

The Last Chroniclers of Croyland

H. A. KELLY

1. Introduction

THE CHRONICLE OF CROYLAND ABBEY is one of the most interesting and important historical compilations of the fifteenth century. It consists of two pseudepigraphous sections (by 'Ingulf' and 'Peter of Blois') and three anonymous continuations.¹ The first of these continuations, which was written by a prior of the abbey, extends from the twelfth century to the author's own day, ending in the year 1470. The second continuator starts by correcting and supplementing the latter part of the first continuation, beginning in 1459, and carries on the history to late 1485, with a supplement going to the end of April 1486.² The third continuator admits that he does not know the identity of the previous writer, even though he brings the history of events forward only a week or two, into May 1486. There follows an account of the month-long stay at the abbey of John Russell, Bishop of Lincoln, who paid each week for himself and twenty companions, beginning in April.³ The independent account of Russell's visit in his episcopal register is both more definite and more vague: the Bishop 'came to Croyland monastery on 14 April 1486, having as in mind, as he asserted, to sojourn there with a few members of his household for a month or so.'⁴ The chronicle ends with the fragmentary record of the Bishop's adjudication of a matter between the monks of Croyland and the monks of Peterborough.

The circumstance of Russell's presence at Croyland in April of 1486 led Paul Murray Kendall and others to the conclusion that the Bishop was responsible, or largely responsible, for the second anonymous continuation: that he either wrote it entirely himself, or (and this was the conclusion favoured by Kendall) wrote an account that was later edited and added to by one of the Croyland monks, perhaps the prior of the abbey.⁵ In the past, I was willing to accept the likelihood of Russell's authorship,⁶ or alternatively to hold that it was written by a canonist who was a part of the retinue that accompanied Russell to Croyland in April 1486.⁷ But I have come to favour the view that most of it was written at the end of 1485 by a well-connected canonist (other than Russell) who had an interest in Croyland Abbey.

J. G. Edwards has proved to my satisfaction that the words at the end of the second anonymous continuation:

Acta sunt haec et expleta apud Croylandiam, anno Domini millesimo quadringentesimo octogesimo sexto, per spatium decem dierum, quorum postremus fuit ultimus dies mensis Aprilis eiusdem anni.⁴

should not be taken to refer to the writing of the continuation (as has been done in the past), but rather to the judicial proceedings referred to above, effecting the transfer of the parish church of Brighthurst from the charge of Croyland to that of Peterborough Abbey, which were begun on 21 April.⁵ Unlike Russell's Register, which gives an informal narrative account of the case, ending with the Bishop's sentence that he delivered on the afternoon of 24 April,⁶ the Croyland chronicler gives the actual *actus impropriationis*, the *instrumentum publicum* drawn up afterwards and addressed by Bishop Russell to all members of the Church at large. The end of the document is missing, since it breaks off two-thirds of the way through the sentence delivered on the 24th. After the sentence, the *actus* would have concluded with the date on which Russell issued and sealed it, and it would have been followed by the affidavits of two notaries public. All of this, following Edwards's reconstruction, would have been completed on 30 April.

Anyone who wishes to revert to the older interpretation will have to demonstrate that the expression *acta sunt* can refer not only to actions but also to writing, apart from the making of legal documents." Furthermore, if one wishes to say that it was Russell who compiled the chronicle during the last ten days of April 1486,⁷ one should be prepared to face the objection that those ten days would not have provided the Bishop sufficient leisure to complete such a precise and lengthy account (of some 15,000 words), especially since he was occupied during some of these days with the above-mentioned judicial business, and, as we will see, he was also conducting other business and furthermore was in such bad health that he was intending to resign from the administration of his diocese.⁸ However, if one eliminates the ten-day restriction, one could allege that Bishop Russell composed the continuation during the month that he stayed at Croyland, or else that he wrote it (in whole or in part) before coming to Croyland and finished it or left it there in April or May of 1486.⁹ We will return to these possibilities later, as well as to the question of divided authorship. In the meantime, let us discuss Russell's appropriateness as putative author.

2. John Russell as the Second Anonymous: Overqualified?

One reason for focusing on Russell as the author, apart from the fact that he would have been well informed on the secular history he relates, is that he seems to fit an identification that is made in the text as it has come down to us. In telling of the second mission sent by Edward IV to the Duke of Burgundy after the battle of Tewkesbury, the author specifies that the envoy was one of the King's councillors, a doctor in canon law (*unus ex consiliariis regis, doctor in iure canonico*), and a marginal note identifies him as the compiler of this history (*Ille qui hanc historiam compilavit*).¹⁰ Edwards has suggested that the 'history' referred to in the sidenote may indicate not the whole continuation but rather only the account of the embassy to Burgundy, and that, furthermore, the note may not have been added by the author of the continuation.¹¹ I find the first

suggestion unlikely. The second is possible, of course, but if the note refers to the whole history and if it was not added by the author, then, unless it were sheer guesswork it would clearly have to have been added by someone who knew who the author was. This would exclude the third continuator, who, as noted above, professed not to know the identity of his predecessor."

If we may accept the author of the note as well informed and completely accurate (and as identifying the writer of the *whole* continuation), we must find someone who had a doctorate in canon law, who was a *consiliarius* (a loose term) of the readepted Edward IV, who was sent to Burgundy at the right time, and who could have and would have written the sort of thing that we find in the continuation (unless inappropriate material could be explained away by postulating a co-author, or editor, or reviser).

John Russell, as I have said, looks promising. He was up for his doctorate in canon law at Oxford in 1459, and he actively served Edward IV both before and after the restoration of Henry VI in 1470-71 (during which time he served Henry).¹⁰ Furthermore, he was out of the country on government business at the right time. Cora Scofield cites the Easter Issue Roll under date of 13 July 1471, as noting that Russell had been gone from England for twenty-eight days. But Scofield's conclusion is that someone who accompanied Russell, rather than Russell himself, may have been the author of the Croyland history.¹¹ Perhaps some light could be thrown on the matter by searching the Burgundian archives to see if any record of the English mission survives.¹²

The chief difficulty in accepting Russell as the Second Anonymous is the content of the chronicle. The author knows a great deal, but not as much as we would expect from the prominent statesman who served as Chancellor during most of Richard III's reign.¹³ It is strange, to say the least, that Russell would describe his own actions in detail in but a single instance, telling of only one of the many embassies he performed over the years, and never speaking of his domestic activities. One could, perhaps, put down his reticence to a self-effacing modesty, or to a desire not to implicate himself too deeply in the policies he witnessed and carried out. But he would hardly have been likely to express the hostility for Richard III that he does without somehow indicating that Richard's Chancellor was serving him under duress and with reluctance, as he does for the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cardinal Bourchier. Instead, he is content with general statements that others were motivated by fear, and he refrains from naming any of Richard's clerical supporters or functionaries.¹⁴ But even apart from the question of Russell's own actions, the Second Anonymous shows ignorance where Russell would have been knowledgeable. Let us take the example of the chronicle's reports of Richard's dealings with his nephews and nieces, the children of Edward IV.

After telling of King Richard's reception in York in early September 1483, which he wrongly describes as a second coronation, the Anonymous says that in the meantime the two young sons of King Edward were kept in the Tower under strict guard (*sub certa deputata custodia*), but he does not tell who the custodians were, something that Russell, who was in charge of the government in Richard's absence, would surely have known. He does not tell us of the attempt on the part of some members of the King's household to rescue the Princes. These conspirators seem to be the arrested persons that Richard,

writing from Minster Lovell on 29 July, ordered Russell to put on trial.²² Instead, the chronicler tells only of a plot to spirit away Edward's daughters in case anything fatal should happen to the sons. Richard, on hearing of it, 'deputed men of the greatest severity' to guard the environs of Westminster Abbey. This time the author does name the guards, or at least their leader, namely, John Nesfield, *armiger* (one of the esquires of the King's body).²³ But Nesfield's identity would have been public knowledge. He was in fact proclaimed as Queen Elizabeth's attendant before a large assembly on 1 March, 1484, on the occasion of the Queen's release of her five daughters into Richard's care.²⁴

The chronicler's only further certain reference to the two Princes is clearly that of an uninformed writer. He says that when the people of the South came together in opposition to Richard, with proclamations that the Duke of Buckingham, now repentant, would be their chief captain, it was reported that the Princes had met with some kind of violent death. It is quite obvious that the author and all of those he writes about were convinced that the report was true, and he shows everyone acting on the assumption that the Princes were dead. He goes on to say that the rebels realised that if they could not find a new captain everything would soon be over. They then remembered Henry Earl of Richmond, and Buckingham on Morton's advice promised him their support on condition that he would marry Princess Elizabeth.²⁵

Richard's latest biographer, Charles Ross, who takes Russell as the Croyland author, says that he makes clear, 'if obliquely', his belief that Richard was guilty of the death of the Princes.²⁶ But why would he have to be oblique on this point when he is straightforward about condemning Richard for other unjust deaths? Hastings was executed without justice or judgment, he says, and Ratcliffe's execution of Rivers, Grey, and Vaughan was the second occasion on which innocent blood was shed in the course of Richard's usurpation.²⁷

Once the Princes were taken for dead, Richard needed to concern himself only about the daughters. The Croyland author earlier noted with disapproval the *color* by which Richard claimed the throne: it was shown that the children (*fili*) of Edward IV were bastards because Edward had married Eleanor Butler before he married Elizabeth, and since the children of Clarence were attainted the next in line was Richard. This case was made by way of supplication on a parchment roll reported to have been conceived in the North, but the chronicler says that everyone knew who it was who was solely responsible for such great sedition and infamy—a person who was present in London the whole time (he is perhaps referring to Robert Stillington, Bishop of Bath and Wells, who is named in a Yearbook of early 1486 as the author of the petition).²⁸ In due course he tells of Richard's Parliament in January 1484, in which his claim of the previous summer was corroborated. Just as the chronicler disallowed the grounds for bastardising Edward's children (now, of course, as I mentioned, only the daughters were at issue), so too he believed that the formal declaration of the *Titulus Regius* in Parliament was invalid; Parliament was not a competent body to decide questions of matrimonial nullity, which were matters for an ecclesiastical court: 'Even though that lay court could not give definitive sentence on it [Richard's title], since it concerned a dispute over the validity of marriage, nevertheless, because of the great fear affecting even the most

constant, it presumed to do it, and did it'.²⁹ But there were, of course, bishops present at the Parliament, including the two archbishops and Russell himself (who opened the assembly with a sermon on the fidelity that English subjects owed to their king).³⁰ Separately or in concert, they could have conducted a legitimate juridical process on the question, that is to say, an inquisition of the sort that the authors of the *Titulus Regius* expressed their willingness to promote 'hereafter, if and as the case shall require', on the charge that Edward's marriage was invalid because of witchcraft.³¹ The witchcraft charge is completely ignored by the Croyland author (and most modern historians have followed suit), but it was clearly taken seriously by Parliament. Such a charge had been sufficient to annul the marriage of Humphrey of Gloucester in 1441, and Henry VIII was to think of using the same impediment to dissolve his marriage to Anne Boleyn.³²

The Croyland author reveals an interesting combination of specific knowledge and misinformation or ignorance when he says that Queen Elizabeth in the face of frequent intercessions and terrible threats released all of her daughters to Richard, and then tells of a subsequent meeting that occurred, while Parliament was still in session, on a certain afternoon in February, 'in a lower chamber near the passageway leading to the rooms of the queen': on special order from the King 'almost all of the spiritual and temporal lords of the realm and the greater knights and esquires of the king's household' assembled to sign a special oath of adherence to Prince Edward, Richard's only son, in case Richard himself should die.³³ If Russell were telling this, he would surely have remembered that it was only after the closing of Parliament that Elizabeth sent her daughters to Richard,³⁴ and it is not likely that he would have been ignorant of the authors of the oath: the Anonymous speaks of it as 'quoddam formatum a quibus nescio novum sacramentum' ('a certain new oath drawn up by persons unknown to me').

The subject of Edward's offspring comes up again in the midst of the chronicler's account of the 1484-85 Christmas season, which has struck readers as being that of an eye witness. He inserts a discussion of Richard's revival of Edward's methods of extorting taxes, even though Richard had condemned them in full Parliament. The Anonymous had denounced these procedures earlier, and now refrains from telling of the countless new methods that Richard introduced, lest they inspire perfidious minds to imitate them. He adds: 'Let there also be many other things which are not written in this book, of which it is shameful to speak; but there is one matter that should not be passed over in silence',³⁵ and he goes on to tell of Richard's dealings with Queen Anne and Princess Elizabeth, 'at which the people were seen to find fault and the nobles and prelates greatly to wonder'. Ross says that the author is 'obviously suggesting that he knew far more than he was prepared to tell',³⁶ but it would clearly be reading the passage out of context to conclude from these words that he is holding back details of the Princes' murder. He is not speaking of anything so egregious; rather, he seems to be saying that the misdeeds he passes over were on a lesser scale than what follows. As for what follows, the author would appear to disapprove rather of Richard's eagerness to be rid of Anne than of his desire to marry Elizabeth.

Ross says that Richard's intentions towards Elizabeth show that he did not

believe in Edward's precontract (that is, his previous marriage to Eleanor Butler), since 'there was little sense' in such a plan 'if she were indeed the bastard he had proclaimed her to be.'³⁸ I would say, on the contrary, that such a marriage would make good sense, for it would have the effect of silencing those who, like the Croyland author, did not share Richard's (and Parliament's) conclusion that she was illegitimate. But an even greater advantage, which is emphasized by Polydore Vergil and is also evident in the Croyland account, is that it would preempt Henry's plan of marrying Elizabeth. For this latter purpose, the question of Elizabeth's legitimacy or illegitimacy made absolutely no difference. But two matters were of crucial importance: whether young Elizabeth would consent to the union, and whether Richard could validly marry her (that is, whether the Pope could, and would, allow him to marry his niece).

