

On "THE CONQUEST of LISBON" and its Author

by Professor H.V. Livermore

Formerly Professor of Portuguese and Spanish,
University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada

Although King Afonso Henriques assumed the title of *Rex Portugalensium* seven years earlier, it was the conquest of Lisbon in 1147 that ensured the completion of the Reconquest and the survival of what had hitherto been an extended county. Without the independence of the Atlantic seaboard, it is difficult to see how the voyages of discovery could have been launched, or the resulting expansion of Europe could have taken the form it did. The taking of Lisbon was an event of capital importance in the history of Portugal and of the west. It was also perhaps the only positive consequence of the Second Crusade. Yet the Peninsular chroniclers have little to say about it, only three documents alluding to it have survived in the Portuguese archives.¹ The German participants have left a short but useful account. In fact three similar letters which C.W. David calls "The Teutonic Source", p.49. But by far the best contemporary source is the unique manuscript account preserved at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.² It has only once been edited in this country, by William Stubbs in 1864, but this and other versions were superseded by the publication in 1936 of Charles Wendell David's *De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi, The Conquest of Lisbon*.³ David perceived that the text "comes far closer than most writers of his epoch to seeing a crusade as it really was". He deserves our gratitude. His edition remains indispensable, and the amendments made by later study are not numerous. If there is something to add, it is mainly because he failed to resolve the riddle of its authorship.

1.

The manuscript formed part of the collection of Archbishop Matthew Parker (1504-75), born in Norwich, a student at Corpus Christi in 1522, vice-chancellor of the University in 1549 and Archbishop of Canterbury in 1559. It is bound in a miscellany with a brief table of contents "in a fine Renaissance hand" which calls it "Historia Osberni

de Expeditione". It was first printed from a transcript made by N.E.S.A. Hamilton of the British Museum in Alexandre Herculano's *Portugaliae Monumenta Historica: Scriptores* (1861). The title was given wide currency by its conclusion in Portuguese translation in Júlio de Castilho's *Lisboa Antiga* (Coimbra 1884, v. II, pt. 2 and several later editions), now considered a minor Portuguese classic. Stubbs gave it a different title, *De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi*, in 1864. There is, however, no authority for either title or the assumed author. Stubbs' name filled a need, and C.W. David accepted it, having nothing better to offer. The "Historia Osberni" had been repeated in three editions of the Corpus Christi catalogue and was therefore hallowed, though inexact. It was deduced from the opening words of the manuscript, which is in the form of a letter. However, it ends, not with Vale, but with Amen, which may suggest that in its existing form it had a different function. As a letter, it opened with the words: "Osborne de baldr R cal". David, reversing an earlier assumption, accepted that "it was a rule of medieval epistolography that a writer should place his correspondent's name before his own unless he were addressing a subordinate." Since the persons in question were not of exalted rank, the attribution to Osb(ern), who does not exist, or to Osb(ert), who does, are both wrong. This must have been a disappointment to David, since in his search he had found the name of Osbert of Bawdsey, *clericus*, who in 1171, twenty three years after the conquest of Lisbon, attested the foundation charter of Butley Priory in Suffolk, an Augustinian foundation established by Ranulf de Glanvill, then sheriff of Yorkshire and later chief justiciar of England (c. 1130-1191). The other witnesses in 1171 include members of the Glanvill family, one being Hervey de Glanvill, a name familiar from the conquest of Lisbon as the respected leader of the contingent from Suffolk and Norfolk. In a note in *Speculum* (January 1932) the late C.R. Cheney had noted that Osb. could only be the recipient of the letter, and abandoned R. as "beyond hope of identification." Cheney observed that the inclusion of Bawdsey Church in the endowment of Butley Priory favoured David's identification and made one or two other suggestions which David disposed of without difficulty *Speculum* (July 1932). But David was discouraged: in his edition the complexities of the Glanvill family are summarized in one long footnote (p. 55, n.2) and Butley Priory does not even appear in his index. He was obliged to leave the author "in a kind of half world, neither known nor yet wholly anonymous", and (despite the faults of his Latin style) "a singularly appealing figure."

