

Richard III's Books:

VIII. Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae* with *The Prophecy of the Eagle* and Commentary

1. The *Historia Regum Britanniae*

**ANNE F. SUTTON AND
LIVIA VISSER-FUCHS**

The Author

One of the most successful writers of fiction of all time, Geoffrey of Monmouth has also been the subject of fiction writers himself. As a consequence it was not till quite recently that a reliable and rational account of his life was available.¹ Geoffrey was probably born of Breton parents in Monmouth where the ruling family, placed there by William I, was also Breton. He became a member of the secular clergy and was at Oxford by 1129 when he witnessed the foundation charter of Oseney Abbey. He remained at Oxford until 1151 and during that time was witness to several other documents together with Archdeacon Walter and a Ralph of Monmouth. He was referred to as Geoffrey Arthur, possibly his father's name, but more likely a nickname commenting on his interest in the king who was the hero of his *Historia*.² His association with Archdeacon Walter seems to have been close for he was to claim that it was Walter who had given him the book on which he based his *Historia*. Walter was provost of the college of St. George in Oxford Castle and Geoffrey was probably a secular canon there until its dissolution in 1149. He was referred to as *magister* and may have taught, for Oxford was already a centre of clerical instruction. In 1151 Geoffrey was elected bishop of St. Asaph, and in 1152 was ordained a priest and consecrated bishop at Lambeth by Archbishop Theodore. He probably never visited his Welsh diocese which was overrun by civil war. In 1153 he witnessed a treaty at Westminster between King Stephen and the future Henry II. In 1155 he died.

Geoffrey wrote three works while at Oxford.³ The first was *The Prophecies of Merlin*, made to King Vortigern, which he claimed to have translated at the request of Alexander, Bishop of Lincoln (died 1148), and which were probably completed not long before the death of Henry I in 1135. They originally appeared as a separate work but were later incorporated in Geoffrey's most famous creation the *History of the Kings of Britain*, on which he had already made a start. He finished his *History* in 1138. He himself said the work was known as *Gesta Britonum* (The Deeds of the Britons) but it is now usually referred to by the title created for it by Jerome Commelin for his Heidelberg edition of 1587 and San Marte for his Halle edition of 1854.⁴ Different copies were given different dedications by the ambitious Geoffrey as the political scene and alliances of Stephen's troubled reign altered — Oxford itself was the scene of some of the most dramatic events of the wars between Stephen and Matilda — and as he sought patronage. Dedications were to Robert Earl of Gloucester, a patron of letters, bastard of Henry I and a supporter of his half-sister Matilda, to Robert and Waleran, Count of Meulan, and lastly to Robert and King Stephen.⁵

After 1148 Geoffrey composed a Latin verse romance, *Vita Merlini* (*Life of Merlin*), dedicated to Robert de Chesney, elected successor to Alexander as bishop of Lincoln on 19 December 1148. Robert had been a canon of St. George's College like Geoffrey. The poem would have been finished before Geoffrey was himself elected to the bishopric of St. Asaph in 1151.⁶

*The History of the Kings of Britain*⁷

Geoffrey tells the reader his purpose in writing the *History* in his preface.⁸ He had been amazed that he had been unable to find anything in books on the kings who lived in Britain before the birth of Christ although their deeds had been 'handed joyfully down in oral tradition'. The fact that Britain had been conquered and named by Brutus, the great-grandson of the Trojan Aeneas, ancestor of the Romans and hero of Vergil's *Aeneid*, was already known to Geoffrey and his contemporaries from Nennius' *History of the Britons*, but after that they were only too conscious of the gaps in their knowledge until the histories of the Anglo-Saxons by Bede and others told of their race's victories over the Britons. Geoffrey asserted he had found the solution. While he was 'giving a good deal of attention to such matters, Walter, Archdeacon of Oxford . . . presented me with a certain book written in the British language.'⁹ It was a narrative of events from the days of Brutus to those of Cadwallader, the last native king who died in Rome in 689 AD. Walter commanded Geoffrey to translate the book and so he tells the reader he did.