On the first point, George Buck reports having seen a letter that Elizabeth addressed to John Howard in which she professed to look forward to marrying Richard and expressed her hope that Queen Anne's expected death would soon occur. If this letter is authentic—and I find the arguments of Buck's editor, Arthur Kincaid, worthy of consideration—it may have been written at the instigation of Elizabeth's mother Queen Elizabeth (as Kincaid suggests).³⁹ The Croyland author does not indicate any opposition from young Elizabeth, nor does Polydore Vergil, in the earliest version of his history; but Vergil in revising his account cared in a phrase to express the girl's protest against the union.⁴⁰ It is possible that Vergil made this change in reaction to his later reading of the Croyland history, as he clearly did elsewhere in the manuscript:⁴¹ for the Croyland author seems to believe, and rightly so, that a valid uncle-niece marriage was possible. Vergil, who was something of a canonist (he would vote with the canonists on Henry VIII's marriage in the Convocation of 1533),⁴² made clear his theoretical opposition to such a marriage in the earliest (pre-Croyland) layer of his manuscript, and he obviously did not believe it to be within the Pope's dispensing power: he regarded it as a great crime (*tantum nefas*). In contrast, the Croyland author reflects the attitude (as I read him) that the marriage could have been permitted if only Ratcliffe and Catesby had not dissuaded him—with the aid of theologians who, presumably like Polydore Vergil and many other authorities, honestly believed that the union was prohibited by untouchable divine law. The fact is, as I showed in an earlier study, that there were recent little-known opinions and precedents based on the realisation that the uncle-niece relationship was not included in the Levitical degrees (hence a marriage in that degree would not be against divine law) or on the position that some of the Levitical degrees, even though imposed by divine law, could be exempted by the Pope.⁴³

Someone among Richard's councillors must have been aware of these developments, and enabled or encouraged the King to entertain the possibility of what most people, even most churchmen, would have considered completely impossible; and who was more likely a person than the King's Chancellor, one of the most learned canonists in the land?⁴⁴ It is at least likely that Richard would have consulted Russell on the matter. But the tone of the Croyland account seems to be less that of a consultant than that of an outside observer—therefore, not Russell himself but a fellow-canonist who understood the laws and papal precedents involved.

Let us look at the same episode from another point of view. The author reports the opinion of many that Ratcliffe and Catesby and others like them 'had thrown up such great obstacles out of fear that if Elizabeth should become queen she might at some time have power to take revenge upon these principal consultants in the death of her uncle, Earl Anthony, and her brother Richard'.⁴ But Elizabeth had two brothers named Richard, her half-brother Richard Grey, who is the one meant here, and her full brother Richard Duke of York, who had been taken from sanctuary at Westminster to join his brother Prince Edward in the Tower. The fact that Elizabeth is not thought to harbour desires of vengeance for the death of the two Princes shows that, in the Croyland author's view (or at least the view of those whose speculations he is reporting), she did not consider any of Richard's advisors, or his *current* advisors, responsible for their death.⁵ The author's statement is one of hearsay speculation, and not the sort of thing that one would expect Richard's Chancellor to say.

The fate of Edward's children comes up again in the hexameters on the three Richards, beginning *Tres sunt Richardi*, that close the history proper of the Second Anonymous.⁶ The verses add nothing to my argument that the author is not as well-informed as Russell would have been, but they do raise a question as to whether they are actually by the Second Anonymous, because unlike him the poet seems (at first glance) to accuse Richard of killing his nephews. According to the explanatory statement introducing the poem, the poem draws on the signs and badges of Richard III and Henry VII and the *pueri* (boys or children) of Edward IV; the cause of the *pueri*, the writer says, was especially vindicated by this war (the battle at Bosworth): 'quorum causa hoc bello potissime vindicata est'. The poem ends by saying that 'the teeth of the boar were stunned, and the red rose, vindicator of the white, shines upon us':

Dentes Apri stupuerunt,
Et vindex albae rosa rubra refulget in ore.

As the poem stands in Fulman's edition, it accuses Richard of squandering Edward's wealth and then of 'oppressing' his offspring:

Tertius, exhausto satis amplo divitiarum
Edwardi cumulo, non contentus nisi fratris
Opprimeret proles, proscribens auxiliares
Illarum partes . . .

(The third, having exhausted Edward's sufficiently ample accumulation of riches, not content unless he should also oppress his children, proscribing the parties who were helping them . . .)

But the version appended to the abridgment of George Buck's work, published by his great-nephew (also named George Buck) in 1646, as 'transcribed from an old manuscript' (*ex vet. lib. M.S. transcriptum*),⁷ omits the reference to Edward's offspring:

Tertius, exhausto statim amplo divitiarum
Edwardi cumulo, proscribens auxiliares
Henrici partes . . .

(The third, having immediately exhausted Edward's accumulation of riches, proscribing the parties who were aiding Henry . . .)

If the reference to Edward's offspring is to be taken as original to the Croyland

continuation and to be interpreted according to the mind of the Second Anonymous, we must recognise a range of possibilities. *Opprimere* can refer to physical actions (killing, smothering, and so on) or to political suppression. The grammar of the lines may indicate only that Richard suppressed Edward's children, including Elizabeth, by proscribing their partisans. The verses can therefore be read in harmony with what the Second Anonymous has said earlier on the subject.

3. Other Croyland-Connected Canonists

Let us see if we can find any persons other than Bishop Russell who could be put forth as candidates for the authorship of the second anonymous continuation. The proceedings of the court case presided over by Bishop Russell at the end of April 1486 reveal that there were other canonists either present in the Bishop's retinue or appearing in the court, or connected with the Lincoln curia or chapter, and therefore directly or indirectly concerned with the Croyland negotiations.

Thomas Hutton, listed as 'doctor of decrees', that is, doctor of canon law, had received this degree by 1477. He was also a doctor of civil (Roman) law as early as 1474.²⁹ He is named as a witness to the proceedings on 22 April, but he had also been empowered to act in the case as a proctor for the dean and chapter of Lincoln on 1 April, and for the Archdeacon of Leicester, Richard Lavender, on 5 April.³⁰ There is no record of Hutton's having performed any state service under Edward IV. Russell appointed him 'official principal in spiritual matters' (judge of his consistory court) in 1480 or 1481,³¹ and he was probably the first of the Lincoln officials to serve also as the Bishop's commissary-general.³² Richard III employed him as soon as he became King: he was sent as envoy to the Duke of Brittany on 13 July 1483.³³ He was appointed along with Russell on 20 February 1485 to complete the negotiations with Brittany inaugurated earlier (in this case he is designated as doctor of laws, that is, doctor of civil law).³⁴ He was one of the new masters in chancery in Richard's reign, and in the Parliament that opened on 23 January 1484, he served as a receiver of petitions for the British Isles and undoubtedly acted as clerk of the Parliament.³⁵ In September of 1484 he was one of the commissioners dealing with the Scottish envoys at Nottingham, in which Russell also participated.³⁶ On 14 May 1485 Richard empowered him, calling him 'the faithful clerk of his council', to investigate crimes in the islands of Jersey and Guernsey.³⁷

Since Hutton was out of the country at the end of July 1483, when Richard sent his cryptic letter to Russell and perhaps when the Princes disappeared, this might account for the vagueness of the Croyland report on the events of this time and on the actual fate of the Princes, if Hutton were responsible for the history. But then the Croyland history does not mention the embassies to Brittany at all, though it is very specific about the negotiations with the Scots in 1484 (it states that the Scots sent delegates to the King at Nottingham on 7 September).³⁸ However, Hutton would seem to be excluded as the author of the chronicle by the consideration that he does not appear to have been a doctor of canon law as early as 1471, and also by his apparently very active support of Richard, specifically against Henry Earl of Richmond.³⁹

Let us next consider Henry Sharp, who, as Archdeacon of Bedford from 1471 to 1489 was a member of the Lincoln cathedral chapter, which, as I noted above, was involved in the proceedings at Croyland in 1486. (This need not mean, of course, that he was personally active either in the chapter or in his archdeaconry; archdeacons in particular tended to exercise their duties through their officials.) He was a member of Edward IV's council, and undertook many diplomatic missions abroad between 1463 and 1473, including two to Burgundy in 1468 and 1469. He was protonotary of chancery from 1461 to 1488, and thus in a good position to learn the sort of details given by the Croyland chronicler. He has, in fact, been put forth as the Second Anonymous by Nicholas Pronay.⁶⁴ But he had the wrong degree. He was a bachelor of civil law by 1439 and a bachelor of canon and civil law by 1447. He received a doctorate in civil law from Padua as early as 1447.⁶⁵ There was little difference in training and knowledge between doctors in canon and civil law: both were called 'canonists', and their degrees were often mistaken or confused by outsiders; but since it is the Croyland author himself who identifies the 1471 envoy as a doctor in canon law, he would hardly have mistaken his own degree. If the annotator was correct in identifying him as the author, he cannot have been Sharp. If he was not correct, the field lies open.

Another canonist who, like Sharp, was a member of the Lincoln chapter but not named in the Croyland proceedings is John Cooke, Archdeacon of Lincoln since 1481.⁶⁶ In his case, his archdeaconry included Croyland within its boundaries: the abbey was in the rural deanery of Holland at the southern extremity of Lincolnshire.⁶⁷ Cooke was a councillor of Edward's as early as 1472. He undertook several missions for him, and was similarly employed by Richard III and Henry VII. He was one of the commissioners appointed by Richard on 16 July 1483, to deal with the French (therefore like Hutton he would have been out of the country during decisive events after Richard's accession). On 11 August 1484, he was sent on a mission to the Archduke Maximilian.⁶⁸ But, as with Sharp, his doctorate was in the wrong field. He received his baccalaureate in canon law in 1455 and another in civil law in 1457. He was a doctor of civil law by 1466, and he lectured in civil law at Oxford in 1468.⁶⁹

Yet another prominent canonist who was a member of the Lincoln chapter was Oliver King, Archdeacon of Oxford from 1482 to 1492, but he too was a civilian. He had been licenced in civil law at Cambridge and was a doctor of civil law by 1481. In 1471 he was probably serving Henry VI's son Edward, though he became clerk of the signet for Edward IV in 1473, and was sent to Brittany in 1475. He became principal secretary for the French tongue in 1476, and the King's secretary in 1480. He was dismissed when he was arrested with Morton and Rotherham on 13 June 1483. Henry VII reappointed him in 1487.⁷⁰

John Bouchier, nephew of Cardinal Bouchier, was Archdeacon of Buckingham in the diocese of Lincoln from 1474 to 1495. He was a doctor of canon law, but received his degree from Cambridge only in 1480. He was offered another doctorate, probably in both canon and civil law, by Oxford in 1481.⁷¹

Philip Lipyat, subdean of the Lincoln cathedral chapter, was acting for the absentee dean of Lincoln, George Fitzhugh,⁴ in the Croyland negotiations of 1486. Lipyat supplicated for his baccalaureate in canon law in 1456 and he was licenced in civil law before 1485. He was a canon of Lincoln in 1457.⁵ He appointed proctors for the dean and chapter of Lincoln on 1 April 1486, and was represented by one of them, namely, William Miller, Master of Arts.⁶

I come, finally, to two incumbent archdeacons of the Lincoln diocese who did have doctorates in canon law early enough to qualify for identification as the envoy to Burgundy in 1471, namely, William Sheffield and Richard Lavender.

Sheffield, Archdeacon of Stowe from 1477 to 1496, was a doctor of canon law perhaps as early as 1470 (he was admitted as regent of canon law in 1468-69). But his diplomatic career, so far as it is known, came late (1487, 1491), and it is unlikely that he had any personal connection with Croyland Abbey in 1485 and 1486, since he became treasurer of York on 15 July, 1485, and in August he was appointed vicar-general of the Archbishop of York, Thomas Rotherham.⁷

That leaves Richard Lavender, who like John Russell some years before him had gone up from Winchester College to New College, Oxford (Lavender arrived in 1454). He had his doctorate in canon law by 1470, and he became a canon of Lincoln in 1477.⁸ In 1481, Russell referred to him as 'our chancellor' when he appointed him as his commissary and judge in an earlier case of annexation involving Peterborough Abbey.⁹ This was a position distinct from that of Chancellor of the cathedral chapter.¹⁰

It was presumably when Russell was named Chancellor of the realm on 10 May 1483 that he appointed Lavender 'our vicar-general in spiritual matters while we are engaged outside our city and diocese'. He addressed him as such in a letter of 6 September, in which he authorised Lavender and Thomas Ingilby, Bishop of Rathlur, his suffragan, to undertake visitations in his place, with the power of inquisition and correction and the faculty of collecting visitation procurations.¹¹ Russell himself had authorised all ordinations up to those of 24 May 1483,¹² and he must have sent to the Pope about this time for permission to visit by deputy, for Sixtus IV granted his request in a bull dated 4 July.¹³

In the Croyland proceedings, Lavender is designated as doctor of decrees, Archdeacon of Leicester, and official of the consistory of Lincoln.¹⁴ He did not become archdeacon until after Richard's overthrow, being admitted on 5 October 1485.¹⁵ We do not know when he became official, or whether there was an intervening official between him and Hutton. We saw that Hutton was one of the proctors whom Lavender appointed on 5 April 1486, to represent him as archdeacon at Croyland, but he was in fact represented by Roger Wood, Master of Arts, and Lavender himself is not said to have been present at the proceedings.

Lavender is interesting for possessing at his death in 1508 the 1498 edition of the *Summa Angelica* of Angelo Carletti of Chivasso,¹⁶ first printed in 1486. Carletti was under the mistaken impression that Martin V had allowed a brother-sister marriage; since Carletti supported the Pope's

right to grant such a dispensation, he would have admitted the possibility of a licit uncle-niece union."

No record of Lavender's early activity has been uncovered. He was appointed rector of a parish in Dorset in 1470; but it is unlikely that a man of his academic attainments would have restricted himself to pastoral duties and would not have found employment in some sort of government service.

As far as potential connections with Croyland Abbey are concerned, Lavender stands in the most advantageous possible position. Apart from any formal occasions there would have been of visiting the abbey in his capacities of vicar-general, official, and commissary-general, his position as judge of the consistory court would have taken him regularly to Stamford, which was only fifteen miles or so from Croyland, for the court met there in St. George's church in two-day sessions during most months of the year." In fact, Lavender was at Stamford on 5 April 1486, when he assigned Hutton and Wood to act as his proctors in the Croyland case.