David's picture of the author was well observed. He was of Norman rather than of English ascent. His piety, his inclusion of sermons, his interest in ecclesiastical matters, all proclaimed him a priest, though a fighting priest who took part in the unpremeditated attack which carried the western suburb and in the struggle to protect the tower built for the final assault. He showed a special interest in the men of Suffolk, mentioning seven lads from Ipswich who held the tower, and was closely associated with Hervy de Glanvill, in whose tent he passed the first night ashore and whose speech he reports, if not verbatim, in general terms.

David's reasons for making the author Norman French rather than English included the use of the word *garciones* for "lads". But the question of the author's style is intertwined with the separate but related issue of whether the manuscript was his holograph or a copy, and if the latter, of what date.

2.

The eighth centenary of the conquest occurred in 1947 and on this occasion another David, Professor Pierre David, whose learning added much to the Coimbra school of medievalists led by Dr. Torquato de Sousa Soares, published a note "Sur la relation de la prise de Lisbonne (1147), redigée par un clerc anglo-normand".⁴ His palaeographic examination forbade (as he put it) so late a date as the 13th. century: in all probability the document was copied in the years 1160-1175 and was probably the author's original "revu et amendé par lui".

More than ten years later, in a volume dedicated to Pierre David, Dr. Rui de Azevedo laid to rest the ghost "Osbern" and again adverted to the date of the manuscript.⁵ C.W. David had admitted the possibility of Stubbs' view that it was an autograph, though he had considered it "most improbable". Dr. Azevedo was "strongly inclined" to agree with Stubbs and questioned whether the period of 28 years (1148 to 1175) was sufficient to differentiate between palaeographic styles. The point was referred through the British Museum to C.R. Cheney and R. Vaughan, who gave the view that the date could hardly be as early as 1147: their opinion is printed with Azevedo's article. If paleographers differed, this was partly because the English consultants took it for granted that the document was produced in England, whilst Professor David viewed it from a French angle. It was however common ground that,

while the original was composed in Portugal, the existing manuscript was probably a copy made in the second half of the 12th century after the author's return to England.

Azevedo had pointed out that only three documents alluding to the conquest have survived in Portugal. Of these much the most interesting is the donation of the Anglo-Norman cemetery and chapel to the Augustinian Priory of Santa Cruz at Coimbra, dated April, era of 1185,

or 1148. This document is in the Arquivo Nacional da Torre do Tombo (Santa Cruz, Mo. 3, no. 18). It was unpublished until 1928, when J.M. Cunha Saraiva included it in Afonso Dornelas' *Elucidário Nobiliarquico*: it appears in photographic form in A. Forjaz Sampaio's *Historia ilustrada da literatura portuguesa* (Lisbon 1929, v. I, p. 17 and Corrigenda, p. 386), where it is accompanied by a Portuguese translation by Dr. J.M. Rodrigues. I am indebted to the kindness of Dr. J. da Costa Pereira, until recently Director of the Arquivo Nacional, for showing me the document and providing a copy, and to Dr. Maria José Mexia for her comments on it and on the scribe Salvatus.

The donor is the priest Raol, who gives the following account of the foundation of his hermitage and graveyard:

In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, amen. I, Raol, priest, coming with my companions among the Franks to the siege of Lisbon, which was then with all its district in the possession of the Saracens, being the foremost of the seafarers to land, after due prayer, set up the sign of the Holy Cross in a certain solitary place, far from the city and from all its inhabitants, both within and without, having with my own bow expelled the infidels. And there on the second day of our arrival I erected an altar for the service of Our Lord Jesus Christ. In which place I dwelt thenceforth, not forgetting to go daily to the siege with my companions, and in praise of Our Lord Jesus Christ I built with my own money, toil and sweat and not without the greatest devotion an hermitage and tabernacle dedicated to the Blessed Virgin Mary. In the cemetery of which the English who died, killed by the arrows of the Saracens or of a natural death, lie buried. After the capture of the city and the removal of the infidel foulness, with the favour of Afonso, King of the Portuguese, and by

authority of Archbishop John of Braga, I bequeath the said place with all its appurtenances and possessions to you, the canons of Santa Cruz in the monastery of Coimbra living under the rule of Saint Augustine in recognition of your brotherly love. And this I do for the remedy of my soul and those of my parents and of those who are buried there. If any person, lay or ecclesiastic, should in any way attempt to infringe or impair the terms of this testament he shall by royal judgement pay tenfold to the said church and monastery of Santa Cruz, and unless he repent be separated by means of anathema from the company of the Christian faithful forever. This act of mine shall have perpetual force. I have paid 200 marks of silver to the canons of Santa Cruz. I, the aforesaid Raol, priest, bade this deed to be written and make this sign I before appropriate witnesses. Those present were

