



<http://kentarchaeology.org.uk/research/archaeologia-cantiana/>

Kent Archaeological Society is a registered charity number 223382

© 2017 Kent Archaeological Society

## BECKET MEMORANDA.

---

I.—ON A STONE IN THE “MARTYRDOM” OF CANTERBURY CATHEDRAL.

II.—ON THE KINDRED OF ARCHBISHOP BECKET.

BY THE REV. J. C. ROBERTSON,  
CANON OF CANTERBURY.\*

### I.

Among the objects which are usually pointed out to visitors who make the round of our Cathedral is the stone on which Archbishop Thomas Becket is said to have fallen in death, and especially that part of it where the original material has been taken out, and another piece has been inserted in its stead. It would seem from the Report of the Archæological Meeting held at Canterbury in 1844, that a good deal was said about this small subject at that meeting; but as no attempt was made to bring the light of historical evidence to bear on it, we may still find room for saying something further.

There can, I suppose, be no doubt that, as the

\* These short papers were written in consequence of a request that the author would prepare some contribution for the Canterbury meeting of the Archæological Institute. The first of them was read at the spot to which it relates, in the course of the perambulation of the cathedral, under the guidance of Canon Venables, on the 23rd of July, 1875.

Dean of Westminster says in his well-known and admirable "Memorials of Canterbury," "the spot is proved by its exact accordance with the localities so minutely described in the several [contemporary] narratives," to be "precisely the place where Becket fell."\* But there is strong reason for believing that the stone which we now see is not that which occupied the spot at the time of the murder; for Robert of Swapham, a monk of Peterborough, in his history of that church,† tells us that Benedict (one of the writers who have given an account of the Archbishop's death), on being translated from the priory of Christchurch, Canterbury, to the abbacy of Peterborough, in 1177, carried off the stones "on which the holy martyr fell," and made them into two altars for his new church. Unless, therefore, we disbelieve this writer's express statement, the stone which is now in our cathedral must have been substituted for that which received the dying Archbishop's body. And if we take this view as to the entire stone, we must, of course, reject the popular story that, where we see the square insertion, the original piece, being the part on which his head rested, was cut out and sent to Rome, where it is said to be still preserved as a relic.

But even if we set aside Robert of Swapham's authority, let us see how this story will bear examination. Whether such a piece of stone as is supposed could have been cut out entire, and that with the tools of the twelfth century,—whether, as a matter of fact, the hole extends throughout the thickness of the flag-stone,—I do not care to inquire. Let us confine ourselves to the historical evidence.

\* Ed. 1, p. 78.

† "Cœnobii Burgensis Historia," in Sparke's collection, p. 101.

We are told, then,—

(1) That the popular story has the support of local tradition.

(2) That Baronius speaks of the cardinals who had been sent by Alexander III. to treat with King Henry after the murder as having “brought back with them [to Rome] a part of the pavement on which the Archbishop’s brains had been scattered,” adding that they were placed in the church of St. Mary Major.\*

(3) That the corresponding piece is still preserved at Rome; nay, that a person has been seen anxiously measuring the hole in the Canterbury pavement, as if to compare it with a measurement supposed to have been taken from the original stone.†

Yet, formidable as this “threefold cord” of evidence may seem, I believe that, by an exception to the wise man’s saying, it may be “quickly broken.”

(1) The Canterbury tradition appears to have originated within the present century,—nearly six centuries and a half too late. It is not mentioned by any of our earlier topographers, although among these were Somner, a native of Canterbury, and all his life familiar with the Cathedral; Battely, brother of a prebendary and archdeacon, and himself vicar of a parish in the immediate neighbourhood of the city; and Gostling, the genial old gossiping minor canon: men who from their positions could not have failed to know the story if it had been current in their days, and who could hardly have failed to record it if it had been known to them. The passage in which Battely speaks of the stone appears to go about as far

\* Morris, “Life of St. Thomas Becket,” 390.