4. Lincoln Diocese Business: Times and Places

Since Russell and Lavender are the only available canonists with the proper credentials to qualify them for Croyland authorship, I will concentrate my attention on them. We can find out a certain amount of information about their whereabouts from the Register of Russell's episcopacy, especially from the ordination and benefice records. The ordinations were almost always performed by Bishop Ingilby or other suffragans, but they had to be authorised either by Bishop Russell or by Lavender acting as vicar-general, and the data suggest that the authorisations were usually given in person at the place of ordination a day or two before the ceremony was to take place. Collations of benefices were always made by the Bishop. As for admissions of rectors and perpetual vicars to parishes chaplains to chantries, most of them occurred at the Bishop's London residence in the Old Temple, or, when they happened elsewhere, the places seem to coincide with what we know of Russell's movements. I think then that we can make at least a 'soft' assumption that Russell always received the appointees in person, except during the time that Lavender served as vicar-general. During this period either Russell or Lavender would have officiated.

On these premises, we can conclude that Russell himself occasionally came to Stamford on business. Beneficiaries were admitted there on four days in 1481,¹⁵ three days in 1482,¹⁶ and one day (1 April) in the first half of 1483.¹⁷ But it was probably Lavender who received the beneficiaries at Stamford in October of 1483 and on the five days recorded in 1484. On one of these days, 29 January, a rector was admitted as well at Russell's Old Temple residence. Admission took place at Stamford on 2 and 3 April, and it was Lavender who authorised the ordinations that Ingilby performed there on 3 April. Lavender's first recorded activities as vicar-general also occurred at Stamford. On 18 September 1483, he addressed a letter from there to the dean and chapter of York, and he authorised the ordinations that took place at Stamford on 20 September.

Since it was Lavender who licenced the ordinations held at Buckden in Bedfordshire (where the Bishop of Lincoln had a residence) on 13 March

1484, it was presumably he who received a rector there on 12 March. It was probably also Lavender who admitted beneficiaries at various religious houses of Leicestershire later in the month, doubtless while conducting official visitations.

Throughout his episcopacy, Russell spent most of his time in London, but he was even more consistently there from the time that he took over as Richard's Chancellor until he returned to Lincoln in April of 1484, where he performed the ordinations in person on Holy Saturday (17 April). For the rest of 1484, up to 18 December, all ordinations were authorised by Lavender, and this is the last record we have of his acting as vicar-general. Russell himself gave the necessary licence for all of the ordinations that occurred during the remainder of his episcopacy, beginning with those at Buckden on 26 February 1485, those at Stamford on 19 March (just three days after the death of Queen Anne), those at Lincoln on Holy Saturday, 2 April (therefore shortly after Richard publicly disclaimed his intentions of marrying his niece), and those at Oseney on 28 May. Perhaps, then, Russell appointed Lavender as official at the beginning of 1485, after deciding that he could manage without a vicar-general.

Russell's month-long sojourn at Croyland was unprecedented. No other connection with the abbey before that time is noted, and only two mentions occur in later times, when perpetual vicars were admitted there on 6 September 1488." It is probable that Russell went to Croyland in April of 1486 because of ill-health, perhaps with a view to trying it out as a retirement home. It must have been about this time that he sent a request to the Pope to be permitted to relinquish his duties as Bishop and live on a pension of a thousand gold ducats a year, a request that the Pope granted on 21 July." But while he was at Croyland, he not only presided over the Croyland-Peterborough exchange, but also took care of the business of admitting or collating rectors and vicars—one on 19 April, two on 22 April (the first day of the formal hearing), one on the next day (the Sunday on which the court did not meet), two more on 24 April (when there were morning and afternoon sessions in the hearing, and Russell delivered his decree). Two admissions took place at Croyland on 27 April, one on 30 April, and one on 1 May. On 5 May beneficiaries were admitted both at Croyland and Stamford, which probably means that Russell went to Stamford for part of the day and then returned to Croyland, for another admission took place at Croyland on 6 May. The last Croyland entry occurs on 9 May. On 15 May there was an admission at Tattershall, two-thirds of the way back to Lincoln, and two on 20 May at Sleaford, halfway between Croyland and Lincoln. Russell authorised the ordinations that took place there on that day, and on the same day he returned to Stamford and admitted a rector there. On 22 May at nearby Sempringham Russell bestowed a double chantry on a priest; on the next day there was an admission at Bourne and another at Stamford. On 24 May, Russell dated a letter from Peterborough.

There is no further activity in the area for some time. The next admissions at Stamford occur on 30-31 March 1487," and then on 21 March and 1 April 1488." We recall that the only other Croyland

admissions took place in September of that year. The Register shows little else of interest for us in our inquiry, except that on 22 September 1486, writing from Buckden, Russell appointed Martin Colyns as deputy official and commissary-general in the absence of the 'official of our consistory'.²⁰ It would seem that Lavender left the diocese on some business at this time. There is no indication that he ever performed any other function in the diocese.

5. Single Authorship and Deliberate Anonymity

Before I proceed with further speculation about Richard Lavender's candidacy as the Second Croyland Anonymous, I will take up the question of whether the continuation is of composite authorship, and the related question of how the identity of the 'writer' could have been concealed from the next continuator.

Alison Hanham, following Paul Kendall, hypothesises that behind the second continuation there lies an *Urtext*, a history of secular events, which was written by Bishop Russell or someone like him; it would have been finished in 1485 or possibly in April 1486, left at Croyland, and found there by the official chronicler of the monastery, who did not know the identity of the author. This monk, the theory continues, proceeded to adapt the history as a sequel to the prior's continuation of the Croyland chronicle, which extended to the year 1470, and the same monk is the third continuator who professes ignorance of the identity of the previous writer.²¹

This hypothesis strikes me as unlikely, even if we posit a deliberate deviousness on the part of the monk-editor (of the sort that produced the original pseudepigraphous sections of the chronicle). For if the monk were only *pretending* to secular knowledge unavailable to the prior, while actually drawing on someone else's account, there would be tell-tale signs of the imposture. If we read the account straightforwardly and take it at face-value, it is clear that the author is contrasting his own personal knowledge with the laudable ignorance of the *chronographus prior* (a punning expression that means both 'previous chronicler' and 'prior-chronicler'). Such ignorance is appropriate to a monk; but since he does not have it, he implies that he himself is not a monk.

Because the modification of the prior's account begins as far back as 1459, it is not credible that a monk-editor using a history by Russell (or some other outsider) that started in 1459 would have included only the details that he does. Furthermore, when Hanham contends that the redactor uses an editorial 'we' or impersonal constructions in contrast to the author of the secular history, who often uses the first-person singular,²² she does not give an adequate picture of the text. There is in fact a unity of style and theme throughout. A first-person singular locution of a similar kind appears in both the secular history²³ and the Croyland sections,²⁴ and the first-person singular is also used at the beginning where the knowledgeable continuator specifically refers to the prior's history.²⁵ He also uses the plural later in the secular history when referring back to his own earlier account.²⁶ At one point, he uses singular participles in summing up Croyland history,²⁷ and the plural participle on reverting to the secular events.²⁸ He uses the impersonal

expression *libet* in both secular and monastic portions of the work;” and the same is true of the second-person expression *vidisses*.¹⁰⁰ He explains the Roman computation of the year in a monastic section and uses it in the secular history.¹⁰¹ Finally, he uses the rare word *tragedia* to designate one portion of his history which encompasses both secular and monastic events (from the aftermath of Edward IV’s death to the death of Abbot Croyland on 10 November 1483).¹⁰²

The Croyland sections, then, are clearly integral to the history. Contrary to Edwards’s analysis, which indicates that the Second Anonymous places the Croyland material only after he has delivered his account of secular events,¹⁰³ he follows the prior’s method of inserting it in chronologically appropriate places in the course of his narrative, according to the reigns of the successive abbots.¹⁰⁴

As for the hypothesis that Russell wrote the whole of the second continuation, if we ignore the difficulties of content noted above (the continuator does not seem to know as much as someone in Russell’s position should know, and his hostility to Richard cannot easily be reconciled with Russell’s record of service), we cannot ignore the other main objection that was raised: the third continuator could not have been ignorant of the Bishop’s identity, unless this continuator was himself a stranger to the abbey; for the Bishop could not have had access to the prior’s continuation and further Croyland records without being known to a monk of the place who carried the history to the end of Russell’s stay in mid-May 1486.

I wish to propose that both the second and third continuators were outsiders. I suggest that Richard Lavender was the second continuator and that Bishop Russell was the third, and that both of them wrote with the approval of the monks, but that the monks actively connived with Lavender to keep his identity a secret from Russell and other secular readers.

6. Richard Lavender as the Second Anonymous

I have already noted the ways in which Lavender would have come into proximity with Croyland as Bishop Russell’s chief deputy. But after he became Archdeacon of Leicester on 5 October 1485, the monastic authorities would have had another reason to take a special interest in him. As archdeacon, he had jurisdiction over the parish of Brighthurst, which, according to an earlier agreement, was to be transferred from the patronage of the monks of Croyland to that of the monks of Peterborough. This transfer was the subject of the judicial proceedings of April 1486.

I suppose, then, that Lavender had occasion to stay at Croyland Abbey and to read the prior’s continuation, and that he decided to continue the history, after first reviewing and correcting some of the details in the prior’s account. Since he proceeded in the same fashion as the prior, weaving in Croyland history as he went, he would have had to use the monastic records of recent times. I assume, therefore, that he wrote with the consent and encouragement of, and perhaps even at the commission of, the official record-keeper of the abbey.

I presume Dr. Lavender to have been the councillor of Edward IV that the King sent to Burgundy in 1471, perhaps in the company of Dr. Russell, as

Scofield conjectured. If Lavender's government career was not active thereafter, he could have been kept informed of events through colleagues at Lincoln like Bishop Russell and Dr. Hutton and perhaps Dr. Cooke, all of whom were supporters of Richard III. There were no doubt others at Lincoln who had supported Henry Tudor, such as the Lincolnshireman Richard Fox, who as we shall see below is mentioned in the Croyland history (but with the wrong first name). According to Bishop Russell's register, he was ordained subdeacon on 25 March 1486, when he was already a doctor of civil law from Cambridge.¹⁰⁹ Lavender, I posit, felt free to express his own dislike of Richard III but did not wish to compromise his clerical ministers, and so he remained silent about them.¹¹⁰ But he does name the churchmen who resisted Richard. He says that on 13 June 1483, when Hastings was peremptorily executed, Archbishop Thomas Rotherham and Bishop John Morton were exempted from the death penalty but were held under arrest; he adds that, with these three strongest supporters of the new King (Edward V) thus removed and others fearing the same fate, the Dukes of Gloucester and Buckingham acted as they pleased. Three days later, he says, they forced Cardinal Bourchier 'with many others' to enter sanctuary and persuade the Queen to release the young Duke of York.¹¹¹ (We know that Bishop Russell was among those who accompanied Bourchier.)¹¹² Morton and Peter Courtenay, Bishop of Exeter, aided Buckingham in his support of Henry Tudor,¹¹³ and Courtenay, called 'the flower of the knighthood of his country' (presumably because he was the son of a knight), was among the exiled clergy who returned with Henry and witnessed his victory at Bosworth.¹¹⁴ With him were Christopher Urswick and 'John Fox' (he means Richard Fox), 'one of whom later acquired the office of almoner and the other that of secretary'.¹¹⁵ Urswick became the King's almoner on 24 September 1485,¹¹⁶ and Fox appears as secretary in November.¹¹⁷ The fourth churchman mentioned at this point is Robert Morton (John Morton's nephew), identified as *clericus rotolorum cancellariae*. Since Lavender does not refer to his later acquisition of the office, as he does with Urswick, he is doubtless referring to the fact that Morton had been master of the rolls before he was removed from that position by Richard on 23 September 1483.¹¹⁸ We should conclude, therefore, that Lavender is writing before Morton's reappointment on 13 November 1485.¹¹⁹ If so, the latest event mentioned in the continuation up to this point is the death of Abbot Fosdyke from the sweating sickness (which he mistakenly puts on 14 November instead of 14 October): 'This good father, touched by the same disease, did not last more than eighteen hours before rendering his spirit to his Creator, on the fourteenth day of November 1485, a little after the end of Richard's reign; and when we describe the remaining events up to that point [it is not clear whether he means Richard's death or Fosdyke's death], we shall conclude the series of this whole history that was promised by us'.¹²⁰

In the event, Lavender begins his 'peroration' immediately after Henry's victory at Bosworth, with the statement, 'Thus ends the history that we promised to tell . . . up to the death of the said King Richard'.¹²¹ He sums up what he has added to the prior's compilation, and then introduces the verses *Tres sunt Richardi*, referring to himself in the third person as *quidam metrista* (a certain versifier).¹²² After the verses comes a paragraph in which he refers to the sweating sickness of which he spoke earlier and of which Abbot Fosdyke died:

In his primordiis novi regis invaluit pestis sudoris de qua supra tetigeramus, et qua praefatus abbas Croylandiae Lambertus decessit in fata, decimo quarto die Octobris, ut praefertur.

(In these beginnings of the new king, the sweating sickness broke out again, as we mentioned, and the aforesaid Abbot Lambert died of it on the fourteenth day of October, as is said above.)

He goes on to the election of Fosdyke's successor, Edmund Thorp, previously the prior of the place, on the feast of St. Theodore, the [ninth] day of November 1487 (we note that this time the months are given correctly, but the year is wrong).¹¹¹

J. G. Edwards has argued that since the immediately preceding material does not deal with the beginnings of Henry's reign but rather with the end of Richard's reign, the text has somehow been dislocated.¹¹² But in fact the verses end, as we have seen, with a reference to Henry's reign ('the red rose shines'); furthermore, before the formal summation and conclusion, there is an account of Henry's treatment of the survivors of the battle. I find, therefore, that the passage fits where it stands. But there is another question that must be asked: namely, when was it written? The material following it was written in April 1486; the material before it shows no sign of knowledge of events beyond October (or November) 1485. I conclude from this that the whole of the history up to that point was finished in 1485. The paragraph in question could well have been written at that time, whether of set purpose or as something of an afterthought, in fulfilment of the author's earlier promise to bring the history down to Abbot Fosdyke's death. But it could just as easily be the beginning of the supplement to the history that was written several months later. This supplement naturally divides into two parts: 1) an account of Abbot Thorp's accomplishments to date, and 2) an account of Henry VII's doings to date. Edwards believes that the latter material, beginning *Cum mos scribentium* and ending with the verses on peace, *Qui legis haec*,¹¹³ was meant to come first; but while I see his rearrangement as a possibility, I think it more likely that the actual positioning of the text in Fulman's edition preserves the original order.