He dedicated his 'translation' to the highest and most powerful men in the land to secure preferment, and was eventually successful. His subject matter may have been dear to his own heart, even an obsession, but it was also aimed to please his political masters and dedicatees. He portrayed a truly glorious past for the Britons and made them the equals of the Romans and even their victors. With these warlike ancient Britons and their hero kings, Belinus, and above all, Arthur, the new Norman rulers of Britain could identify and claim relationship with pride and satisfaction, relegating the Anglo-Saxons to the position of a

defeated race (with the honoured exceptions of Edward the Confessor, fast becoming a saint and the object of a cult at this time, and Matilda, wife of Henry I and great-granddaughter of Edmund Ironside). Geoffrey and his Norman patrons were very aware that whereas the Capetian kings of France, overlords of the new Norman kings of Britain for their continental possessions, could look back with pride to Charlemagne and his knights, they had no such heroes in their own kingdom's past, however more powerful they were in contemporary politics. Geoffrey presented them with Arthur, another conqueror of Europe. Henry I's daughter and designated heiress, Matilda, and half-sister of Geoffrey's preferred patron Robert of Gloucester, would have been equally pleased with the array of great and successful British queens in the *History*.¹⁰

Above all else,¹¹ however, it is likely that Geoffrey wished to amuse his readers and fill the empty spaces of the island's history. Bolder, less scrupulous and more a creative writer than a chronicler or historian, Geoffrey took on William of Malmesbury, Henry of Huntingdon and the others at their own game and supplied what was missing. William of Malmesbury, a sound historian, had started soberly with Julius Caesar's arrival in Britain and continued to the reign of Henry I, Henry of Huntingdon liked a good myth¹² and had started with the founding of Britain by Brutus. Geoffrey too took his lead from Nennius and started with the Trojans but unlike the unimaginative Henry, he then used his sources as a mere starting-point for fantasy. Using every available source of information, he peopled the missing years with a whole new range of characters and created a sequence of stories that was to capture the imagination of generations of readers. He elaborated on hints in Nennius and whereas such as William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon had only repeated their source's meagre details, he created King Arthur. William had written a chapter on Arthur, Geoffrey devoted about a quarter of his book to him,¹³ attaching fables to the obscure historical character and making him a hero whom the reader could receive with enthusiasm.

Some of Geoffrey's sources for his *History* can be readily established: Gildas, *The Ruin and Conquest of Britain* (written before 547 AD), Nennius' *History of the Britons* (circa 800 AD), Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (Bede lived 672-735 AD), besides classical authors such as Vergil, Livy and the universal history of Orosius (417-18 AD) as well as the *Old Testament*. He certainly did more than merely translate an old history of the Briton kings. It was usual for classical and medieval authors to cite an ancient source book for their work — whether Geoffrey was just following this custom or whether he ever had a book 'in the British language' is still the subject of heated, and often nationalistic, debate. No such book has ever been found and no Welsh or Breton chronicle exists in a manuscript older than those of Geoffrey's *History*. It is safe to assume, however, that he did have access to early Welsh and Breton chronicles, that he exploited king-lists and genealogies, verbal information from such as Walter the Archdeacon, folk tales and songs as well as the more mundane works of contemporary historians such as William of Malmesbury.¹⁴

Geoffrey handled his sources with great skill. He employed a down-to-earth style with no rhetoric. He larded his text with circumstantial and

convincing details of place-names derived from the names of their founders, his heroes, with nuggets of genuine information drawn from respected authors. Above all he structured his book on the sound framework of the established chronology of world history used by such historians as Bede:¹⁵ he cross-referenced events in Britain to events in Rome and the Holy Land. He also placed his action in an ordered topography. In everything he contrived to give his fictions the solid appearance of history, never admitting that they were fictions. For this he has been severely criticised from the moment the book appeared to the present day.¹⁶ Among his earliest critics were William of Newburgh, a judicious historian who hated Geoffrey's lies, and Gerald of Wales who mocked them.¹⁷