† Dunkin, “Report of the Archæological Meeting at Canterbury, 1844,” p. 246.

as is possible in the way of negative evidence. "It is commonly said," writes this antiquary, "that the stones of the pavement on which [the Archbishop] fell down dead, have the marks of his fall, and are stained with his blood. Some devout persons of the Roman communion will fall prostrate and kiss the pavement in that place, and have got off some little chips from the stones there, as big as diamond sparks, and perhaps to them as valuable. But I will inform them that, although the place where he gave up the ghost is to be seen, yet the stones upon which he expired have been removed several hundred years ago; for Benedict the prior carried them with him to the Abbey of Peterborough." "This remark," adds Battely, "may lessen the price of the fragments of that stone."\* From this passage, which speaks so particularly as to the stone, but gives no hint of the story as to the square insertion, we may pretty safely infer that that story was not current in 1703, when Battely's enlarged edition of Somner appeared. And a like inference may be drawn from the silence of Dart, Gostling, and others, down to Hasted, A.D. 1799, and to Wild, A.D. 1807. The earliest appearance of the story that I am aware of is in Woolnoth's "Canterbury Cathedral," which bears the date of 1816.† But, having once found its way into print, it is repeated by the next historian of our Cathedral, Britton, in 1821, and by the later writers in general,—a circumstance which seems to add to the probability that, if the older topographers had been acquainted with it, they too would have put it on record.

(2) We next come to the supposed confirmation by Baronius; and we find that this rests simply on a

\* Supplement to Somner, p. 22.

† P. 59.

mistranslation. For the great annalist's words are: "Intulerunt in urbem sacra pignora novi martyris, nempe quod super ecclesiæ pavementum respersum fuerat ejus capitis cerebrum, necnon ejus tunicam ipsius sanguine cruentatam; quæ hactenus reliquiæ asservantur in basilica S. Mariæ Majoris."\* All that Baronius says therefore is, that the legates brought to Rome, among other relics, the martyr's brains which had been shed on the pavement, together with his tunic, and that these,—the brains and the tunic,—were preserved at St. Mary Major; and we may fairly infer that he knew nothing either of any record that the legates also brought with them a portion of the stone on which the brains had been scattered, or of a belief that such a fragment was in his own day extant at Rome.

(3) We have to examine the statement that the missing piece of stone is still preserved at Rome.

Although several alleged relics of St. Thomas *are* preserved there, and are occasionally exhibited on certain festivals, no one, I believe, can be found who professes to have ever seen the square piece of stone, to know where it is, or to have heard of it except in the form of inquiries after it. But surely, if there were at Rome a relic so remarkable, so interesting, and (according to the supposition) so well attested, of a saint so famous and revered as Thomas of Canterbury, it would be among the most cherished treasures of any church to which it might belong, and would be displayed at appropriate times with all suitable ceremony and publicity.

At St. Mary Major are some small bags, which are said to contain portions of the martyr's blood and

\* 'Annales Ecclesiastici,' A.D. 1172. 12.

brains,—the same, no doubt, that Baronius speaks of. In 1852 these bags were seen by the Dean of Westminster, then a Canon of Canterbury; but on asking after the square stone, he was told that nothing was known of it. My own attempts to see the bags in 1859 and in 1863 were unsuccessful. In 1861 the late Dean Alford saw them, and was told that they were supposed to contain “little bits of stone, with blood and brains” (*piccoli pezzi di pietra, con sangue e cervello*); but whatever construction we may put on these words,\* they bring no confirmation to the Canterbury story, which speaks, not of many little bits of stone or grit, but of one entire piece more than four inches square. I have been told on authority which I cannot doubt, that the late eminent antiquary Dr. Rock (who, as a member of the Roman Church, must have enjoyed especial advantages for such an inquiry), after having done all that he could to discover the stone, was convinced that it had no existence.

As for the tale of the mysterious Unknown who is said to have employed his compasses or his measuring-tapes on the Canterbury pavement, the most respectful way of disposing of it may be to suggest that perhaps he was on his way *to* Rome, not *from* Rome, and that he may be supposed to have taken his measurement with a hope of verifying it there—a hope in which, unless he was more fortunate than other travellers, he must have found himself disappointed.