I Afonso, King of the Portuguese	John, Archbishop of Braga
Fernão Peres	John, Bishop of Coimbra
Roderic, son of Pelagius, alkaide	Pedro, Bishop of Oporto
Menedus Afonso	Odoarius, Bishop of Viseu
	Menendus, Bishop of Lamego

Salvatus, subdeacon, wrote this.

3.

My reasons for identifying Raol the priest with the author of the conquest of Lisbon may be summarized as follows:

1. Raol corresponds to R., who was also a priest (David, p.4)
2. Raol was a Frank serving with the Anglo-Norman contingent: R. was also a Frank or Anglo-Norman (p. 40),
3. Raol says that he was *prius*, foremost or among the first to land. R. says that he and 39 others landed and were the only ones to spend the first night ashore.
4. Raol says that he expelled the infidels with his own bow: David has clearly characterized R. as a fighting priest.

5. Raol says that he built his chapel in a solitary place on the western side of the city where the English were buried: R. says that two churches were built, one to the east for the Flemings and Germans and one to the west for the Anglo-Normans.

6. Raol says that he dedicated his chapel to the Virgin: R. expresses the same devotion.

7. Raol says that he dwelt at his chapel, going every day to the siege: R. does not speak of returning to his ship or of life on ship-board during the siege.

8. Raol refers to the removal of the *spurcitates* of the "pagans": R. gives concrete evidence of this (p.133).

9. Raol claims to have built his chapel with his own money, toil and sweat: R. frequently upbraids the crusaders for greed and concludes by quoting I Chronicles, 21, v.15 "Domine, parce operi manuum tuarum."

10. Raol's lines correspond to and confirm David's characterization of R. and David had not seen the donation

11. Raol's donation is to the great Augustinian monastery of Santa Cruz at Coimbra: R.'s correspondent and Hervey de Glanvill were concerned in the Augustinian foundation of Butley Priory, and the Glanvills also founded the Premonstratensian abbey of Leiston in Suffolk.

12. Raol's document is witnessed by King Afonso Henriques, Fernão Peres Rodrigo Pais, Menendus Afonso and the five bishops of Braga, Oporto, Coimbra, Viseu and Lamego: four of the five bishops, the King, Fernão Peres (Captivo) and Menendo Afonso, are among the witnesses to the contract with the crusaders given by R. (p. 111).⁶

It may be added that, since the total number of ships in the expedition was 164, each being treated as a parish, the number of priests was of this order. If half belonged to the Anglo-Norman contingent, there would have been some 82 priests. Those whose name began with R. would hardly exceed five or ten at most. If we rejected the identification, then we require two priests, each called R., each of Norman-French formation, each with the English contingent, each with high influence in Portugal, each among the first to land, each with similar character and piety, each connected with the Augustinians. The coincidences are too many. If we accept the identification, then a new and more positive series of consequences ensues.

We see now that Raol the priest was a more influential figure than David may have supposed. He was no simple parish priest or chaplain to Hervey de Glanvill (David, p.40, n.5). He negotiated personally and independently with the king and clergy of Portugal for the care of the English fallen. Neither of the Davids noted that he, the "certain priest" who preached to the troops before the final assault, carried a piece of the true Cross. Canon David thought it unlikely that R. should carry a Bible and Solinus, the two authorities he quotes most often, to the Holy Land. It is certainly even more unlikely that he should be equipped with a fragment of the Cross unless he were one of St. Bernard's missionaries sent to preach the crusade. As C.W. David noted, the letter of Raol ends, not with the expected vale, but with an exhortatory sermon concluding with Amen. It is possible that the original letter ended in another way, but the version we have is clearly intended to emphasize the crusading nature of the enterprise. As we know, some of the crusaders had regarded the Lisbon campaign as a departure from their oath, and it had required Hervey de Glanvill's authority to convince them to stay. Raol's letter stresses the crusading intention as if to allay any doubts that it was some kind of diversion. He was not one of those who elected to remain in Portugal with Gilbert of Hastings on the invitation of King Afonso Henriques. If he had been, it would hardly have been necessary to deliver his trust to the Augustinians of Coimbra. He had responsibilities toward the dead and the living.

