filz fust Duc.—Après ces choses ainsi advenues le Duc Richart chéy en maladie, & manda ses Barons; & en leurs presences saisy Richart son aisné filz de la Duchie de Northmandie, & à Robert son filz donna Hyemmes & toutes les appartenances. Son meuble il parti en trois: . . . . Il se fist porter à Fescamp; & par le conseil de l'Arcevesque de Rouen, Robert son frère, se fist confes & acommunier: & puis de sa voulente vint en Chappitre, & là se fist discipliner à tous les Moynes, & avoit le haire vestue: & assez tost après saintement trespassa de cest siecle, & rendy son ame à Dieu l'an mil xxvii,[33] & regna xxx ans. Il fut enterré à Fescamp ou degout de la gouttiere emprès son bon pere: mais depuis ce ilz furent ostez hors tous deux, & mis en sepulture en l'Eglise devant le maistre autel.

These two accounts are fairly descriptive, and together give a clear sequence of events. "Last of all" his mundane affairs he parted his dominions between his two lawful sons, then he took upon himself the vows and habit of a monk, and "quickly thereafter" died in the odour of sanctity. The chronicle of Verdun already mentioned explains a superficial difficulty of the second narrative. The burial "in the drip of the gutter" is manifestly in reference to the direction given by Duke Richard I le Hardi to his half-brother Ralph Count of Bayeux and Ivri, that he was not to be laid in the church or abbey of Fécamp, but "in stillicidia tecti" so that the rain dropping from this holy roof might wash away his sins, as is described with much detail by Dudo. These pious directions were carried out, but afterwards the intent was frustrated by the building of a basilica over his grave, and this portico was built in the time of Dudo because he mentions it in the passage just referred to, and the chronicle of Verdun states the burial of Duke Richard II le Bon "in Basilica," that is doubtless beside his good father who had been buried in the drip of the eaves. The details of the death of Duke Richard I and

[32] Vol. xi, p. 321.
[33] 1027. So in this work quoted.

the same directions for his burial, without mention of the Count of Ivry in particular, are also given in a chronicle of Fécamp,[34] and though it is impossible that Duke Richard II could have been buried at once "ou degout de la gouttiere" and "in Basilicâ," the anachronism is trivial and the two expressions can hardly fail to indicate an identical spot.

Leaving this digression as to Richard's burial, it is by these accounts fairly plain that Richard the Second ruled the Duchy till within a few days of his death, and that he alone was in a position to call himself Dux Nortmannorum in the Donatio of January 1025-6. The basis of the idea that Richard II was for any appreciable time a monk appears to have been in the first instance a simple conjecture, a kind of explanation offered on the spur of the moment as it were, in the following passage, for no other foundation for such a belief has been discovered. It would be unwarrantable to make such a suggestion in order to account for these remarks by so distinguished an authority, were it not for the fact that his own research is good evidence that he was on this occasion doing himself injustice. It occurs in a note on page 10 of the second volume of M. Le Prévost's edition of Vitalis, the note having reference to the passage in book iii chapter 1:—"Defuncto autem Ricardo Gunnoride Ricardus Juvenis filius ejus successit et vix anno uno et dimidio ducatu potitus obiit." M. Le Prévost's note reads as follows:—

Quant au jour même de sa morte, les nécrologées de Saint-Germain-des-Pres et de Saint Benigne de Dijon indiquent le 6 août (viij° idus Augusti); un autre témoignage contemporain la porte au 23 du même mois (x° kalendas Septembris). Nous ne dissimulons pas la difficulté d'accorder ces diverses fixations nonseulement entre elles mais avec des actes d'une grande authenticité. Ainsi par example d'après le dotalium de la duchesse Adèle, il paraîtrait que son mari Richard III aurait pris l'administration de la Normandie dès les premiers jours de 1026 (Ego Richardus Nortmannorum dux . . . Datum mense Januarij anno incarnationis Domini m°xx°vi° indictione ix[a]). D'un autre côté les chartes de Richard II en faveur de Jumièges, de Fécamp, et de Bernai présentant la date du mois d'août 1027. Nous ne voyons d'autre moyen de concilier ces dates qu'en supposant que Richard III ait pris l'administration du duché avant la morte de son père qui aurait passé les derniers mois de sa vie à Fécamp, entièrement livré à ces habitudes monastiques qui lui étaient si chères.

How this strange projection can have been adopted and garnished with suitable details by the very same antiquary who suggested, as has already been shewn, a good, critical, and in all probability accurate explanation of this same charter with its 1027 date, for which he is here simply guessing an explanation of some sort, is perfectly incomprehensible. His own criticism of the date of this Bernay charter, made some years before, really destroys the whole difficulty, because it shows that charter as it stands in print to be quite insufficient evidence for rejecting the chroniclers' statements that Richard II died in 1026. Where M. Le Prévost obtained the date "X° Kalendas Septembris," what record he meant by "un autre témoignage contemporain," a considerable

[34] *Anonymi Fiscannensis Libellus, Neustria Pia*, p. 193; and Migne, *Patrologia*, 151, col. 719.

amount of research, perhaps insufficiently methodical, or too limited in range, has quite failed to discover. He probably had good reasons for his date, and other writers have taken it on the same, or else on his unsupported, authority; and he himself in the same work had already[35] taken it for general knowledge in a note:—"Or, on sait que le Duc Richard II mourut le 23 août" etc.; a note which Forester took, with acknowledgments, for his translation of Vitalis published by Bohn, but unfortunately converted it to nonsense in the borrowing.

But if there is in fact no good reason for thinking that Richard III assumed the administration of the duchy during his father's lifetime, or that Richard II parted with any of his power or dominions till everything was slipping from his grasp; and if moreover it is plain that the chroniclers who say he died in 1026 probably were quite correct in that statement; and if further Vitalis is correct in his precise statement that this duke died in the third year of King Conrad the Salian, that is to say after 13 July 1026 at the earliest; and if lastly there can be no question that the Donatio professes itself to be dated in the month of January 1025-6; then the inquiry which Duke Richard it was who accepted the lady Adela appears to present no difficulty, and it seems to be beyond dispute that de Limiers was perfectly right in assigning this princess to Richard le Bon. It may be matter of some surprise that this duke, well advanced in years and presumed to be devoting his remaining days to religious exercises should have added, or should be thought to have added, another to his previous extensive matrimonial and quasi-matrimonial experiences, and especially that he should have taken a wife then so young that her age has been reduced to mere infancy, and indeed to a minus quantity. No doubt the bride in the "cradle," really in the first flush of womanhood, was fitter for the young Duke about to be carried off by poison; but on the other hand in times when marriage was used to seal any compact, and women were mere pawns in the game, there is no very great reason for astonishment if his elderly father should have recognised her attractions; and, in the simple light of plain figures, it appears that the fact, however astonishing, cannot have been otherwise than as herein presented.

HAMILTON HALL.

---

[35] Vol. i, p. 176, note to Vitalis, lib. i, cap. xxiv.