I suggest, therefore, that sometime in the spring of 1486 Lavender made another visit to Croyland and decided to continue his history by writing of the accomplishments thus far of Abbot Thorp. In his notice of the abbot's election on 9 November (this notice, as we saw, may have been written in November or only added now), Lavender specifies that Thorp is a bachelor of theology. Thorp had, in fact, spent all or most of Richard III's reign pursuing his degree at Cambridge;¹¹⁴ he would, then, have been a helpful source to the author, especially for Croyland affairs but also for secular events. The same is true to some extent of Abbot Fosdyke, who was himself a canon lawyer. He entered the study of canon law at Cambridge in 1476-77 and received a bachelor's degree in the subject. He was elected abbot on 12 January 1484, and would no doubt have attended Richard's Parliament later that month. In fact, Richard gave his assent to Fosdyke's election on the opening day of Parliament, 23 January, and on 6 February, after receiving the fealty of the new abbot, restored his temporalities.¹¹⁵

Fosdyke or Thorp may have commissioned Lavender to write the history, and Thorp as prior may even have been responsible, like the prior who wrote

the first anonymous continuation, for recording events of concern to Croyland in the abbey registers. If so, Thorp's successor as prior may have contributed the data for the Croyland material in Lavender's addendum, which consists entirely of an account of Thorp's masterful handling of three troublesome matters. The third of these matters was the completion of the settlement decreed by Archbishop Rotherham on 1 May 1481, which the continuator referred to earlier, at the end of his 'tragedy',¹²¹ namely, the impropriation of the church of Bringhurst in Leicestershire to the monks of Peterborough.¹²² The main obstacle to this settlement was that a royal licence was needed; but Thorp acted so prudently, 'that finally they merited to come to the fulfilment of what was proposed; for he obtained from the King letters patent directed to the abbot and convent of Peterborough licencing the transfer—of which [letters] and of the whole process that followed from them a fuller account will perhaps be written below by someone else in its proper place'.¹²³

According to the act of impropriation that was in fact added to the final continuation, we see that the King's letter was dated 25 February 1486.¹²⁴ On 1 April, in the chapter house at Lincoln, Philip Lipyat, subdean, with the unanimous consent of the whole chapter (of which Lavender was a member), assigned proctors to represent the chapter at the coming proceedings.¹²⁵ On 5 April, when he was at Stamford, presumably in consistory, Dr. Lavender appointed proctors to act for him in his capacity of Archdeacon of Leicester.¹²⁶ It is possible, then, that Lavender visited Croyland at this time and wrote this section of his addendum then, if his reference to the *processus inde secutus* is to be taken to mean the legal proceedings already begun but not yet finished. Such a reading would explain his saying that the proper place for such an account would be below (*inferius*). But if his meaning is that the proceedings are completed, he would not have been able to say so before 24 April, when Bishop Russell delivered his sentence. If so, then Lavender would perhaps have been among the twenty persons who accompanied Russell to Croyland on 14 April. Lavender could in fact have written these words on 24 April itself while Russell and others were in court, since his own presence was not necessary (he was represented by his proctor, Roger Wood). Later on, after all of the documents of the case had been drawn up and notarised, Lavender or the monastic registrar would have added the sentence, 'Acta sunt haec et expleta', etc., perhaps as a marginal note (which could account for its subsequent displacement in Fulman's text), specifying that the proceedings began on 21 April and were completed on 30 April.

At the same time that Lavender wrote his account of Abbot Thorp, or at least in the same month of April, he added a brief supplement to his secular history. He tells of Henry VII's departure from Lincoln (where he had gone for Easter, 26 March) and also of the report of rebellion in the North. Since Henry heard of the rising after he reached Nottingham on 11 April, and then summoned the men of Lincoln to his aid,¹²⁷ the report of the rising would have come to Lavender's ears very near the time that Russell and his train arrived in Croyland on 14 April. Therefore, Lavender may well have been writing at the abbey after this date, if he accompanied Russell. We know that he was writing before report came of Henry's escape from harm on 23 April, which is told in the next continuation.

The secular addendum consists of two sentences, in the first of which Lavender refers to himself as 'praefatus scriptor'¹¹¹ and in the second as 'ille qui haec scripsit' ('he who wrote these things'). In the first sentence, he tells why he decided to end his history with the death of Richard III (historians do not wish to speak of the vices and virtues of living persons); he will add only that after Henry VII's victory and coronation (which he places one month too early) the event hoped for from the beginning took place, namely his marriage to Elizabeth, firstborn of Edward IV, at the instance of all three estates of the realm, on 18 January 1486, after a papal dispensation had been obtained for their consanguinity in the 'fourth and fourth degree.' The second sentence introduces the poem *Qui legis haec*. He says that after peace was thus graciously restored, the madness of some malign persons was still not averted: in the North, whence is derived all evil, a certain ungracious sedition began to be set in motion immediately after Easter, even against the King, who was in those regions; the verses that follow are designed to exhort the readers to be grateful for peace or resigned to further conflict, depending on the outcome of events. The printer interrupted the verses themselves with an explanatory note (as can be seen from the transcript of the manuscript that Fulman annotated). By a similar error of even earlier vintage, apparently, an instruction to a copyist to add verses in praise of Croyland Abbey became part of the text.¹¹² In the verses, beginning *Dulce patri fratrem*, the poet praises the monks' hospitality, 'which we ourselves have seen' ('quod ipsi/Vidimus'), which, as Antonia Gransden notes, would indicate that the author was a visitor to the abbey rather than a member of the community.¹¹³ But he goes on to associate himself with the monks as a brother:

Ne sancta precamina votis
 Frustrantur precibus fratris, ego nunc mea vestris
 Omnia commendo: valeant qui vestra valere
 Exoptant, etiam vos in Christo valeatis.

(Lest holy petitions be lacking in the devout prayers of a brother, I now commend all of mine to yours: may those persons prosper who wish yours to prosper, and may you too prosper in Christ.)

The poem opens with the rather puzzling sentiment that 'it is sweet to be a brother to a father in an assembly where all fraternal envy is lacking'.

Dulce patri fratrem fore quo coetu vacat omnia
 Fraterna invidia.

Finally, after the poem, comes the misplaced note telling of 'these actions' accomplished in the last ten days of April.

7. Bishop Russell as the Third Anonymous

The next event in the evolution of the chronicle, I propose, was that Bishop Russell, during his time of leisure at Croyland, from 1 May to around 14 May, after hearing of Henry VII's successful return from the North, read the history composed by Lavender. I posit that Lavender's identity as author was kept from the Bishop at Lavender's own request, because of the harsh attitude the history manifests towards Richard III and his government.

Then, I suggest, Russell decided to begin his own continuation, perhaps at the encouragement of Abbot Thorp. He opens by disagreeing with the previous author's reasons for not recording contemporary events, gives his own reasons

for doing so, and expresses the hope that others will follow his example. I give a literal translation of the sentence:

Although the writer of the immediately preceding history, whoever he was, imposed an end on his work at that point where and whence it seemed to him he should not proceed further, for the reasons given by him, I, however, who every day find something worthy of note and which, if it is not immediately written down, I do not doubt will be subject to oblivion or to a not sufficiently faithful recitation, have undertaken, by adding the following points to what has gone before, to give occasion to those who come after to follow up immediately by writing in our fashion other things that will occur in their times.¹⁵

In his account of Henry VII's first Parliament, at which he himself served as a trier of petitions,¹⁶ Russell speaks with great disapproval of the attainders there enacted, though he admits that they were not so severe as those enacted under King Richard III or King Edward IV. He thereby shows that he considers Richard to have been a legitimate king, as he does in his further exclamatory question: 'O God, what security can our kings expect in the future against being deprived of the presence of their subjects on the day of battle, if these subjects know that when they are called by the king's dreadful summons and the king's side chances to fail, as often has been seen, they will lose life, fortunes, and their whole heredity?'"

Russell goes on to note that there were those in Parliament who thought that Henry's claiming of the throne not only by heredity but also by conquest would have been better left unsaid, especially since the marriage of Henry to Elizabeth was arranged in the same Parliament; for it appeared to everyone that whatever seemed lacking in Henry's title could be supplied in hers. Russell says that he may write more on this matter below ('sed de his fortassis inferius'),¹⁷ but he never returns to it.

It seems to me that the attitudes manifested towards both Richard III and Henry VII in these remarks are closer to what might be expected from someone with Russell's history of governmental service, rather than the extremes of enmity towards Richard and approval of Henry shown by the Second Anonymous. Even if one were to establish that Richard removed the great seal from Russell towards the end of his reign out of a suspicion that Russell favoured Henry, or were also to show that the suspicion was well founded, there is still the record of previous co-operation to be accounted for.¹⁸

There follows in the continuation Russell's report of the death of Cardinal Bouchier in Easter Week of 1486, and his recollection of Cardinal Beaufort's death in Easter Week of the same dominical letter thirty-nine years before. He ends his reminiscence with the words:

Qui enim haec scripsit, affuit, et haec omnia vidit et audivit, et scimus quod verum est testimonium eius.

(For he who wrote these things was present and saw and heard all these things, and we know that his witness is true.)

This is a paraphrase of John 21:24:

Hic est discipulus qui testimonium perhibet de his et scripsit haec, et scimus quia verum est testimonium eius.

(This is the disciple who bears witness to these things and who has written these things, and we know that his witness is true.)

The whole sentence, of course, was taken to have been written by the evangelist; therefore, Russell is speaking of himself.¹³⁹

It is this declaration of the author's having witnessed Beaufort's death at Winchester on 11 April 1447 that constitutes the strongest reason for identifying him as John Russell. Russell entered Winchester College in 1443 and no doubt stayed there until entering Oxford around August 1447. The only other of the above-discussed ecclesiastics who comes close to having been in Winchester at this time is Richard Lavender, who entered Winchester College in 1450.¹⁴⁰

Russell ends his continuation by returning to the deeds and fortunes of Henry VII. He tells of the King's passing from Lincoln to York and his near escape from assassination while he was worshipping on the feast of St. George (23 April). He concludes by noting the King's return in peace to the South.¹⁴¹

Let me refer here to an article dealing with the Third Anonymous by K. B. McFarlane, first published in 1948, which has been surprisingly neglected by historians. In it McFarlane expresses his own surprise that historians have neglected the Third Anonymous, with his 'refreshingly unorthodox' remarks on Henry VII's title and his discontent with the new King's parliamentary policy. My analysis coincides with McFarlane's in finding it more likely that the author was an outsider and not a monk of Croyland, and also in recognising that the author is referring to himself when he quotes John 21:24. He also notes that Russell had been a Winchester scholar in 1447 when Cardinal Beaufort died. But rather than guessing that Russell himself was the author, he suggests that the 'ageing chronicler' who wrote the account was a fellow-scholar who was with Russell at Winchester at the same time, and that it may have been his conversation with Russell at Croyland in April 1486 that recalled to him 'this impressive memory of his youth'.¹⁴²

8. The Concluding Chronicler and Marginal Annotator

There is no break in the printed text of the chronicle after the above-detailed material, except for the beginning of a new paragraph, but I suggest that from this point forward the history was continued by the monastic register-keeper, who was writing after Russell's departure in mid-May 1486: he is able to specify how long Russell and his entourage stayed at the abbey. This fourth and final continuation consists entirely of three sentences in which the author describes the legal arrangements made for the Brighthurst transfer, followed by the long act of impropriation, which, as noted above, breaks off before the end.¹⁴³ I suggest further that it was this monk who added the marginalia, including the notation 'Ille qui hanc historiam compilavit'. He, of course, would have known very well the identity of Lavender (or whoever it was who wrote the second continuation), since he would have collaborated with him in supplying documents and information about Croyland. The note would not have been there when Russell read the history, presumably, for if it were he would have been able to identify the author, the doctor in canon law who was sent to Burgundy in 1471.¹⁴⁴

9. Hypothetical Summary

Let me sum up my conclusions and hypotheses by outlining one possible set of particulars derivable from them.

I suggest that Dr. Richard Lavender, who as Bishop Russell's second-in-command was well-known to the monks of Croyland, was invited to stay at the abbey after he became Archdeacon of Leicester on 5 October 1485, and that he was there when the sweating sickness struck and took off the abbot, Lambert Fosdyke, on 14 October. While the deceased abbot's papers were being put in order and preparation made for the election of his successor, the prior of the house, Edmund Thorp, showed Lavender the Ingulf-Blois chronicle and the continuation that a previous prior had brought up to 1470. Explaining that none of the successors of this *chronographicus prior*, including himself, had been able to fulfill their obligation to carry on the narrative, Thorp commissioned Lavender to do the job, and promised him access to all of the pertinent monastic records. Lavender worked on the project for a month or so, both at Lincoln or Stamford and at Croyland, and by the time he finished Thorp had been elected abbot and had appointed another monk as prior and keeper of the monastic records. In the following year, when Bishop Russell and his *familia* went to Croyland in mid-April, Lavender stayed behind as official and commissary-general. But towards the end of the month he came to the monastery himself to report to the Bishop. While the Bishop and Abbot Thorp were taken up with the Bringhurst affair in the court convened for the purpose, Lavender decided, at the suggestion of the current prior, Thorp's successor, to add an account to his history, summing up Thorp's outstanding management of his office thus far, and he decided as well to add a recital of notable secular events of the past six months, as a prelude to his verses.

A week or so later, Abbot Thorp showed the compilation to Bishop Russell, with or without the knowledge and consent of Lavender but with due regard for his wish for anonymity. Russell, impressed by what he read, and wishing to encourage the continuation of the chronicle, added a few more details (to constitute the beginning of the third anonymous continuation). After the Bishop and his train departed from Croyland, the prior followed up on Lavender's suggestion that 'someone else' complete the account of the transaction between Croyland and Peterborough. He told of the Bishop's visit and the judicial proceedings effecting the transfer of Bringhurst, as an introduction to the official act of impropriation. He also summarized the earlier portions of the chronicle by means of marginal notations, and included a cryptic identification of the second anonymous continuator — which Russell would not have been likely to see on a subsequent visit, even if he looked at the chronicle again, say with a view to carrying out his idea of 'perhaps writing more' on the subject of Henry VII's claim to the throne. The prior did not identify Russell as the third anonymous continuator, whether at the Bishop's request or at his own discretion, perhaps to save Russell any embarrassment that might arise from his censure of the actions of Henry VII's first Parliament.