The latest date in the letter is November 1st, 1147. (David, p.37). The deed of donation shows that Raol continued in Lisbon until the following April, when King Afonso and his court were still there (or had returned). The Flemings and Germans had sailed on, on February 1st. (David p.39). If Raol remained through the months of February and March, it is likely that the Anglo-Norman contingent did the same.

Although the conquest of Lisbon was the most, if not the only enduring achievement of the Second Crusade, the connection between the two undertakings is insufficiently explored. Afonso Henriques had adopted the title of king of the Portuguese in 1140. Some three years later, he planned an attack on Lisbon with the aid of some shipmen of Southampton, William and Ralph Vitulus or Veal, (or Calf), and others. It did not succeed, and the Veals were dissatisfied with their treatment. They now became the leading voices in favour of rejecting

the offer of Afonso Henriques and continuing to the Mediterranean. St. Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux, began to preach the Second Crusade at Vézelay in March 1146. At about the same time, Afonso Henriques, now a man in his thirties, married Mafalda, daughter of Amadeus III, Count of Savoy and Piedmont, and of Mafalda of Albon. The date of the wedding is not known, but was probably not long before July 1146, when both husband and wife attested a donation in favour of Santa Cruz at Coimbra. The first son of the marriage was born on March 5th, 1147, a few days before the king set out to capture Santarém, the necessary prelude to the conquest of Lisbon. The prince was named Henry, after his Burgundian grandfather, but he did not survive.

The great monastery of Santa Cruz at Coimbra had been founded, on land granted by Afonso, while not yet count, in 1130, its cornerstone being laid the following June. Its founder, Archdeacon Telo, died in 1136, but it was already on the way to become the royal treasury and perhaps scriptorium: both Afonso Henriques and his son Sancho I are buried there. Telo had visited Jerusalem soon after its conquest in the First Crusade, and intended that the monastery should have the design of the Holy Sepulchre. His pupil and successor, Teotónio, Prior of Santa Cruz from 1131 until his resignation in 1152, had also made the pilgrimage in 1126, staying at the Sepulchre with the Augustinians, established there some dozen years earlier.⁷ The chronicler of the foundation and historian of the Augustinians in Portugal, Fr. Nicolau de Santa Maria, had no doubt that St. Bernard knew of the sanctity of Prior Teotónio, sending him gifts and monks and establishing close relations between Clairvaux and Coimbra, though his statements appear to have been taken from Fr. António Brandão.⁸ But no documentary evidence has appeared, nor is there any precise indication of a date.⁹

An undated letter of St. Bernard indicates that Afonso Henriques applied to St. Bernard for aid, sending his brother Pedro to formulate the request. This brother of the king is otherwise unknown, a fact which has been held to invalidate the reply of St. Bernard. This runs:

I have received the letter of Your Highness with great pleasure in Him who sent "deliverance to Israel". What I have done in the matter will be evident from the outcome, as you will see for yourself. You will see with what promptitude I have complied with your request and with the exigencies of the matter. Peter, the brother of Your Highness, and a prince

worthy of all honour, has acquainted me with your wishes. After having travelled through all Gaul in arms (*Gallia armis pervagante*), he is campaigning in Lotharingia (in *Lotharingia militat*), and will soon be fighting in the hosts of the Lord (*proxime militaturus Domini exercitum*). My son Roland will bring you the documents which set forth the liberality of the Holy See.