Everyone else loved the book.¹⁸ Geoffrey had written the history he and everyone really wanted — it was also a great feat of creation, an epic tragedy with memorable characters, well conceived and finely written.¹⁹ It had to be true — there was nothing to contradict it except scepticism. The ensuing success has been one of the wonders of literary history. Henry of Huntingdon saw it at Le Bec in January 1139, was amazed and enthusiastically described it in a letter. A prose variant text, with more Christian and pious overtones, was made in Geoffrey's lifetime,²⁰ Gaimar did an Anglo-Norman adaptation,²¹ and in 1155 the Norman poet, Wace, put it into verse as *Le Roman de Brut*.

A few details of Wace's life show just how enthusiastic the reception could be for the *History*. The author of the *Roman de Rou* and lives of saints, Wace visited England to seek out the sites of the *History's* events and to find 'fays' in the forest of Broceliande ('A fool I returned, a fool I went') before he put Geoffrey's text (at one remove, the variant version) into verse, elaborating it with Breton tales and imaginings and adding greatly to its length. He presented it to the new Queen of England, Eleanor of Aquitaine, in 1155, the year of Geoffrey's death.²² Wace in his turn was put into English verse by the priest, Layamon, who adopted Arthur, the harrier of his own race, as his hero.²³ Both the *History* and Wace's *Roman de Brut* were among the sources for Chrétien de Troyes' romances written in the 1170s for the court of Marie, Countess of Champagne and daughter of Eleanor of Aquitaine by Louis VII of France.²⁴ Chrétien fleshed out the Arthurian characters sketched by Geoffrey, chivalry, honour and the courtesy of love being the main themes of his stories. The Arthurian cycle of romances was to expand its canon throughout the middle ages (and after) and draw into its orbit many other, once independent, tales, such as the story of Tristan and Isolde, a version of which was owned by Richard, Duke of Gloucester. In these romances the 'history' of Geoffrey of Monmouth was transferred back, with advantage, to the world of the storyteller where it had originated.

A discussion of Geoffrey's *History* in the context of Richard III's ownership of a text, must concentrate on the use of the book in the original form created by Geoffrey, as 'history'. This has several aspects: the straightforward transmission of the text alone, in adaptation or in conjunction with other related texts (such as the *Historia Troiae*) is one; the reasons why such a history of Britain should have appealed to the affections of successive generations of people, their enthusiasms and above all their political pretensions is another. The last aspect cannot be discussed separately from the *Historia*

Troiae or the *Prophecy of the Eagle* (so closely associated with the *Historia Regum Britanniae* in Richard's copy), for the history of the Trojans was part of the glorious history of the kings of Britain and all Europe and both history and prophecy were favourite means of propaganda.

The vulgate Latin text of Geoffrey's *Historia* was accessible mainly to scholars. Some Latin chroniclers transposed parts of it wholesale into their works, others, like Ralph Higden, might paraphrase. The ordinary reader knew Geoffrey's fables through the medium of popular prose chronicles, of which one large group took their name from their first hero Brutus, the founder of Britain, and were called the *Brut*. These were chivalric and patriotic in spirit. There were two main versions of the *Brut* and they could be in Latin, French or English, the majority being English. Their sources for the earliest period were the Gaimar and Wace versions of Geoffrey and for the later periods their continuators relied on a string of chronicles. There was a spate of *Bruts* created in the early fourteenth century and another around 1461 after the accession of Edward IV. Under the name of Caxton's *Chronicles*, a version of the *Brut* was the first English history to be printed in 1480.²⁵ Through these, and their close relatives the London chronicles, the legend of the Trojan foundation of Britain and Arthur's conquests became common knowledge.