---

\* Dean Alford suspected that the “little bits of stone” had been added to the supposed contents of the bags, in consequence of inquiries suggested by the publication of Dean Stanley’s “Memorials.”

## II.

Thirty years ago it was generally believed that the father of Archbishop Becket was (what we are not now allowed to call) a Saxon, and that his mother was a Saracen,—Gilbert being the hero, and Matilda the heroine, of a romantic legend which was then generally accepted as historical. But it is, I believe, now agreed that, although settled in London, they were both of Norman descent, if not both of Norman birth. Whether the name of Becket belonged to Thomas as a hereditary surname is, however, still a matter of dispute; and, therefore, as I wish for the present to avoid all controversy, I beg that, where I make use of this name, I may be understood as doing so for the sake of convenience only.

It will be remembered that, when the Archbishop sought a refuge in France, Henry II. banished all his kindred; a cruel measure, of which this is not the only instance in the history of those times. How far the tie of kindred was reckoned to extend—how far, indeed, its ramifications may be supposed to have been known to those who carried out the King's order,—I cannot undertake to say; but we find various relatives mentioned from time to time as sharing the penalty of exile.

Thus, in one letter,\* the Archbishop recommends a sister's son to the Dean and Chapter of Reims, with a request that the boy may be maintained in their house, and may be made to apply to grammatical studies. In another letter he bespeaks the assistance of the Archbishop elect of Syracuse† for his sister's son G.,

\* Ep. 103, ed. Giles.

† Roger Palmieri, elected 1157, consecrated 1169. Gams, Series Episcoporum, 954.



—an initial which may mean either the Geoffrey or the Gilbert whom we shall presently meet with;\* most probably Gilbert, as we know that *he* visited Italy. Elsewhere we find Pope Alexander III. thanking the Abbot of Clair-Marais, near St. Omer, for his kindness to a sister of the Archbishop and her children;† and among the documents of our cathedral is a copy of a letter hitherto unpublished, in which the Pope mentions that William, then Archbishop elect of Sens, one of Becket's strongest supporters, had been in the habit of making a monthly allowance to the exile's nephew, Geoffrey, and begs that the same amount may now be bestowed on Geoffrey's cousin Gilbert, who was studying at Bologna, and that, in order to save him the expense of messengers, it may be paid in one annual sum.‡

In these notices it will be observed that there is no mention of any brother of the Archbishop, nor does any such person appear, so far as I am aware, in any of the contemporary documents. We know, however, the names of three sisters. One of these, Mary, who was probably the youngest, became a nun. In 1173, at the time when her brother was canonized by the Pope, and when King Henry had especial reason to conciliate the hierarchical party, she was appointed by him to the Abbacy of Barking, at the suggestion of Odo, Prior of Canterbury, and, as we are expressly told, out of regard for her brother.§

Garnier, of Pont Ste. Maxence, one of the earliest

\* Ep. 151.

† Ep. 196.

‡ The Pope's letter will be found at the end of this paper.

§ "Contemplatione fratris," R. de Diceto, ap. Twysden, 570; Gervas. ib. 1424; Taxter, contin. Flor. Vigorn. ii. 153; Monast. Angl. i. 437.

biographers of the saint, has recorded in lively French verses the hospitality and other kindness which this lady and her sisterhood lavished on him when he visited her convent for the purpose of collecting information about his hero :—

“ L’abesse, suer Saint Thomas,  
 Pur s’onor et pur le barun  
 M’ad doné palefrei et dras ;  
 N’i faillent nis li esperun.  
 Ne getai pas mes dez sur as  
 Quant jo tornai à sa meisun !  
 \* \* \* \* \*  
 Et les dames m’unt fet tut gras  
 Chescune d’eles de sun dun.”\*

Another sister was Roheise—*Rohesia*,—the name being evidently the same with that of Roësa, which, according to one biographer,† was borne by the Archbishop’s mother, who is more commonly called Matilda. Roheise was married,—to whom I cannot say,—and she appears to have been a widow at the time when her name first comes before us. This was on the occasion of King Henry’s penitential visit to the martyr’s tomb in July 1174, when Garnier tells us that the King entreated forgiveness of St. Thomas’s sister, and in redress (for his supposed concern in the murder) gave her a mill, which brought her an income of full ten marks a year.‡ This was the mill known as East-bridge, or King’s Mill, near the ancient hospital in the High Street of Canterbury. It had been given by

\* Garnier, ed. Hippeau, pp. 206-7.