Many of the details of this 'trial scenario' could, of course, be altered while preserving the general sequence of events. But as it stands it will serve to illustrate that we are faced with more than a few simple alternatives when trying to decide how the Croyland chronicle was put together.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

Briefer versions of this paper were read for the Richard III Society in Los Angeles on 2 October 1983 and for the Medieval Association of the Pacific in Seattle on 17 February 1984.

1. All of the components of the chronicle were edited by William Fulman in *Rerum angliearum scriptores veteres*, vol. 1 (Oxford 1684): *Historia Ingulphi*, pp.1-107; *Petri Blesensis Continuatio*, pp.108-132; *Historiae Croylandensis Continuatio*, pp.451-546; *Alia Historiae Croylandensis Continuatio*, pp.549-578; and *Alia eiusdem Historiae Croylandensis Continuatio*, pp.581-593. A translation was made by Henry T. Riley, *Ingulph's Chronicle of the Abbey of Croyland with the Continuations by Peter of Blois and Anonymous Writers* (London 1854). In the past, I have followed Riley in counting the Peter of Blois section as the first continuation, the first anonymous as the second, and so on. But in this paper, to conform with most other recent historians, I will speak only of the first, second, and third anonymous continuations. An edition of the second and third anonymous continuations is being prepared by Nicholas Pronay for publication by the Richard III Society in 1986. For attempts at dating the original pseudepigraphous fabrications, see Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writings in England*, vol. 2 (London 1982), pp.490-491. I am grateful to Dr. Gransden for her generous response to my inquiries.
2. The main part of the second continuation is on pp.549-576 of Fulman's edition, and the supplement on pp.576-578. Fulman's text was apparently based on the fifteenth-century B. L. Cotton MS Otho B.xiii (only the portion corresponding to Fulman's pp.549-554, covering the years 1459-70, of the second anonymous continuation escaped the 1731 fire) by way of a seventeenth-century transcript, Oxford Corpus Christi College MS B 208 (the portion corresponding to the second anonymous continuation is on fos. 228-246v.). See J. G. Edwards, 'The "Second" Continuation of the Crowland Chronicle: Was It Written "In Ten Days"?' *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, vol. 39 (1966), pp.117-129, esp. p.117 n. 1. See also Alison Hanham, *Richard III and His Early Historians, 1483-1535* (Oxford 1975), pp.98-100.
3. Fulman, p.582 (Riley, p.514).
4. Register of John Russell, Bishop of Lincoln (1480-1494): Lincolnshire Archives Office, Episcopal Register 22 (=RR); I have consulted a microfilm copy. The passage in question is on fo. 78v: 'Memorandum quod Anno domini millesimo Quadringentesimo octuagesimo sexto, Indiccione quarta, pontificatus sanctissimi in Christo patris et domini nostri, domini Innocencij diuina providencia pape octauj Anno secundo, mensis vero Aprilis die xiiij', Reuerendus in Christo pater et dominus, dominus Johannes permissione diuina Lincoln. episcopus, venit ad Monasterium Croyland. habens vt mente vt asseruit ibidem perhendinare cum paucis de familia sua per spacium vnus mensis vel circiter.' Edwards, who did not personally inspect the Register, is mistaken in giving the date as '16 April' (p.123). There is no possibility that the number *xiiij* could be construed as *xij* or *xviij*: though *v* sometimes appears as *u* (consisting of two minims) in the Register, it does so only in words, not in numbers.
5. P. M. Kendall, *Richard III* (London 1955, repr. 1956), p.432 (p.512 in the Norton Library edition, N785, New York, n.d.; this edition was issued in 1975, according to *Books in Print, 1983-84*; it has a revised text, but there is no introductory reference to the revisions (which are mainly of format and style), and we are left to wonder whether they were authorized by Kendall before his death in 1973. I will refer to this edition as 'ed. 2). The article on the subject that he wrote with J. G. Edwards and George Lam, 'Bishop Russell and the *Croyland Chronicle*,' which he announces on p.499 (ed. 2, p.578), n. 9, as shortly to appear in the *English Historical Review*, never did appear, and it is clear from Edwards's 1966 article (n. 2 above) that Edwards, at least, withdrew his support for the interpretation.
6. H. A. Kelly, Canonical Implications of Richard III's Plan to Marry His Niece, *Traditio*, vol. 23 (1967), pp.269-311, esp. pp.272-273; *Divine Providence in the England of Shakespeare's Histories* (Cambridge, Mass. 1970), p.59; English Kings and the Fear of Sorcery, *Mediaeval Studies*, vol. 39 (1977), pp.206-238, esp. p.231.
7. I suggested this in 'Canonical Implications', p.306.
8. 'These things were done and finished at Croyland, A.D. 1486, during the space of ten days, of which the last was the final day of April of the same year' (Fulman, p.578).
9. Edwards, pp.118, 122-124.
10. RR, fos. 78v-83.

11. Examples of the typical use of the phrase (referring to actions) appear on pp.554 and 556: 'Haec acta sunt circa festum Michaelis' ('These things occurred around the feast of St. Michael') and 'Acta sunt haec omnia mense Maii paulo ante festum Ascensionis dominicae' ('All of these things happened in the month of May a little before the feast of the Lord's Ascension'). A typical conclusion to formal documents found in the Rochester Register is the following on fo. 101v: 'Data et acta fuerunt haec omnia et singula prout suprascribuntur et recitantur' ('Each and all of these things were given and done as written and recited above'), followed by reference to the date (15 September 1488). Russell himself at the end of the document he sealed on 24 September 1481, referred to in n. 73 below, uses the words: 'Data et acta fuerunt haec omnia et singula sic vt premititur per nos Episcopum antedictum in hac parte habita et gesta' ('Each and all of these things had and done in this matter as stated above were given and done by us the said bishop'), followed by place and date. In this case, the actions consisted mainly of his receiving and approving the certificatory letter sent him by his chancellor, Richard Lavender, in a matter in which Lavender had been deputised to act as judge for Russell.
12. An article with this thesis has been expected for the last decade from M. M. Condon (see Charles Ross, *Edward IV*, Berkeley 1974, p.430), or from Condon in conjunction with Charles Ross (see B. P. Wolfe, Hastings Reinterred, *English Historical Review*, vol. 91 (1976), pp.813-824, esp. p.818 n. 1; Charles Ross, *Richard III*, Berkeley 1981, pp.xliii-xliv); it was to be based on the point that Russell elsewhere uses the phrase 'acta sunt haec et expleta', and also on the fact that he was at the right place at the right time. My inquiries to the authors (sent in July and November of 1983) have gone unanswered, and I assume that their plans for publication have gone awry. Ross, it should be noted is mistaken in saying that Russell and his train were at Croyland 'in the course of an episcopal visitation' (*Richard III*, p.xliv n. 74), since we are told that the bishop was paying (*satisfaciens*) for his keep, rather than being put up at the abbey's expense or receiving visitation procurations from the abbey. The Abbot of Croyland did, however, pay all of the legal expenses of the property transfer that the Bishop adjudicated during his stay (Fulman, p.582). A formal visitation was a comparatively brief affair, and there would surely have been some reference to the required procedures, if it had taken place during Russell's month-long stay. See A. Hamilton Thompson, *Visitations of Religious Houses in the Diocese of Lincoln*, 3 vols., Publications of the Lincoln Record Society 7, 14, 21 (Horncastle 1914-29), vol. 1, pp.ix-xi, for the formalities of visitations, and vol. 2, pp.54-60 for Bishop Alnwick's visitation of Croyland, 18-19 June 1440.
13. Russell seems to have been able to write at a fairly rapid rate when he was simply copying material, even when tired and ill but not otherwise occupied, to judge from MS 156 of University College, Oxford, which contains eighty-three folio-sized leaves. He says at the end that he compiled the work at Woburn Manor, Bedfordshire, in eight weeks, ending on the feast of the Epiphany, 1491, according to the computation of the English Church (which would, of course, be 1492 by the Roman method): 'Prosequatur residuum qui voluerit[;] satis nobis sit hos octo quaternos ex multis congestis auctoritatibus in hoc compendium adduxisse in octo septimanis[;] plura executuris si opportunitas et valetudo correspondissent. Jo. Lincoln. manu propria, dat. Woborne' ('Let whoever will complete the rest; for us, let it suffice to have brought together these eight quires from many collected authorities into this compendium in eight weeks. We would have done more if opportunity and health had permitted. John of Lincoln, by his own hand, given at Woburn'), and so on, as in the preface (the text of which I give below, n. 134). See Henry Octavius Coxe, *Catalogus codicum MSS Collegii Universitatis* p.43, in *Catalogus codicum MSS qui in collegiis aulisque oxoniensibus hodie adservantur* (Oxford 1852), Part I. See A. B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500*, 3 vols. with continuous pagination (Oxford 1957-59), p.1610, who identifies the book as New College MS 156.
14. I made such a suggestion in 'English Kings', p.231 n. 99.
15. Fulman, p.557. The note was probably in the fifteenth-century Cotton MS. since the marginalia of the surviving portion correspond to those of Fulman's text (Edwards, p.127 n. 1).
16. Edwards, pp.126-129.
17. Hanham (n. 2 above), pp.86-87, follows Kendall in thinking that the sidenote was by the author (most likely Russell) of the original account, before it was modified by a monk of Croyland to include Croyland history; and she thinks that the same monk wrote the final continuation, which should not be distinguished from the penultimate (see below at n. 91). She also suggests (p.87 n. 1) that the sidenote was originally part of the main text; this may be so, but her further suggestion that it was in the first

- person ('ego qui hanc historiam compilavi') is untenable, because the narrative is in the third person, and a first-person intrusion would be ungrammatical; it would also be unnecessary, since authors then as now regularly speak of themselves occasionally in the third person ('according to the present writer', etc.).
18. Emden, *Oxford* (n. 13 above), pp.1609-1610.
 19. Cora L. Scofield, *The Life and Reign of Edward IV*, 2 vols. (London 1923), vol. 2, p.16 nn. 1-2. Gransden (n. 1 above), p.271 n. 148, is mistaken to interpret the roll as restricted to Easter Sunday, 14 April 1471 (the day of the battle of Barnet). Edward first sent news of the Tewkesbury victory to Burgundy in a letter dated 28 May; see Richard Firth Green, *The Short Version of The Arrival of Edward IV, Speculum*, vol. 36 (1981), pp.324-336, esp. p.334. Thereupon, according to the Second Anonymous, Burgundy sent delegates to Edward, and it was only after this that Edward sent the canonist (Fulman, pp.556-557).
 20. Through the good offices of my colleague Professor Paul Sellin, I have been advised by Professors W. Schrickx and W. Prevenier that pertinent materials are preserved in the Archives Departementales de Lille (Rue St. Bernard): Arch. du Nord, Lille, B 1 to 1560 (correspondence by embassies); B 1878 to 2143 (accounts); B 17599 to 17726 (more correspondence). More information can be found in the General Archives of Brussels, *Acquits de Lille 977*, etc. For a survey of all Burgundian archive materials, see Robert-Henri Bautier et al., *Les sources de l'histoire économique et sociale du moyen âge*, series 2: *Les Etats de la maison de Bourgogne*. Only vol. 1 part 2, *Les principautés du Nord*, has thus far been published (Paris 1984).
 21. Gransden, p.267, notes that though the author was one of Edward IV's councillors, he was not of the King's inner council, for he confesses ignorance of how peace negotiations were started in 1475. But the expression used, 'nescio quomodo,' is often meant to convey insignificance rather than ignorance. For what seems to be a genuine expression of ignorance, see below at n. 34.
 22. See below at nn. 29 and 106. On Richard's 'dismissal' of Russell as chancellor, see below at n. 138.
 23. See Rosemary Horrox, Richard III and London, *The Ricardian*, vol. 6 no. 85 (June 1984), pp.322-329, esp. pp.325-326 and n. 11, drawing on John Stow's *Annals*. Richard's letter is given in Hanham, p.49; she makes the unlikely suggestion that the warrant deals with persons caught before they could put their enterprise into action, and so must refer to something like the plan to take Edward IV's daughters out of sanctuary. In the passage, 'Certain persons of such as of late had taken upon them the fact of an enterprise . . . be attached and in ward', Hanham reads 'had taken' to mean 'would have attempted [had they not been detected]'. It seems to me more likely that the verb is pluperfect and that the sentence means: 'Some of those who had undertaken to perform an enterprise [were detected and] are attached and in ward'.
 24. Fulman, pp.567-568.
 25. Kendall, pp.286-287 (ed. 2, pp.344-345). The Croyland chronicler does not mention Nesfield in this connection when telling of the release of the princesses (Fulman, p.570), but he does say that he was one of the fierce captains captured at sea by the French at the beginning of Richard's second year (end of July 1484) (Fulman, p.571).
 26. Fulman, p.568. For a judicious survey of the theories that have been put forward about the fate of the Princes, see Helen Maurer, Whodunit: The Suspects in the Case, *Ricardian Register*, vol. 18, no. 3 (Summer 1983) pp.4-27. I wish to thank Mrs. Maurer for reading the present essay and giving me many valuable suggestions.
 27. Ross, *Richard III*, p.100. See below at n. 36.
 28. Fulman, pp.566-567.
 29. Fulman, pp.566-567; see Mortimer Levine, Richard III — Usurper or Lawful King? *Speculum*, vol. 34 (1959), pp.391-401, esp. pp.392-393 n. 8. See n. 106 below.
 30. Fulman, p.570: 'Cuius tamen quamvis diffinitionem, cum de viribus matrimonii disputatur, curia illa laicalis facere non potuit, et tamen propter ingentem in constantissimos cadentem metum, facere praesumpsit, et fecit'. Earlier on, he noted improper judicial procedure in the trial of Clarence: certain persons were introduced without its being made clear whether they were accusers or witnesses, both of which functions cannot be performed by the same individual ('Introducta autem erant nonnulli de quibus a multis valde dubitabatur an accusatorum an testium officiis functi sunt; utraque enim officia simul in eadem causa eisdem personis non congruunt', p.562). The word *accusatorum* is the genitive plural of