The use of Geoffrey's *History*, directly or indirectly, by later chroniclers is well charted. Few failed to use it.²⁶ The exploits of King Arthur roused most criticism and doubt among the more learned of the chroniclers who had read continental authors who knew nothing of the King's European conquests during the period they were supposed to have occurred. Ralph Higden said as much in his *Polychronicon*. Any criticism was, however, almost invariably countered by an outburst of patriotic support such as that of John Trevisa, the translator of Higden, who rebuked his author severely for his doubts about King Arthur.²⁷ Other chroniclers, like the author of the Fitzhugh or Anonymous Chronicle which Richard of Gloucester once signed and presumably browsed through, were content quietly to record the doubts expressed by some of their sources and make temperate use of Geoffrey as convenient.²⁸

The writings of three men from different social spheres can be cited to illustrate a range of opinions of Geoffrey and his legends during Richard III's lifetime: Abbot John Whethamsted of St. Albans, cleric, scholar and author, William Caxton, mercer, diplomatist and author, and John Rous, chantry priest, antiquary and author. Whethamsted was one of the humanists in the circle of Humphrey Duke of Gloucester and ruled as Abbot of St. Albans 1420-40 and 1452-65. In his dictionary of historians, *Granarium*, he briefly expressed several reasons for doubting the truth of the Trojan foundation of Britain that may have been common among his friends.²⁹ Caxton, as a bookseller and printer, published a version of the *Brut* chronicle in 1480, for which he himself compiled a continuation up to 1461, and expressed no doubts about its veracity in either his prologue or epilogue.³⁰ When he came to publish the *Mort Darthur* of Sir Thomas Malory in 1485, however, he went out of his way to explain³¹ why he had taken so long to print anything about Arthur and the Holy Grail. He had told his critics that 'dyvers men holde oppynyon that there was no suche Arthur' because he was not mentioned in some chronicles. He had been persuaded of Arthur's existence by the following arguments: the tomb of Arthur

was to be seen at Glastonbury and the story of its discovery was in the *Polychronicon*; Arthur was in Boccaccio's *De Casibus Virorum Illustrium* and in Geoffrey of Monmouth's 'Brutysshe book'; relics of Arthur and his knights survived all over England and Wales (Arthur's seal at Westminster Abbey, Gawain's skull at Dover, the round table at Winchester, stones of Camelot in Wales); he was famous throughout Europe and books about him existed in every language. The arguments propounded by 'one in specyal'³² and which Caxton 'coude not wel denye' may be circular and far from convincing in the face of twentieth century historical knowledge but they form an interesting assortment of the kind of arguments used by a literate layman of 1485 interested in Geoffrey's most successful creation. If Gerald of Wales, an experienced historian of the end of the twelfth century, despaired of separating the layers of fiction that already overlaid a fragment of fact about Arthur's relative, Morgan la Fee, (as he saw her), how much less could a fifteenth century writer do so.³³

The third example, John Rous,³⁴ appears to have been totally untroubled about the truth of any legend. He began his *Historia Regum Angliae* with its foundation by Brutus and included all the fables, showing a particular fondness for giants. His sources included both Geoffrey's *History* and its successor the *Brut*. He was also happy to endorse the pedigree of his patrons, the Earls of Warwick, that began with the giant-killer, Guy of Warwick, and included Sir Enyas the Knight of the Swan, out of whose cup Rous had drunk in the presence of Anne Beauchamp, Countess of Warwick.³⁵ Anne was, no doubt, equally prepared to believe in her ancestors' existence, or at least in their propaganda value — and the value of ancestors was as apparent to both Yorkist kings. Rous describes how niches had been built in St. George's Chapel, Windsor, Edward IV's great building project, to hold statues of past kings, churchmen and founders of cities. He had been encouraged at the end of Edward's reign to write a 'little work' on these so that the statues could be chosen.³⁶ Rous's preoccupation with founders of cities and ancestors stretching back in an orderly procession through the centuries giving their names and charters to places and institutions is a mirror image of Geoffrey of Monmouth's preoccupation. Both writers, of widely different talent, were feeding the hunger of patrons for a glorious past, whether Robert of Gloucester, Anne Beauchamp or Richard III.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