The letter is given by Migne (CLXXX, po.1.) and appears in the English translation of B. Scott James.¹⁰ In his life of St. Bernard, the Abbé Vacandard includes a note on the chronology of the letters, rejecting a few as apocryphal or doubtful, though he does not give his reasons. His chapter on the origins of the Second Crusade is primarily concerned with Bernard's influence on the rulers of his day, and though he knows of Stubbs' edition of the Conquest of Lisbon, he seems unaware of the importance of the event, or indeed of the composition of the expedition, which he takes to be a Flemish and German affair, with a minor English participation. He notes the difficulty in establishing the dates when the crusade was announced and adopted, placing the letter to the bishops of Cologne and Spire in September-November 1146 and noting that the letter to the Bavarians was read at Ratisbon on February 13th (1147).¹¹ The letter "ad gentem Anglorum" is undated, but Vacandard supposes that it followed those to the Flemings and Germans, without giving reasons. No account of the conquest of Lisbon is given, but "en même temps, le roi des Espagnes" had addressed Eugene III: "Alphonse, prince de la maison de ducs de Bourgogne et petit-fils du roi Robert, projetait d'arracher Lisbonne aus Maures de la Péninsule." There would appear to be some confusion between Afonso Henriques and his cousin Alfonso VII, the Emperor of Leon.¹² To the best of my knowledge, no record of this other R. — Roland — or of his mission to Portugal has been preserved. The problem of the king's supposed brother remains intractable. If there had been a full brother by Count Henry and Queen Tarasia, he would have been almost as old as the King, and some documentary evidence of his existence would have survived. If he were a half-brother by Queen Tarasia and Fernão Peres de Trava, he might have been a youth in his twenties. He might have been a brother of Queen Mafalda: it was usual for a brother to escort a sister on her marriage abroad, but as no document has survived for the wedding, it is impossible to say. Afonso Henriques had a son named Pedro, born out of wedlock, but his career belongs to the latter part of the king's long reign, and he could not have been an active soldier

and ambassador in 1146. But these considerations do not affect the validity of the situation shown in the letter of St. Bernard. The king was in touch with the organizer of the crusade, and the appearance of the crusading fleet at Oporto did not come as a surprise to him.

The absence of references to the cemetery of the English in the documentation of Santa Cruz is also surprising. However, one of the incidents reported by the chronicler Nicolau de Santa Maria in favor of the holiness of Teotónio shows that an English monk from the crusading expedition did go to Coimbra. One Samuel "of the company of those who came to the conquest of Lisbon", went there to see the Prior, attracted by his reputation for sanctity. He fell ill and was tormented by the devil with horrible visions, the only remedy for which was the presence of the Prior, whom the Enemy could not face. No date is given, but Teotónio resigned the Priorate in 1152 and died ten years later, so that the visit was probably soon after the conquest.

5.

We may now return to Raol and his account of the conquest. The title "De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi" was invented by Stubbs. The "De Expeditione" appears in the Corpus Christi index written in the sixteenth century: it overlooks the fact that the expedition was destined for Palestine, whilst the account ends with the capture of Lisbon, not originally contemplated. The title suggested by Raol's donation is "De obsidone", for he refers to his arrival as "in obsidionem Olyxbone veniens". In the Cambridge manuscript the word *obsidio* is constantly used, rather than *expugnatio*. It is indeed more accurate, since it reflects the protracted nature of the enterprise. Raol's deed does use the latter term, but only in reference to the daily operations, *cotidiana expugnatio*, not to the campaign as a whole.

As regards the name Raol, it is attested by the priest's own statement "Ego superdictus Raol presbyter hanc paginam facere iussi . . . hoc signum facio." The form is characteristic of north-central France. Professor C.V. Aubrun, himself of the region, says: "Raol est de langue français (et plus du Maine, de l'Anjou, ou du Berry que de la Picardie." It gives the toponym Châteauroux. The Norman English equivalent is Ralph and the Latin Radulfus, Ranulfus, both of which forms occur in the charter of Butley Priory. In Portugal the name is very uncommon, but J. Mattoso records a Randulfo Soleimas, a knight of Coimbra (1125-

1160).¹³

C.W. David's quest for the author led him to Dougdale's *Monasticon anglicanum*, where the foundation charter of Butley Priory is given, with 27 named witnesses, who include "Osberto de Baldreseia" clericus. David was dissuaded from the idea that he had found the author, whom he saw to be a priest, by J.C. Russell, who noted that if so, he would probably not be called clericus, but presbyter, sacerdos, or persona. C.R. Cheney saw that the inclusion in the charter of Bawdsey church favoured the identification, but that Osbert could not be the author. There is now no need to doubt that Osbert was the recipient. In the charter of Bawdsey there figure not only Ranulf de Glanvill, the donor, but three other Glanvills, including a Hervey, as well as Osbert of Bawdsey and Ranulf of Bawdsey.