- both *accusor* and *accusatus* but presumably it is the former that is meant. See M. A. Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence: George, Duke of Clarence, 1449-78* (Gloucester 1980), p.167.
31. See *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, 6 vols. (London 1767-77), vol. 6, pp.237-238. For portions of the complete text of the speech, see John Gough Nichols, *Grants, Etc. from the Crown during the Reign of Edward V... and Two Speeches for Opening Parliament by John Russell, Bishop of Lincoln, Lord Chancellor*, Camden Society original series, No. 60 (London 1854), pp.lviii-lixiii.
 32. See Kelly, *English Kings*, p.233.
 33. See Kelly, *English Kings*, pp.219-229, for the trial of Eleanor Cobham; see also Ralph A. Griffiths, *The Trial of Eleanor Cobham: An Episode in the Fall of Duke Humphrey of Gloucester*, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, vol. 51 (1968-69), pp.381-399. For Henry VIII, see H. A. Kelly, *The Matrimonial Trials of Henry VIII* (Stanford 1976), pp.241-242. Ross, *Richard III*, pp.90-91, gives a faulty analysis of the *Titulus Regius* (or, as he calls it, *Titulus Regis*). He indicates that Parliament alleged that the marriage was invalid because: 1) it was made a) without the lords' assent, and b) through witchcraft; 2) it was entered into secretly; and 3) Edward was already married. It is wrong to suppose that Parliament alleged each of these points (four in all) as reasons for declaring the marriage null and void. There were in fact only two reasons for invalidity put forth: 1) witchcraft (forced consent), and 2) previous marriage. The other factors were listed as circumstances, not causes, of the invalid union — though the clandestinity of the marriage had an important bearing on the real question, namely, the illegitimacy of Edward's children. See R. H. Helmholz, 'The Sons of Edward IV: A Canonical Assessment of the Claim That They Were Illegitimate', to be published among the papers of the Richard III Society 1984 Symposium. (Helmholz, by the way, does not mention the witchcraft allegation.) Furthermore, Ross, following Levine (n. 29 above), pp.391-392, is mistaken to attack the parliamentary case on the grounds that 'if a precontract existed, making the marriage of 1464 invalid, there was nothing to prevent Edward and Elizabeth going through another ceremony of marriage after the death of Eleanor Butler in 1468'. The point is that no such remarriage did take place. On the questions of later validation and legitimation, see my 'Canonical Implications', pp.282-283, and especially Helmholz; see also n. 43 below.
 34. Fulman, pp.570-571.
 35. See Kendall, pp.285-289 (ed. 2, pp.343-348).
 36. Fulman, p.572: 'Sint et alia multa quae non sunt scripta in libro hoc, quaeque loqui piget, tametsi id tacendum non sit, quod . . .'
 37. Ross, *Richard III*, p.xlvi.
 38. *Ibid.*, p.90.
 39. George Buck, *The History of King Richard III* (1619), ed. Arthur Noel Kincaid (Gloucester 1979), pp.190-191; see Kincaid's remarks, pp.xo-xciv, cxiv, 308.
 40. Polydore Vergil, *Anglica historia*. Vatican Codex Urbinae latinus 498 (=OPV), fo. 228v: 'Ricardus coniugali vinculo per hanc modum solutus, tentare coepit nuptias neptis: sed quia tantum nefas [caredet: puella reclamante] omnes abhorrebant: statuit nihil praemature super re agere: cum praesertim curis undique urgentibus premeretur' ('Richard, freed of the marital bond in this way, began an attempt to marry his niece. But because such a great crime [against which the girl protested] was abhorred by all, he decided to do nothing about the matter prematurely, especially since he was hard pressed on all sides by urgent concerns'). The printed versions are similar (with the added phrase retained). See the first edition (Basel 1534) (=IPV), p.550, and the early English translation of the second edition of Basel 1546, *Three Books of Polydore Vergil's English History, Comprising the Reigns of Henry VI, Edward IV, and Richard III*, ed. Henry Ellis, Camden Society (London 1844) (=2PVt.), p.212.
 41. I detail some of these instances in *Divine Providence* (n. 6 above), p.90 and passim; see also 'English Kings', p.230. Hanham (n. 2 above), pp.135-151, suggests other instances of Croyland influence, but she was not aware of my findings and she did not make use of Vergil's manuscript. If I am right in thinking that Croyland influence can be found only in material that was not contained in the original form of Vergil's manuscript, then many of the similarities she notes must be the result of coincidence or of derivation from similar sources (or the same events). Such is the case with Buckingham's invitation to Henry Richmond (Hanham, p.135), and Vergil's mix-up of the times of Buckingham's revolt and Richard's Parliament (Hanham, pp.141-142), all of which is in the original text of the manuscript (OPV, fos. 221v-222). Of the material she gathers on pp.148-149 on Richard's takeover, the only points that Vergil added later to his manuscript concern Shaw's sermon and Buckingham's speech (OPV, fo. 219v),

- and the second reference to the execution of Rivers (OPV, fo. 220v). One other instance not noted earlier by me where there does seem to be Croyland influence is the matter of Edward IV's 'almost miraculous escape' from Middleham (Hanham, p.138), which Vergil reacts to in a marginal note in OPV, fo. 194.
42. Kelly, *Matrimonial Trials* (n. 33 above), p.202. Denys Hay, *Polydore Vergil* (Oxford 1952), p.19, does not notice Vergil's participation in this Convocation, and says nothing of his canonistic background. He says that he has failed to find any positive evidence that Vergil studied at Bologna as well as at Padua (pp.1-2).
 43. When Ross, *Richard III*, p. xxxiii n. 40, says, 'The reference by Hall to "unnatural copulation" rests upon the then widely-held but mistaken belief that the marriage of uncle and niece was contrary to the laws of the church', it is he who is mistaken. Uncle-niece marriage was unquestionably against church law in Richard's time, and obviously against the law of the English Church when Hall was writing. The question in Richard's time was whether it was against divine law, and, if so, whether the Pope could legitimately dispense from the divine law. On the question of Richard's marriage to Anne, I should note that the accounts given by me, 'Canonical Implications,' pp.271-272 n. 11, and by Ross, *Richard III*, p.28 and n. 21, are somewhat misleading. According to the parliamentary act of 1474, if Richard and Anne should be divorced (that is, if the ecclesiastical authorities should declare their marriage invalid), but then remarry each other lawfully, the divorce will be regarded as not having taken place. However, if there should be such a divorce and a valid remarriage be not possible in spite of Richard's best and continual efforts, he may continue to enjoy Anne's patrimony for the rest of his life, provided that he does not marry any other woman before Anne's death (*Rotuli Parliamentorum*, vol. 6 pp.100-101). Since Richard believed (according to the Croyland author) that he had grounds for annulling his marriage to Anne, he need not have waited until her death to marry, or attempt to marry, Elizabeth. When an impeded marriage was brought to light, it seems to have been canonical policy to declare the marriage invalid and to require a new marriage, if the partners wished to remain married, even when a dispensation was immediately forthcoming. This was what happened in the case of Edward Prince of Wales and Joan of Kent in the previous century. See Karl P. Wattersdorf, *The Clandestine Marriages of the Fair Maid of Kent*, *Journal of Medieval History*, vol. 5, (1979), pp.203-231. They were also excommunicated, not because they married clandestinely, as Wattersdorf thinks (p.218), but because they knowingly contracted marriage in spite of the impediments of consanguinity and spiritual kinship that existed between them. (I also note that Joan's first public marriage, to William Montague, would only have had the force of betrothals until Montague reached the canonical age of fourteen; see Kelly, *Matrimonial Trials*, pp.104-105.) Later cases are cited by Joel T. Rosenthal, *Aristocratic Marriage and the English Peerage, 1350-1500: Social Institution and Personal Bond*, *ibid.*, vol. 10 (1984), pp.181-194, but with much more serious inaccuracies.
 44. See Kelly, 'Canonical Implications', p.273, for works on canon law that have been attributed to Russell.
 45. Fulman, p.572: 'Putabatur a multis ideo hos homines cum aliis sibi similibus tantos obices concisicis ob metum quod, si dicta Elizabeth ad statum reginalis dignitatis accederet, posset aliquando esse in eius potestate mortem avunculi sui comitis Antonii fratrisque Richardi in praecipuos hos eius rei consultores ulisci'. The text of the entire episode is reproduced in my 'Canonical Implications,' pp.310-311.
 46. Kendall, p.408 (ed. 2, p.483), makes a similar argument.
 47. Fulman, pp.575-576.
 48. *The History of the Life and Reigne of Richard the Third*, London 1646: facsimile of the 1647 reprint, with introduction by A. R. Myers (London 1973), p.150; also given by Kincaid (n. 39 above), p.218. On p.318, Kincaid says that there are very few differences between this version and that of Croyland, and he notes only that for *Ille truceam* the Buck text has *Mundanam*. He does not, in other words, notice the differences I cite in the text above. Another difference that should be mentioned is in the last line: for *refulget in ore* ('shines on [our] face') Buck's version has *refloret in orbe* ('blooms again in the world').
 49. Emden, *Oxford* (n. 13 above), p.991.
 50. Fulman, pp.583, 586, 587.
 51. RR, fo. 55. There is a contradiction in the date, given as 12 September 1480, but in the second year of Russell's translation, which would be 1481.
 52. Colin Morris, *A Consistory Court in the Middle Ages*, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 14 (1963), pp.150-159, esp. p.155 n. 1. See also 'The Commissary of the Bishop in the Diocese of Lincoln', *ibid.* vol. 10 (1959), pp.50-65. I wish to thank Professor Morris for his helpful response to my inquiries.
 53. Thomas Rymer, *Foedera* (ed. 2), vol. 12, p.194. Polydore Vergil, in a passage not in his original

- manuscript or in his first edition, speaks of this mission and describes Hutton as 'a man of pregnant wit' (2Pvt, p.191).
54. Rymer, *Foedera*, vol. 12, p.261: 'Maistre Thomas Hutton, docteur es loix, chanoine de Lincoln', 'Thomas Hutton, legum doctor, canonicus lincolniensis'.
 55. A. F. Pollard, Fifteenth-Century Clerks of Parliament, *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, vol. 15 (1937-38), pp.137-161, esp. p.155-156.
 56. James Gairdner, *Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Reigns of Richard III and Henry VII*, 2 vols., Rolls Series, vol. 24 (London 1861-63), vol. 1, pp.63-64; Rymer, *Foedera*, vol. 12, pp.235-243 (20 Sept.), pp.244-246 (21 Sept.).
 57. Rymer, *Foedera*, vol. 12, pp.269-270.
 58. Fulman, p.571.
 59. Hutton appears in no governmental role for more than a decade after the accession of Henry VII:
 60. See Grandsen (n. 1 above), pp.265-274, esp. p.270, drawing on Pronay's introduction to his forthcoming edition.
 61. Emden, *Oxford*, pp.1678-1680. Nicholas Pronay, The Chancellor, the Chancery, and the Council at the End of the Fifteenth Century, in *British Government and Administration: Studies Presented to S. B. Chrimes*, ed. H. Hearder and H. R. Loyn (Cardiff 1974), pp.87-103, is specific about the degrees of most of the lawyers he treats, but not about that of 'Dr. Henry Sharp' (p.91). He identifies the Second Croyland Anonymous as 'a Doctor of Law, a Chancery man, an ambassador and councillor of Edward IV', and speaks of 'his fellow civilians' (p.102), which would indicate that he thinks of the author as a doctor in civil law.
 62. Emden, *Oxford*, pp.480-481. Emden also lists Cooke as being archdeacon of Chichester in 1481 and remaining so until death, but this is probably a mistake. He left nothing to that archdeaconry in his will, whereas he willed 200 chalices to churches in the archdeaconry of Lincoln, and also gave six copes to the Lincoln Cathedral. According to J. R. Lander, *Crown and Nobility 1450-1509* (London 1976), p.316 n. 21 (he does not give a reference), Cooke became archdeacon of Chichester only in 1494, the year of his death.
 63. Thompson (n. 12 above), vol. 1, p.153.
 64. Emden, *loc. cit.*, citing Rymer, *Foedera*, vol. 12, p.231. Emden is mistaken in saying that he served similarly under Henry VII in 1487.
 65. Emden, *loc. cit.*
 66. A. B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Cambridge to 1500* (Cambridge 1963), pp.343-344. King's arrest was reported by Simon Stallworth (see n. 108 below).
 67. Emden, *Cambridge*, pp.81-82.
 68. For Fitzhugh, see John Le Neve, *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, continued by T. Duffus Hardy, 3 vols. (Oxford 1854), vol. 2, p.33. He assumed office by proxy on 30 October 1483 and was installed in person on 3 May 1486 (therefore, while Russell and his entourage were still at Croyland).
 69. Emden, *Oxford*, p.1196. He was dead by May 1488.
 70. Fulman, pp.585-586.
 71. Emden, *Cambridge*, pp.521-522.
 72. Emden, *Oxford*, p.1109.
 73. RR, fos. 60v-68v. Lavender was appointed commissary on 22 July 1481 (61r-v) and delivered sentence on 10 August (61v-62), which was confirmed by the bishop on 24 September (68v). For the wording of Russell's 'date', see n. 11 above.
 74. Hugh Tipton was capitular chancellor from 1451 until his death on 15 July 1481 (Emden, *Cambridge*, p.576); he was succeeded on 29 July 1481 by Martin Joyner (RR, fo. 274v.), who held office until his death on 29 July 1485 (Emden, *Oxford*, p.1024); Joyner was succeeded by Geoffrey Simeon on 11 August 1485 (RR, fo. 276v.), who held the post until 1506 (Emden, *Cambridge*, p.528).
 75. RR, fo. 75v.
 76. RR, fo. 11r-v.
 77. RR, fo. 75. The bull is dated 3 July according to the *Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers Relative to Great Britain and Ireland: Papal Letters*, vol. 13, parts 1-2 (1471-1484), ed. J. A. Twemlow (London 1955), p.139.
 78. Fulman, p.587. Here and on p.585 his name is mistakenly transcribed as Langueder, but more correctly