- I. J. E. Lloyd, Geoffrey of Monmouth, *English Historical Review*, vol. 57 (1942), pp. 460-8, discusses in detail the reliable evidence for Geoffrey's nationality and career. See also John J. Parry and Robert A. Caldwell, Geoffrey of Monmouth, in *Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages. A Collaborative History*, ed. R. S. Loomis, Oxford 1959, pp. 72-5, Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Britain*, trans. and introd. Lewis Thorpe, Harmondsworth 1966, pp. 10-14, Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c. 1150-c. 1307*, Ithaca 1974, pp. 201-9, and Neil Wright (ed.), *The 'Historia Regum Britanniae' of Geoffrey of Monmouth. I. Bern, Burgerbibliothek Ms. 568*, Brewer, Cambridge 1984, pp. iv-v.

The most spectacular fiction which gave a Welsh career to Geoffrey was the *Brut y Tywysogion* or Gwentian *Brut* published in 1801-7 by three enthusiastic Welshmen and later translated by Aneurin Owen for the prestigious Cambrian Archaeological Association. In 1926 it was established beyond doubt that it was the composition of Iolo Morganwg, one of the three original publishers and certainly not an ancient Welsh chronicle as claimed, Lloyd, pp.462-3.

2. Chroniclers Robert of Torigni and Henry of Huntingdon also called him *Galfridus Artur*, Wright, *Bern* (see n. 1), p.v.
3. Wright, *Bern* (see n. 1), pp.v-xvi summarises the present state of belief on the date and composition of Geoffrey's works.
4. *Ibid.*, p.xii, n. 14.
5. Wright, *Bern* (see n. 1), pp.xii-xvi on the dedications. See also Acton Griscom (ed.), *The Historia Regum Britanniae of Geoffrey of Monmouth, with Contributions to the Study of its Place in early British History (with a trans. of the Welsh Ms. by R. Ellis Jones)*, London 1929, pp.42-95, and Gransden (see n. 1), p.201. See M. Dominica Legge, *Influence littéraire de la cour d'Henri Beauclerc, in Mélanges offerts à Rita Lejeune*, Gembloux 1969, vol. 1, pp.684-6.
6. Parry and Caldwell (see n. 1), pp.89-90. Wright, *Bern* (see n. 1), p.xx.
7. To date 214 mss. of the *History* have been identified, see *The Ricardian*, no. 103, pp.145, n. 2, 147, n. 29. Acton Griscom (see n. 5) remains the standard edition (with the earliest Welsh text in translation). This was supplemented by Jacob Hammer (ed.) *Geoffrey of Monmouth, Historia Regum Britanniae: a Varian Version*, Medieval Academy of America, Cambridge, Mass. 1931, but Hammer's theories and edition have been extensively criticized. There is now a plan to provide a comprehensive critical edition of both the 'vulgate' and variant versions of which the following volumes have appeared: Neil Wright (ed.), *'The Historia Regum Britanniae' of Geoffrey of Monmouth. I. A Single-Manuscript Edition from Bern, Burgerbibliothek Ms. 368*, Brewer, Cambridge 1984; Neil Wright (ed.), *II. The First Variant Version: a critical edition*, Brewer, Cambridge 1988.