Bawdsey was a berewick in the hundred of Wilford and had once belonged to Edric of Laxford, whose possessions were seized after the Norman usurpation by Robert Malet, one of the most powerful of the intruders in Suffolk. At the time of Doomsday, a Robert de Glanvill held the manor of Holesey and, as undertenant of Malet, the berewick of Bawdsey. His son and grandson were each named Hervey. David's note (p.55, n.2) says: "though it may not be absolutely necessary to conclude that there were two Herveys, father and son, this is an interference which seems too probable to be ignored." One Hervey is documented before 1126, and David cites a reference to Hervey, son of Hervey. There is also a reference of c. 1146 to Hervey de Glanvill *proveccioris aetatis homo*. It seems useless to debate the shades of meaning between "an old man" and "an older man". Raol's Hervey was constable of the men of Suffolk and of Norfolk, and appears in the narrative as a mature and respected man of counsel rather than an active young warrior: his personal influence over the Anglo-Norman contingent was crucial.

One of the Herveys was the father of Ranulf de Glanvill, whose public career opens with his appointment as sheriff of Yorkshire in 1162. His fortunes reached their zenith when he captured William the Lion, king of Scotland, in 1174. He became chief justiciar of England in 1180, and is the supposed author of *De legibus Angliae*. He ceased to be justiciar in 1189, and died before Acre in 1191. In an article on him, Professor J.C. Russell says "there is good reason to believe that Ranulf wrote the remarkable crusading chronicle "The Conquest of Lis-

bon" and the short but interesting account of an East-Anglian shire-moot a few years later." ¹⁴ It is supposed that Ranulf was born in about 1130, and in to make him more than eighteen at the time of the Conquest of Lisbon, Russell extends the date of his birth back to about 1120, attributing the 1130 to anonymous library-cards." He proceeds: "from this point on we are assuming that the three (texts) are the work of one man, and that author Ranulf de Glanvill. One is welcome to doubt on the subject; it is almost too good to be true, a hitherto unknown (sic) chapter in the life of the great English justiciar. Belief in his authorship is enhanced if this writing seems to fit with the rest of Glanvill's career." The argument would not require much attention had not Russel implied that C.W. Dvid gave grounds for it: there is nothing in David's edition of 1936 to suggest that he entertained any such belief.

The precise relationship between the witnesses of the Butley charter is difficult to determine. Ranulf de Glanvill, the future justiciar, had married Bertha, daughter of Theobald de Valoines, lord of Parham, a descendant of Peter de Valoines of Doomsday. She brought him the land on which he founded Butley Priory in 1171. The charter names 27 witnesses, adding "et plures multi." The first eight names are of churchmen, headed by William de Turbe, bishop of Norwich (d. January 1174). None of the later witnesses is noted as having ecclesiastical status. The ninth is Osbert, *clericus* of Bawdsey. Nos. 10 and 11 asre Røbert de Walmures and Radolfo de Valmures. One would expect the wife's family to be prominently represented, since she had given the land, and it seems likely that these names are misread for Valeines: the 27th and the most junior witness is a Savari de Valeines, correctly spelt. If all the laymen put their names after all the clergy in order of seniority, then Osbert stands first. As Russell noted, if he is the recipient of the letter from Lisbon sent 23 years before, he would be a man of much standing and seniority.¹⁵

Among the Glanvills, after Ranulf, the donor,— sheriff of Yorkshire, but not yet captor of the Scotch king, — come Osbert de Glanville (No.12), then Gerard de Glanvill (No.14) and Hervey de Glanvill (No.26). If the usual proprieties were observed, it is impossible that the father of the donor should be placed below two otherwise unknown members of his family, Osbert and Gerard. It seems therefore that this Hervey was not the father of the future justiciar, but a much younger man. If this is so, then the elder Hervey, given so much prominence

in the letter from Lisbon, was probably already dead.