† The so-called Anonymus Lambethiensis (*i.e.*, a writer whose work is preserved in Lambeth Library).—Giles, ii. 73.

‡ “ La sueur saint Thomas merci quist et cria,  
 Et en adreusement un molin li dona,  
 Bien ualt dis mars par an la rente qu’ ele en a.”—P. 212.

King Stephen to the monastery of St. Augustine, in consideration of a loan advanced to him by the abbot, and it had been made over to Henry by Clarembald, an intruder, who held the abbacy for some years, but had lately been ejected.\* I am indebted to the honoured founder of the Kent Archæological Association, my late friend Mr. Larking, for some extracts from documents in the Record Office, as to payments to Roheise from this mill. The first entry is in the year next after the date of the gift—21 Hen. II. A.D. 1175. In 31 Hen. II., her son John, who had probably grown up in the interval, is admitted to a share in the pension; and three years later, in 1188, he appears alone, from which it may probably be inferred that Roheise was then dead. In the Pipe Roll of 1 Richard I., edited by the late Mr. Joseph Hunter for the Record Commission, is an entry recording a payment of £11 from the King's alms in Canterbury mill, to "John, the son of Roheise, sister of St. Thomas."† And we find by one of our chapter documents (L. 4) that this John was a clerk, and was presented by Prior Alan (one of the Saint's biographers) and the convent of Christchurch to the vicarage of St. Mary Bothaw, in the City of London.

Roheise was probably also the mother of Ralph, who is described as a nephew of St. Thomas, and appears to have inherited his ecclesiastical principles. This Ralph was concerned in an uproar arising out of the differences between the Pope and Archbishop Baldwin, in 1188, and was, with other citizens of Canterbury, imprisoned by order of King Henry for

\* See Thorn, in Twysden, 1827, 1881; Somner, ed. Battely, App. 7; Hasted, iv. 438.

† P. 231. Cf. Pauli, *Gesch. von England*, iii. 103.

refusing to communicate with the Archbishop's partisans when these had been excommunicated by Pope Clement III.\*

The third known sister of the Archbishop was Agnes, who married Thomas son of Theobald of Helles, and, in conjunction with him, founded and endowed a hospital for the brotherhood of St. Thomas of Acre on the site in Cheapside where Gilbert Becket's house had stood, and which is now occupied by the Mercers' chapel. (Let me remark in passing that this name "St. Thomas of Acre" is not, as has been imagined, any evidence in favour of the story which connects the Archbishop's mother with Syria. The words "of Acre" do not relate to the Saint himself, but to the brotherhood which was founded in honour of him at that place.) Agnes is also said to have given, after her husband's death, a rent of ten shillings to St. Saviour's Hospital, Bermondsey; and the deed of gift is witnessed by "Theobald, knight, nephew of the blessed Thomas the Martyr"—probably her son.† Through this channel it has been supposed that a great historical house, that of the Butlers of Ormonde, was connected with the Archbishop, according to an old family tradition which was set forth in a petition to the King and Parliament in 32 Henry VI., and is supposed to have received a sort of parliamentary sanction from the granting of the petition.‡ But it need hardly be said that the success of the petition affords no sufficient ground for supposing that the parliament investigated the alleged connection with

\* Gervas. ap. Twysden, 1531; Stubbs, *Memorials of Richard I.*, vol. ii. pp. lxx., 201, 209.

† Carte, "Life of the Duke of Ormonde," i. Introduction xiv. ed. 1736.

‡ *Ib.* viii.-ix.