- as Lavynder on p.595. As Archdeacon of Leicester, he would have been judge of the archidiaconal court, and as official of Lincoln judge of the 'rival' consistory court. But Morris, 'Consistory' (n. 52 above), p.156, notes that most of the consistory cases came from Lincolnshire, and he suggests that the archdeacons' courts in other parts of the diocese handled all of the routine cases. Lavender's archidiaconal court was no doubt presided over by his own official. Appeal from the archdeacon's court was probably not to the bishop's consistory but to the bishop's court of audience, as in the diocese of Salisbury: see Dorothy M. Owen, *An Episcopal Audience Court, in Legal Records and the Historian*, ed. J H. Baker (London 1978), pp.140-149, esp. p.142. In Lincoln, the court of audience was presided over by the bishop or his commissary-general, an office that Lavender probably filled as well: see above at n. 52. On 22 September 1486, Russell appointed Martin Colyns, Doctor of Decrees, to proceed in the absence of the official of the bishop's consistory in all instance causes and cases and to terminate them. He names Colyns president of the consistory in the absence of the official and also names him his commissary-general in the consistory (RR, fo. 85; Emden, *Cambridge*, p.152, wrongly gives the month as December). See below at n. 90.
79. Emden, *Oxford*, p.1109.
80. *Ibid.*
81. Kelly, 'Canonical Implications', pp.295-296.
82. Morris, 'Consistory', pp.155-156.
83. RR, fos. 203v (12 March), 126v (14 March), 162v (5-6 April).
84. *Ibid.*, fos. 128v and 162v (25 January), 204v (24 March), 130 (6 August).
85. For documentation of all Register entries between March 1483 and September 1486, see the Appendix below.
86. RR, fos. 141, 165.
87. *Calendar of Papal Registers, Papal Letters*, vol. 14 (1484-1492), ed. Twemlow (1960), p.127. The Pope recounts Russell's recent petition in which he said that 'he is so infirm of body that he cannot continue to exercise the rule and administration of the church of Lincoln, and for this and other causes he proposes to resign'.
88. RR, fos. 180v-181.
89. RR, fo. 183.
90. RR, fo. 85. See n. 78 above.
91. Hanham, pp.74-84. See n. 17 above.
92. Hanham, p.79. On p.84, she notes that the redactor uses the first-person singular at the beginning of the third continuation.
93. Fulman, p.561: 'animose, ne temerarie dicam'. Cf. p.563: 'parva haec nescio an verius dicam acquisitio seu perditio'.
94. Fulman, p.560: 'illud servitium, ne homagium dicam'; p.569: 'vicini, ne inimicos appellem'.
95. When speaking of the prior's description of Edward's coronation ('modis quibus memoratus chronographus supra descripserat'), he says, 'I pass over this lightly' ('transeo hoc leviter', Fulman, p.550); see also 'Venio ad sextum ipsius regis annum' and 'Hanc ego reputo veriozem causam' (p.551).
96. Fulman, p.560: 'ut praemisimus' (referring to Edward IV's accumulation of riches); p.567: 'ut supra retulimus' (referring to Richard III's spending of Edward's treasure).
97. Fulman, p.561: 'scribens . . . divertens' (there is no finite verb).
98. *Ibid.*: 'reducentes . . . subiciamus'. On p.570, he uses the plural to revert from monastic to secular history ('redeamus') and passes to the singular ('pertranseo').
99. Fulman, p.552: 'Libet . . . explanare' (discussion of calendrical practices); p.557: 'Libet inserere' (quarrel of Gloucester and Clarence over Warwick's estate); p.560: 'Libet . . . referre' (works of Abbot Wysbech).
100. Fulman, p.554 (referring to supporters of Henry VI's restoration); p.558 (French negotiations); p.569 (quarrel between Croyland and Peterborough); p.571 (grief of Richard III and Anne over the death of their son). Cf. the use of *videres*, p.556 (repulsion of attack on London), p.561 (strife between Edward and Clarence), p.563 (the splendour of Edward's court).
101. Fulman, pp.552-553; 561.
102. I will deal with 'The Croyland Chronicle Tragedy' in a later article in *The Ricardian*.
103. Edwards (n. 2 above), pp.118-119.
104. Fulman, pp.552-553 (death of Abbot Littleton and election of Abbot Wysbech, 1470); pp.560-561 (death of Wysbech, election of Richard Croyland, 1476); pp.568-570 (death of Croyland, election of Abbot Fosdyke, 1483-1484); pp.576-577 (death of Fosdyke, election and deeds of Abbot Thorp, 1485-1486). The last-named section is discussed below at n. 119.

105. Emden, *Cambridge*, pp.239-240, citing RR, fo. 21v; see below at n. 111.
106. He makes a rather disparaging remark about Robert Stillington, Bishop of Bath, when he served as chancellor at the beginning of Edward IV's Parliament (Fulman, p.557), but does not mention anything about his doings in the time of Richard III. See above at n. 29.
107. Fulman, p.566.
108. See Simon Stallworth's letter of 21 June 1483, ed. C. L. Kingsford, *The Stonor Letters and Papers*, Camden Society 3rd Series, nos. 29-30 (London 1919) vol. 2, pp.160-161. Cf. Hanham, pp.42, 94. On Hanham's attempt to redate Hastings's death, see the works cited by Ross, *Richard III*, p.84 n. 62. For a chronology of events from 9 April to 13 July 1483, see Anne F. Sutton and P. W. Hammond, *The Coronation of Richard III: The Extant Documents* (Gloucester 1983), pp.13-46; on Stallworth's letter, see p.23.
109. Fulman, p.568.
110. Fulman, p.574. See Emden, *Oxford*, pp.499-500.
111. Fulman, p.574 (with corrigendum from p.599).
112. Emden, *Cambridge*, p.606.
113. *Ibid.*, p.240.
114. See Ross, *Richard III*, p.172.
115. Emden, *Oxford*, pp.1320-1321.
116. Fulman, p.570: 'Is bonus pater eadem asperitudine tactus, non excessit octodecim horas quod non reddiderat Creatori spiritum suum, decimo quarto die Novembris, anno Domini millesimo quadringentesimo octogesimo quinto, parum post finitum regnum regis Richardi, quo cum reliqua describentes pervenerimus, universae huius a nobis promissae historiae seriem concludemus'.
117. Fulman, p. 575: 'Et ita finit historia quam usque ad exitum dicti regis Richardi... declarare promissimus'.
118. Hanham, p.81, says that the poet himself was apparently called Richard. She gives no reason for thinking so, but Richard Lavender would of course fill the bill. The author's introductory statement, in which he notes the similarity between the usurper (*intruder*) King Harold and Richard III, both of whom were defeated and killed by opponents coming from Normandy, should make us expect that this matter would be treated in the verses as well as the similar fates of the three Richards. I should note that Riley's rendering of the phrase 'per Willielmum Conquestorem venientem de Normannia, unde et isti homines advenerant' as 'by William the Conqueror, who came over from Normandy, and from whom these men are descended' (p.505), is mistaken; the last part should read, 'whence also these men had come', referring to the fact that Henry Richmond and his forces set sail from Harfleur in Normandy.
119. Fulman, p.576. Fulman indicates by ellipsis points that the day of the month of Thorp's election is missing. According to Emden, *Cambridge*, p.585, it is the ninth. This was the feast of St. Theodore Tiro, while the eleventh was the feast of St. Theodore the Studite.
120. Edwards, p.120.
121. Fulman, pp.577-578.
122. Emden, *Cambridge*, pp.585-586: He was given grace to proceed to the degree in 1482-83, and was admitted in 1484-85.
123. Emden, *Cambridge*, p.238.
124. Fulman, p.569.
125. See Edwards, p.122 n. 1.
126. Fulman, p.577: 'Tam caute tamque diligenter per medium amicorum prosecutus est, ut tandem ad propositi sui complementum pervenire meruerint. Impetravit enim literas patentes regis de huiusmodi licentia directas abbati et conventui de Burgo; de quibus et toto processu inde secuto scribetur fortasse per aliquem alium inferius latius loco suo'. Hanham, pp.81, 83, mistakes the future-tense *scribetur* for present-tense *scribitur*.
127. Fulman, p.588. L. Gaches, Bishop Piers and the Bakerian Lease, *Fenland Notes and Queries*, vol. 5 (1903), pp.49-52, esp. p.51 note, refers to the original letter 'in Pat. Rolls, pt. 3, m. 20 (8)'.
128. Fulman, pp.585-587.
129. Fulman, pp.587-588.
130. Gladys Temperley, *Henry VII* (Boston 1914 or London 1917), p.53.
131. Hanham, p.79, objects that there has been no such 'previously mentioned writer.' But apart from her

own suggestion that the note, 'Ille qui hanc historiam compilavit', was originally part of the text (see n. 17 above), one could argue, perhaps implausibly, that *prae-fatus* is used in its active deponent sense, meaning, 'who spoke previously'. More plausibly, one could hold that it refers to the author's characterisation of himself as *quidam meirista*. Or, finally, one could say that the author is simply referring to himself generally as the writer of the previously completed history.

132. Hanham, p.100; Edwards, pp.125-126.

133. Gransden, p.268.

134. Fulman, p.581: 'Quamvis ille quicumque sit immediate superioris descriptor historiae ibi operi suo finem imposuit ubi atque unde ulterius sibi progrediendum, ex causis per eum assignatis, non videbatur, ego tamen, qui nonnihil indies notatu dignum comperio, quodque si non statim literis mandetur aut oblivioni aut non satis fideli recitationi subiectum iri non dubito, ex continuatione sequentium ad praecedentia occasionem succedentibus dare institui, ut nostro more cetera quae suis temporibus evenient scriptis illico prosequantur'. Cf. Russell's call to anyone who wishes to add to the excerpts that he made from Thomas Walden's book on the sacraments in 1491-92 (n. 13 above). In the preface to that work, Russell moves from the singular to the plural, as does the writer of the above-quoted sentence (*ego, nostro*). The preface reads (Coxe, *loc. cit.*):

Ego Johannes Russell, episcopus Lincolnensis, fatigatus hoc anno 1491 Oxon. cum multis hereticis, postquam pervenit in manus meas liber fratris Thomae Waldensis, venerabilis doctoris, contra Wiclevistas, quorum insanissima dogmata multos nostre religionis Anglicane populares infecerunt, cogitavi aliqua excerptere ex eodem libro super sacramentalibus, in quae Lollardi ipsi maxime invehantur, unde successores nostri et sui assistentes consilarii in inquisitionibus hereticae pravitatis aliqua paratiora inveniant ad confusionem errantium, quam aut nos ante habebamus aut ipsi successores habuissent istis non habitis.

Remaneant igitur hi quaterni in registro episcopi Lincolnensis quicumque erit pro tempore.

Quicumque hunc titulum deleverit anathema sit.

Jo. Lincolnensis manu propria in festo Epiphaniae apud Woborn anno 1491 secundum computationem ecclesie Anglicane.

The case ending *-ae* as well as *-e* occurs in Coxe's transcription, but probably does not correspond to the original. I translate:

I, John Russell, Bishop of Lincoln, worn out this year of 1491 with many heretics at Oxford, after there came into my hands the book of the venerable doctor Friar Thomas Walden against the Wycliffites, whose wildly unsound dogmas have infected many of the common people of our English religion, thought to make some excerpts from it concerning sacramental matters, which these Lollards especially attack, so that our successors and their assistant councillors in heresy inquisitions may have more material available for the refutation of the erring than we ourselves have had or than our successors would have had without these excerpts.

Therefore, let these quires remain in the register of the bishop of Lincoln, whoever he happens to be, in the future.

John of Lincoln, in [his] own hand on the feast of the Epiphany at Woborn in the year 1491 according to the computation of the English Church.

Russell's desire to have Walden's excerpts placed in the episcopal register was not complied with even in the case of his own register.

135. C. L. Kingsford, *Dict. Nat. Biog.* s.v. Russell; *Rot. Parl.* vol. 6, p.268: 'L'Evesque de Nicoll'.

136. Riley's note on p.512, saying that the text seems corrupt, is uncalled for, except for Fulman's correction of *coepit* to *saepe*: 'O Deus, quam securitatem habituri sunt deinceps reges nostri, ut in die belli suorum subditorum praesentis non fraudentur, qui vocati ad terribile nimis regis mandatum, regia quidem parte, ut coepit [lege saepe] visum est, fortassis declinante, sese vita, fortunis, atque omni haereditate nudatos intelligent?' (p.581).

137. Fulman, p.581.

138. Richard gave the order on 24 July 1485, and Russell complied on 26 July (Rymer, *Foedera*, vol. 12, p.271). See the reasonable explanation given by Kendall, p.338 (ed. 2, pp.407-408).

139. Thus, the suggestion that there is reference here to an independent author (Hanham, p.85; Gransden, p.408 n. 126) is not apropos.

140. See Emden, *Oxford*, entries for Russell and Lavender; see also Thomas Frederick Kirby, *Winchester*

Scholars: A List of the Wardens, Fellows, and Scholars of Saint Mary College of Winchester, Commonly Called Winchester College (London 1888), pp.62, 67.

141. Fulman, p.582. Gransden, p.491, does not notice the Croyland report about Henry's escape on 23 April and says that Lovell's rebellion was suppressed by 22 April, citing Temperley (n. 130 above), pp.53-55, who seems to draw mainly on Polydore Vergil.
142. K. B. McFarlane, *At the Deathbed of Cardinal Beaufort, Studies in History presented to F. M. Powicke* (Oxford 1948), pp.405-428, reprinted in *England in the Fifteenth Century: Collected Essays* (London 1981), pp.115-137, esp. pp.118-120.
143. See above at n. 10.
144. It is barely possible, in my scheme of things, that Russell added the note himself, if in fact he was the envoy in question, but he could have done so only if he considered himself to be the final 'compiler' or editor of the Croyland Chronicle, that is the author of the latest continuation and the annotator of the earlier sections.

APPENDIX

Dates and Places in the Register of John Russell from March 1483 to September 1486

The main entries show where rectors and perpetual vicars were admitted into their parishes and chaplains into their chantries. Other activities are given in asterisked entries. The Register, which is cited in full in n. 4 above, is constructed as follows:

- I. Ordinations, fos. 1-54v
- II. Memoranda and Letters, 55-118v (index, 118v-119)
- III. Institutions and collations by archdeacons:
 1. Lincoln, 125-160v (index, 123v-124v)
 2. Stow, 162-168 (index, 161)
 3. Northampton, 171-201 (index, 169v-170v)
 4. Leicester, 203-218v (index, 201v-202)
 5. Oxford, 219-233v (index, 233v-234v)
 6. Buckingham, 235-249v (index, 250r-v)
 7. Huntingdon, 251-263v (index, 263v-264v)
 8. Bedford, 266-273 (index, 265r-v)
- IV. Collations of prebends and dignities, 274-281v

Items normally appear in rough chronological order within each section or subsection. A notable exception is that the entries beginning with the Croyland visit in April 1486 appear among the 1487 records for Lincoln, Leicester, and Huntingdon (but not for Northampton). The indexes give references to earlier foliations and not to the modern overall numbering that I follow.