Osbert of Bawdsey, the *clericus*, the recipient of the letter, was still alive in 1171. Lower in the list, at No.25, just before the younger Hervey de Glanvill and the junior of the Valeines, appears Ranulf de Baldreseie. He was therefore also a younger man, and there is no reason to suppose that he was either a priest or to be identified with R. When Ranulf der Glanvill founded Leyston Priory in 1182, after his capture of the Lion and his promotion to chief justiciar, there is no reference in the documents to Osbert of Bawdsey.

6.

The status of the Cambridge manuscript, holograph, autograph, contemporary or later copy, has been discussed by a number of Paleographers since C.W. David rejected the views of Stubbs and Pauli that it could be R.'s original, and assigned it to a date more or less late in the twelfth century. If the manuscript is a copy not in the author's hand, the question is not affected by Raol's deed. The deed itself gives the impression of being in two hands, as if Raol himself might have written the terms of donation to which the scribe added the penalties. However, the difference, apparent in the photograph, is less so in the original, and Dr. M. J. Mexia, who is familiar with the work of Salvatus, the scribe of Santa Cruz, has suggested that it is a simply the effect of two pens, one rather worn. Although the bishop of Coimbra was not present during most of the siege, he arrived for its final stage, and would thus have been accompanied by Salvatus (if he were not already there). Since Raol says "hanc paginam facere iussi," it seems that the document was written for him, and that only the sign of the cross was in his hand. The late Professor T.J. Brown, of King's College, London, kindly examined photographs of the deed and the page of the manuscript reproduced by C.W. David, and noted that the hands differ specifically in the use of at least four signs. With respect to the Corpus Christi manuscript, Professor Brown noted that the scribe uses correctly English in Dermmue and Sufolcenses, which might not be expected from a foreign writer. He compared the hand with that used in England at the middle of the twelfth century in books or treatises for private use or for glosses, less formal than bookhand "with a number of documentary features." He pointed out in particular to medical notes shown in the *Catalogue of Royal Mss.* of the British Museum (12 e

XX, plate 73, b and c, but especially c). This suggests that the Cambridge manuscript may have been copied from the original letter in England, in the lifetimes of Raol, Osbert of Bawdsey and Hervey de Glanvill.

Professor Brown also drew my attention to M.S. Parkes' article on the "The date of the Oxford manuscript of the *Chanson de Roland*" (*Medioeva Romanzo*, Bologna, 10, no.2, 1985, 161-175), which notes that innovations from Europe appear in English schools and among Anglo-Normans educated in France at an early date, so that the date of the Oxford Roland may be limited to the period 1119 to 1149. Parkes mentions French or French-trained *magistri* early in the twelfth century, at Lincoln, Oxford and Dunstable (p.171-2). The probable use of the extravagant version of Roland to excite Normans to participate in the Second Crusade opens interesting perspectives which cannot be pursued here. In any case, the question of Raol's native language is separate from the copying of his account of the siege of Lisbon, the former being French and the latter assuredly English.

Raol's hermitage remained in existence until the site was devastated by the great Lisbon earthquake of November 1, 1755. The present Church of the Martyrs was built in the second half of the eighteenth century, some distance away in the Chiado. The burial-ground was near the site of the monastery of St. Francis, which after the dissolution became the home of the National Library now at Campo Grande. Here, two hundred and forty years before the Treaty of Windsor, the memory of the English participation in the conquest of Lisbon was perpetuated by the priest Raol.

Editor's note: This article was written by Professor Livermore and was the basis of his lecture given at the British Council, the 17th of October, 1989.