- A theory, based on Hammer's variant version, developed in particular by R. Caldwell (see n. 1), pp.86-7 suggested that the so-called vulgate or standard version was a later, deliberate revision of the variant text by Geoffrey himself. The authorship of the *History* could therefore be transferred to a pseudo-Geoffrey such as Archdeacon Walter — the full potential of this theory was summarised by Thorpe in 1966 (see n. 1), pp.15-16. This notion has now been discredited after a detailed comparison of the texts, Wright, *II, First Variant*, pp.xi-lxxv: the variant's author was an adapter of Geoffrey's vulgate text with a penchant for biblical quotation and more pronounced Christian preoccupations than Geoffrey (eg. pp. 1, lii); the variant dates from Geoffrey's lifetime and Wace used it as his source for *Le Roman de Brut* completed in 1155 (p.lxii). The variant was not made by Geoffrey himself (pp.lxv-lxxv). The variant does not concern us directly, as Richard III's copy was of the vulgate text.
8. Thorpe (see n. 1), pp.51-2 for translation of the dedicatory preface from which all quotations are taken.
9. Towards the end of his book Geoffrey also says the book was brought 'ex Britannia' by Walter. There have been arguments, (endless and inconclusive given national preferences and emotions), as to whether he meant Brittany or the 'British' part of Britain, that is Wales. Compare J. S. P. Tatlock, *The Legendary History of Britain. Geoffrey of Monmouth's 'Historia Regum Britanniae' and its Early Vernacular Versions*, University of California Press 1950, ch. 16, esp. p.423, Parry and Caldwell (see n. 1), p.81, Wright, *Bern*, (see n. 1), p.xvii, and Thorpe (see n. 1) who translates it as Wales, p.284.
10. For Geoffrey's political awareness and motives see especially Gordon Hall Gerould, King Arthur and Politics, *Speculum*, vol. 2 (1927), pp.38-45, 49. C. Brooke, Geoffrey of Monmouth as a Historian, in *Church and Government in the Middle Ages. Essays presented to C. R. Cheney on his 70th Birthday*, ed. C. N. L. Brooke et al., Cambridge 1976, pp.77-91. Wright, *Bern* (see n. 1), pp.xvii-xix where he also discusses the notion that the *History* was conceived as a parody as put forward by Valerie Flint.
11. For Geoffrey's motives, Tatlock (see n. 9), pp.422-32, Wright, *Bern* (see n. 1), pp.xvii-xix, Brooke (see n. 10) and Gransden (see n. 1) vol. 1, pp.204, 206, 207.
12. For Henry, see Gransden (n. 1), vol. 1, pp.195-201.
13. Gerould (see n. 10), pp.33-6. In Thorpe's translation (see n. 1), pp.51-284, Arthur's birth to 'death' takes pp.207-61.
14. Griscom (see n. 5), pp.99-113, Tatlock (see n. 9), pp.422-32 and Parry and Caldwell (see n. 1), p.81, on