1483

March

- 1 Oxford (175v)
- *15 Ord. at Stamford, auth. by Russell (10v)
- 17 Lincoln (163)
- 19 Huntingdon (132, 223)
- 20 Buckden, Beds. (132, 253)
- 21 Ramsey, Hunts. (132)
- 22 Ramsey (175v)
- 24 Peterborough (175v)
- 26 Buckden (253); Lincoln (132)
- 27 Lincoln (132)
- 28 Buckden (223)
- *29 Ord. at Lincoln, auth. by Russell (11)

April

- 1 Stamford (132)
- *6 Russell collates at Buckden (206v)
- 12 London (132)
- 17 London (223)
- *17 Russell collates at London (223)
- 22 London (223)
- 23 London (175v)
- 24 London (253)
- 26 London (163v)

May

- 1 London (223v)
- 2 London (223v)
- 3 London (163v, 206)
- 15 London (132v, 206)
- 16 London (267)
- *16 Russell at London (266v)
- *19 Russell at London (275v)
- 23 London (223v)
- 24 Buckingham (132v, 267)
- *24 Ord. at Buckingham, auth. by Russell (11r-v)
- 25 Buckingham (267v); Buckden (237v); London (253)
- 30 Osney, Oxf. (223v)
- 31 London (175v)

June

- 2 London (132v); Sulby, N'hants. (176)
- 3 London (132v, 267); Leicester (206)
- 4 London (253); Leicester (206)
- 5 Leicester (206)
- 8 London (267)
- 13 London (223v)
- 17 London (176)
- 18 London (267v)
- 20 London (176, 206, 253v)
- 26 London (237v)
- 30 London (206, 253v)

July

- 3 London (253v)
- *4 Sixtus IV permits Russell to visit by deputy (75)
- 5 London (237v)
- 10 London (233v, 253v)
- 11 London (176)
- 12 London (132v)
- 17 London (176, 206)
- *24-25 Russell at London (253v-254)
- 26 London (176v)
- 29 London (176v)

August

- 2 London (132v)
- 6 London (267v)
- 9 London (223v)
- 11 Stainfield, Lincs. (133)
- 12 Stainfield (133)
- 14 London (238, 254)
- *18 Russell collates at London (275v, 276)
- 24 London (206v)
- 26 London (223v)
- 29 London (206v)

September

- *1 Russell collates at London (254)
- *6 Russell from London directs Lavender and Ingilby to visit for him (75v)
- 8 London (254)
- *9 Russell collates at London (276)
- 17 London (267v)
- *17 Russell collates at London (276)
- *18 Russell collates at London (276)
- *18 Lavender at Stamford (206v-207)
- 20 London (176v)
- *20 Ord. at Stamford, auth. by Lavender (11v-12)
- 23 London? (206v)
- 26 London (267)

October

- 1 Boston, Lincs. (133)
- 2 Horncastle, Lincs. (133)
- *4 Russell collates at London (276)
- 6 Markby, Lincs. (133)
- 8 Grimsby, Lincs. (133)
- *8 Russell collates at London (276)
- *10 Russell collates at London (276)
- *12 Russell collates at London (276)
- 13 London (223v, 254)
- 18 Thornholm, Lincs. (133v)
- 20 London (254)
- 22 Lincoln (163v)
- 23 London (224)
- 26 Stamford (133v)

November

- *15 Russell at London (76)
- 17 London (163v, 238)
- 26 London (176v)
- 27 London (238)
- 30 Peterborough (207)
- *30 Russell collates at London (238)

December

- 2 London (207)
- 10 London (133v)
- *10 Russell collates at London (133v)
- 18 Henley, Oxf. (238)
- 20 London (254v)
- *20 Ord. at Henley, auth. by Lavender (12v)
- 22 London (176v, 254v)
- 30 London (207)

1484

January

- 13 London (254v)
- 29 London (238); Stamford (133v, 134, 163v, 176v, 207)
- 30 Stamford (207)

February

- 1 London (224)
- *3 Russell at London; Convocation begins (94v)
- 5 London (267v)
- 10 London (254v)
- *10 Russell collates at London (176v-177)
- 11 London (134)
- 12 London (224)
- 14? London (207)
- 17 London (224, 267v)
- 18 London (276)
- *23-24 Russell at London (256r-v)
- *24 Convocation ends (94v)
- *24 Russell collates at London (276)
- 27 Stamford (207v)

March

- 3 London (224)
- 5 Legbourne, Lincs. (134v)
- 6 London (267v)
- 9 London (207v, 224)
- 12 Buckden (238)
- *13 Ord. at Buckden, auth. by Lavender (13)
- 14 Lincoln (134)
- 15 Buckden (254v)
- 19 Daventry, N'hants. (224)
- 23 Buckden (177)
- 24 Leicester (207v)
- 26 Ulverscroft, Leics. (254v)
- 29 Loughborough, Leics. (254v); Grace Dieu, Leics. (134)
- 30 Melton Mowbray, Leics. (238)
- 31 Owston, Leics. (207v)

April

- 1 Lincoln (134v)
- 2 Stamford (224)
- 3 Stamford (134v)
- *3 Ord. at Stamford, auth. by Lavender (13v)
- 10 Owston (177)
- 14 Lincoln (134)
- 15 Lincoln (163v, 267v)
- 16 Lincoln (134)
- *17 Russell performs ordinations at Lincoln (14)
- 20 Lincoln (177)
- *20 Russell collates at Lincoln (134v)

May

- 4 London (255)
- 7 London (177)
- 8 Sandy, Beds. (267v)
- 12 London (255)
- 17 London (177)
- 22 London (224v)
- 28 London (224v)
- 31 London (238)

June

- 2 Markby, Lincs. (134v)
- 8 Kyme, Lincs. (134v)
- 10 London (238v)
- 12 Loddington, N'hants. (134v, cf. 170)
- *14 Ord. at Loddington, auth. by Lavender (14v)
- 16 London (268)
- 17 Loddington (177)
- *17 Russell collates at London (177)
- 20 London (134v, 177)
- 25 London (238v)
- 28 London (268)
- 30 London (238v)

July

- 1 London (134v)
- 6 London (135)
- 13 London (224v)
- *14 Russell collates at London (276v)
- 24 Buckden (224v)
- 28 Stamford (255)
- 31 Buckden (268)

August

- 3 London (135, 177, 207v)
- 4 London (268)
- 6 London (163v)
- 7 London (255)
- 8 London (135)
- 18 Buckden (177v)
- 28 Buckden (207v)

September

- 16 Oxford (135)
*18 Ord. at Oseney, auth. by Lavender (15)
20? Sempringham, Lincs. (135)
*24 Russell collates at Nottingham (276v)

October

- 12 London (238v)
14 London (135)
15 London (224v)
24 London (177v, 207v)

November

- 2 London (177v)
6 London (224v)
9 London (163v)
11 London (238v)
13 London (177v)
18 London (177v)
20 London (207v)
24 London (208, 268); Buckingham (224v, 238v)
26 London (255)

December

- 1 London (238v)
3 London (255)
8 London (238v)
*16 Russell collates at London (276v)
*18 Ord. at Biggleswade, Beds., auth. by Lavender (16)
21 London (224v)
*22 Russell collates at London (276v)

1485

January

- 6 London (135)
10 London (239)
14 London (238v)
20 London (177v)
22 London (238v)
28 London (239)

February

- 1 London (177v)
4 London (135v)
8 Sandy (268)
*10 London, Convocation begins (96v)
13 London (239)
18 London (225)
23 London (239)
*26 Ord. at Buckden, auth. by Russell (16v)
28 London (163v)

March

- 3 London (208)
8 London (177v)
*11 Convocation ends (96v)
16 London (255)

- 18 Stamford (268)
*19 Ord. at Stamford, auth. by Russell (17)
21? London (224v)
24 London (255)
25 London (255)

April

- *2 Ord. at Lincoln, auth. by Russell (18)
4 Lincoln (178)
16 London? (164)
19 Louth, Lincs. (135v)
26 Spalding, Lincs. (135v)

May

- 5 London (268)
6 London (255v)
10 London (239v)
11 London (208)
14 London (239)
*16 Russell collates at London (276v)
17 London (164)
18 Buckingham (208); London (178)
19 London (164)
28 Buckingham (225)
*28 Ord. at Buckingham, auth. by Russell (18v)

June

- 1 London (135v)
2 London (225)
6 London (255v)
15 London (178)
17 London (178)
*17 Russell collates at London (276v)
20 London (255v, 268v)
*20 Russell collates at London (225)
30 London? (178v)

July

- 12 London (178)
15 London (239v)
17 Buckingham (178v)
18 London (225v)
19 London? (164)
21 London (208)
23 London? (164)
28 London (225v)
29 London (268v)

August

- 4 London (208)
*11 Russell collates at London (276v, 277)
18 London (225v, cf. 178v)
27 London (135v)

September

- 9 London (178, 239v)
- 10 London (135v, 208)
- 13 London (135v, 268v)
- 15 London (208v)
- 21 London (178)
- 23 London (136, 268v)
- *24 Ord. at Osenev, auth. by Russell (19)
- 25 London (239v)
- 26 Hatfield, Hunts. (268v)
- 30 Northampton (208v)

October

- 1 London (208v)
- 2 Buckden (239v, 255v)
- 4 Buckden (179, 268v)
- 5 Buckden (255v)
- 6 Buckden (178v, 208v, 239v, 240)
- 8 Buckden (268v)
- 11 Buckden (179)
- 12 Buckden (240, 241); Oxford (225v)
- 15 Buckden (240)
- 16 London (209)
- 18 Warden, Beds. (136)
- 24 London (136)
- 25 London (240)
- 26 London (208v)
- 28 London (225v, 255v)

November

- 3 London (208v)
- 7 London (179, 179v, cf. 178v)
- 9 London (208v)
- 12 Buckingham (136)
- 14 London (240, 255v)
- 17 London (255v)
- 18 London (256)
- 19 Buckingham (239v)
- 20 London (136, 179, 255v)
- 24 London (240)
- 25 London (179)
- *26 Russell collates at London (256)

December

- 1 London (179)
- 2 Buckingham (225v)
- 3 London (256)
- 5? London (209)
- 7 London (179)
- 8 London (208v, cf. 164)
- *10 Russell collates at London (277)
- 14 London? (178v)
- *17 Ord. at Wycombe, Bucks., auth. by Russell (19v)
- 20 London? (209)

1486

January

- 26 London (179v)
- 27 London (256)
- 31 London (225v, 256)

February

- 3 London (179v)
- 4 London (209)
- *5 Russell collates at London (277)
- 10 London? (136)
- 13 London (136)
- 14 London (136)
- 16 London (240)
- 18 London (209)
- 24 London (136)
- 25 London (225v)
- *25 Letter of Henry VII authorizing the Bringhurst transfer (80v-81)
- 26 London (136)
- 28 London (179v, 256)

March

- 10 Lincoln (256v)
- *11 Ord. at Lincoln, auth. by Russell (20v)
- 16 Lincoln (136v)
- 20 Lincoln (209)
- 21 Lincoln (136v)
- 24 Lincoln (136v)
- *25 Ord. at Lincoln, auth. by Russell (21)
- 30? Lincoln (136v)
- 31 Northampton (136v)

April

- *1 Lincoln, subdean empowers proctors (79v-80)
- 2 Lincoln (225v)
- 4 Lincoln (136v)
- 5 Lincoln (164, 226)
- *5 Stamford, Lavender empowers proctors (80r-v)
- 7 Lincoln (226)
- *7 Russell at Lincoln (78)
- *10 Russell at Lincoln (78)
- *14 Russell and retinue arrive at Croyland (78v)
- *18 Abbots meet at Singlesholt (78v)
- 19 Croyland (179v)
- *21 Abbot Ramsey empowers proctors; his proctor John Croyland approaches Russell at Croyland (79r-v)
- 22 Croyland (179v)
- *22 Hearing begins at Croyland parish church; adjourned to 24 Apr. (79-81v)
- *22 Russell collates at Croyland (179v)

- 23 Croyland (241)
- 24 Croyland (179v)
- *24 Hearing resumes and concludes (81v-83)
- 27 Croyland (210)
- 30 Croyland (139)

May

- 1 Croyland (179v)
- 5 Croyland (139); Stamford (180)
- 6 Croyland (210)
- 9 Croyland (257)
- 15 Tattershall, Lincs. (139)
- 20 Sleaford, Lincs. (139, 180); Stamford (180)
- *20 Ord. at Sleaford, auth. by Russell (22)
- *22 Russell collates at Sempringham (141r-v)
- 23 Bourne, Lincs. (139); Stamford (180)
- *24 Russell at Peterborough (84)

June

- 1 Buckden (180)
- 4 Buckden (180, 210)
- 8 London (226)
- *9 Russell appoints prioress at London (209)
- 15 London (209v)
- 16 London (226)

- 19 London (226, 256v)
- 21 London (136v, 180)

July

- 1 London (180)
- 3 London (256v)
- 10 London (240v)
- 11 Loddington (209)
- 20 London (164v)

August

- 5 Sonnyngs (?) (210)
- 16 Lincoln (180)

September

- 2 Buckden (139)
- 9 Buckden (139)
- 10 Buckden (139)
- 14 Buckden (257)
- 18 Buckden (180v)
- 20 Buckden (139v)
- *22 At Buckden, Russell appoints Martin Colynés, Doctor of Decrees, to act as official and commissary-general in his consistory in the absence of the official (85)
- *23 Ord. at Huntingdon, auth. by Russell (22)

In the spring of next year, on the 500th anniversary of their composition, it is planned to publish the Nicholas Pronay and John Cox edition of the Croyland Chronicle covering 1459-1486. The Latin text is to be printed in parallel with a new English translation, and there will be a full, detailed Introduction.