NOTES

1. Rui Pinto de Azevedo, A Carta ou memória do cruzado inglês, R., *Revista Portuguesa de História*, VII, 2, Coimbra 1957 (but issued in 1960).
2. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (Ms. 470 ff. 125r to 146r).
3. Charles Wendell David, *De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi, The Conquest of Lisbon*, New York, Columbia University Press, Records of Civilization, Sources and Studies, No. XXIV.
4. *Bulletin des Etudes portugaises*, N.S., v 11, 1947, p. 241-254. In his note on the toponym 'medica in frigorei', P. David remarked that this was not Mesão Frio north of the Douro, but a hill at Paus on the Vouga, 15km. east of Aveiro and 8km. south of Albergaria a Velha. The toponym is not uncommon, from Mansione Frígida, whence Meigeon frio, Mejão frio: it is fully identified by Pe. Miguel de Oliveira, *Lenda e Histórica*, Lisbon 1964, p. 100, n. 36. Pierre David noted that the masculine 'frio' arose from confusion with *medicus*, Old French *mege*, made feminine to agree with *silva*. The argument is open to two objections: 1. French *mege* has parallels in Catalan *metge* and in Galician ('e dizem meges que husam tal preyte que a tal chaga jamais nunca sarra', Alfonso X, *Cancioneiro da Biblioteca Nacional*, II, no. 440, p. 378); 2. the form was probably not invented by R., but received from a French speaker, perhaps a fellow-priest. This may still indicate that R. spoke French, though the evidence is less direct.
5. "A Carta ou memoria do cruzado ingles, R. *Revista Portuguesa de Historia*, VII, Homenagem ao Professor P.David, 2, Coimbra 1957, but issued in 1960.
6. "The persons named in the account by R. are: Fernando Mendes de Bragança II, 'o Bravo' or 'o Braganção', called *socer regis* by R. (but the husband of the King's sister); Fernando Captivo or Peres, de Soverosa (fl. 1129-55), born in Galicia, son of the *comes* of Sobrado, who arrived in Portugal in 1128, was *alferes* (1130-36), and succeeded Egas Moniz as *mordomo-mór* an office he held until his death; Goncalvo Rodrigues; Gocelo de Seusa; Menendo Afonso or Mendo Ildefonsi, fl. 1128-57 a knight of Coimbra from Refoios de Lima, where the monastery adopted the rule of Santa Cruz; Mutio de Lamego; Pedro Pelagio or Pero Pais da Maia, *alferes* from 1147 to 1169, when he was exiled after the loss of Badajoz and passed into the service of Leon; Johanne Raino or João de Raina and Goncalvo Sotheri.
Goncalvo de Sousa is Goncalo Mendes de Sousa, 'o Sousão', who followed Fernao Cativo as *mordomo-mór*, 1156-67, the most influential man in the court after the death of Egas Moniz; Rodrigo Pais was *alcaide* of Coimbra from 1138 to 1158, is called *dux militum* of Coimbra in 1152., was governor of Lisbon in 1158, but was removed after the Muslim advance of 1159.
For details of these, see Jose Mattoso, *Nobreza medieval*, 1981, and *Ricos-homens, infancoes e cavaleiros*, 1982.

7. E.A. O'Malley, *Tello and Theotónio, the twelfth-century Founders of the Monastery of Santa Cruz in Coimbra*, Washington 1954.
8. Nicolão de Santa Maria, *Crónica da ordem dos cônegos regrantes do patriarcha S. Agostinho*, Lisbon 1668, especially vol. II, Book IX, ch. 2 Vida do Padre Santo Theotónio, drawing on Brandão, *Monarchia Lusitana* part 3, ch. 43. In 1136 one Pedro was sent to copy the customs of St. Ruf near Avignon, which were adopted at Santa Cruz. Archdeacon Telo had earlier visited St. Ruf O'Mally, p. 82, 86).
9. Theotónio became prior in 1136, and St. Bernard died in August 1153. O'Malley supposes that St. Bernard sent a staff to Teotónio at the foundation of Alcobaga, completed in September 1152 (p. 149).
10. *Letters of St. Bernard of Clairvaux*, London 1953, p.469, no. 397.
11. Vacandard, *Vie de St. Bernard, abbé de Clairvaux*, Paris 1895, 2 v. Ch. XXVII, Les origens de la seconde croisade, and Appendix E, Essai sur la chronologie des lettres de St. Bernard. Letters to Cologne, v. 2. p. 282, to Bavarians p. 293.
12. *Ibid*, p. 301, n. 3. Vacarand mentions among the Italian participants, Amadeus of Turin.
13. J. Mattoso, *Ricos-homens*. The name does not occur in Mattoso's *Nobreza medieval*.
14. *Speculum*, 45, 1970, p. 69-79.
15. Dugdale's *Monasticon*, 1846 edition, covers Butley in v. 6, p. 380: document 4 gives a short biography of Ranulf. Leiston (Leystone) is at v. 6, p. 880. (C.W. David uses an earlier edition).