Geoffrey's sources. Certain details of Geoffrey's stories have been substantiated by archaeological evidence eg. the transportation of the stones of Stonehenge from Ireland — in fact they came from Wales, Thorpe (see n. 1), p.18.

Wright, *Bern* (see n. 1), pp.xvii-xviii on the latest claims for two Breton-Latin texts, of uncertain date, said to reflect a narrative tradition possibly used by Geoffrey.

15. Parry and Caldwell (see n. 1), p.82.
16. Gransden (see n. 1), vol. 1, pp.202-3.
17. Thorpe (see n. 1), p.17, Parry and Caldwell (see n. 1), pp.87-8.
18. For its immediate success, Parry and Caldwell (see n. 1), pp.88-9. It was swiftly made use of by contemporary historians such as Alfred of Beverley, Hammer (see n. 7), p.3.
19. For an appraisal of its artistic merits, Thorpe (see n. 1), pp.24-8. Tatlock (see n. 9), p.393, praised its 'classical symmetry' and said 'it recalls the structure of good tragedy'.
20. For the letter see Tatlock (see n. 9), p.433; it is printed in Robert of Torigni's *Chronicle of Stephen in Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, ed. R. Howlett, Rolls Series 4 vols., London 1884-9, vol. 4, pp.65-75. Wright, *Variant Version*, see n. 7 above.
21. Tatlock (see n. 9) pp. 451-6. Gransden (see n. 1), pp.209-10. Gaimar's version does not survive. M. Dominica Legge, *Anglo-Norman Literature and its Background*, Oxford 1963, pp.27-30.
22. Charles Foulon, Wace, in *Arthurian Literature* (see n. 1), pp.94-103.
23. R. S. Loomis, Layamon's *Brut* in *Arthurian Literature* (see n. 1), pp.104-111. Tatlock (see n. 9), ch. 23.
24. R. S. Loomis, *Arthurian Tradition and Chrétien de Troyes*, New York 1949, is one of the main books on Chrétien and his sources. Urban T. Holmes and M. Amelia Klenke, *Chrétien, Troyes and the Grail*, Chapel Hill 1959, ch. 2, Chrétien de Troyes and the Legends of Britain, pp.19-40. Jean Frappier, Chrétien de Troyes, in *Arthurian Literature* (see n. 1), pp.157-191. (See this book *Arthurian Literature* generally for the creation of the Arthurian cycle.) Stephen Knight, *Arthurian Literature and Society*, London 1983, ch. 3, 'Prowess and Courtesy', Chrétien de Troyes', *Le Chevalier ou Lion*.
25. *The Brut or Chronicles of England*, ed. F. W. D. Brie, Early English Text Society, vols. 121, 126 (1906, 1908). His introduction has never been published in English: *Geschichte und Quellen der mittelenglischen Prosachronik der Brute of England oder the Chronicles of England*, Marburg 1905. A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England*, vol. 2, c.1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century, London 1982, pp.73-7, 220-227. C. L. Kingsford, *English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century*, Oxford 1913, ch. 5 'The Brut', pp.113-139.
26. Laura Keeler, *Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Later Latin Chroniclers 1300-1500*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1940: she lists in App. 1 24 chroniclers who do not use Geoffrey at all but only 4 of these aimed to cover any part of his period. Laura Keeler, *The Historia Regum Britanniae and four Medieval Chroniclers*, *Speculum*, vol. 21 (1946), pp.24-37. R. William Leckie, *The Passage of Dominion: Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Periodization of Insular History in the Twelfth Century*, Toronto 1981. T. D. Kendrick, *British Antiquity*, London 1950, ch. 1 'The British History in the Middle Ages'.
27. Keeler, *Geoffrey of Monmouth* (see n. 26), pp.30-33.
28. Richard III's Books: IV. The Anonymous or Fitzhugh Chronicle, *The Ricardian*, vol. 8 (1988), pp.104-106.
29. Gransden (see n. 25), vol. 2, pp.371-386 for his career. Kendrick (see n. 26), p.34. Keeler, *Geoffrey of Monmouth* (see n. 26), pp.80-5, gives a very brief summary of Whethamsted's arguments. The Latin passage is quoted in full in D. R. Howlett, A St. Alban's historical miscellany of the fifteenth century, *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, vol. 6 (1972-6), pp.197-8.
30. N. F. Blake, *Caxton's Own Prose*, London 1973, pp.68-9.
31. *Ibid.*, pp.106-108.
32. Possibly the person who lent him the copy of Malory's text to print, *ibid.*, p.165 n. 49. Antony Lord Rivers is suggested as the lender and the persuader, but see Carol Meale, Mss, Readers and Patrons in Fifteenth-century England. Sir Thomas Malory and Arthurian Romance, *Arthurian Literature*, vol. 4 (1985), pp.109-110.
33. Cited Urban T. Holmes (see n. 24), pp.33-4, from *De principis instructione* in *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera*, vol. 8, ed. G. Warner, Rolls Series, London 1891, p.128.
34. Gransden (see n. 25), vol. 2, pp.309-327. Keeler, *Geoffrey of Monmouth* (see n. 26), pp. 23-28. Kendrick (see n. 26), pp.18-29.
35. Kendrick (see n. 26), p.24, *Rous Roll*, ed. C. Ross, Gloucester 1980, n. 18.
36. Gransden (see n. 25), vol. 2, p.314.