Becket and found it to be proved ; or that, even if it were so, the evidence which satisfied the parliament ought to be taken on trust by us. A later Archbishop, Hubert Walter (A.D. 1194-1205), was certainly the brother of that Theobald who went to Ireland, and founded the Ormonde family ; but, although Carte, in his *Life of the great Duke of Ormonde*, gives two conjectural pedigrees, which exhibit Hubert as the great-nephew of Thomas Becket, I am not aware that any connection between the two Archbishops is mentioned by the older writers.

It seems indeed likely that the Butlers were not descended from Thomas Fitz Theobald and the sister of St. Thomas, but from another son of Theobald of Helles, so as to have had no blood-relationship with the Archbishop's family.

As to the place which is connected with the elder Theobald's name, it is identified by Carte with a district called Heilli, in the county of Tipperary. But this involves the mistake of antedating the connection of the family with Ireland ; and it would seem that in truth the name of Helles here designates an ancient chapelry in Kent, now united with Darenth, and which, like Darenth itself, belonged to the see of Canterbury until Archbishop Hubert transferred it to the monks of Rochester in exchange for Lambeth. The Thomas who is named in the deed of exchange as a tenant under the Archbishop was probably no other than the husband of Agnes.

Agnes had, like her sister Roheise, a son named John, who entered into holy orders, and was appointed by the prior and convent of Christchurch to the vicarage of Halstow.\*

\* Cant. Documents, F. 89-90.

We have seen that the fame of the Martyr helped the fortunes of his sisters Roheise and Mary, and at a somewhat later time we find that it was turned to account by others of his relations, but that these had sunk into a very needy condition. Indeed the matter looks very much as if they relied on his name for the means of living in idleness and beggary. Thus, in the Cathedral accounts of 1221—half a century after the murder, and the year following that which witnessed the translation of the Saint's remains to the costly shrine erected in the new eastward extension of the church—we read that two of his nephews—William, a clerk, and Andrew,—had their shoes mended at a cost of twelvecence to the convent of Christchurch.\* Soon after this, Andrew is supplied with linen which costs twenty pence, and William gets sixpence for his shoes, and twelvecence for some purpose which is not specified—possibly for maintenance or pocket-money.† In these latter entries the two are not styled, as at first, *nepotes*, but *consanguinei* of St. Thomas; so that we may suppose them to have probably been his great-nephews. They continued to be shod and clothed at the expense of the convent; in fact their consumption of shoe-leather is very serious, so as to give an idea that either they were much given to pedestrian exercise or the material was not durable; and the supply or repair is usually connected with some noted time in the ecclesiastical year—such as Easter, Lammas, or Michaelmas. By and by another kinsman of the Saint turns up,—a claimant named Roger, who had just returned from a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, apparently much out both at his elbows and at his toes. The monks provide him with woollen clothes to the

\* Cant. Documents, C. 165.

† *Id.*

value of 7s. 9½d., and, like his relations Andrew and William, he continues to receive supplies of linen and shoes from time to time.

In quite another quarter a necessitous relation of the Saint appears, sixty-three years after the murder—a niece, who is recorded in the accounts of Louis IX. of France for 1233 to have received from the saintly king, at Vincennes, a charitable gift of 100 Paris sols.\*

There were, however, in foreign countries, families which claimed a connection with St. Thomas, and were in far more prosperous circumstances. This was especially the case in Italy, although we do not know by whom these families were founded—whether by kinsmen who had found their way across the Alps during the exile, like the nephew whom Becket recommended to the Archbishop of Syracuse, and him (whether the same or another) who studied at the university of Bologna; or whether, according to a story which I shall presently mention, the settlement in Italy was after the murder. Whatever their origin may have been, families which traced a connection with the Archbishop appear to have existed in considerable numbers down to comparatively recent times, and perhaps some of them may have continued to this day. John Baptist Cola, who in 1696 published at Lucca a translation of a French Life of St. Thomas, with additions, speaks of the “Signori Becchetti” of Piacenza, Fabriano, Verona, Bercetto in the duchy of Parma, Sacca in Sicily, and elsewhere, as related to the Saint.† As to one of the places here named, Fabriano, I may mention, on the authority of a life

\* Bouquet, *Recueil des Historiens de la France*, xxi. 241.

† Pp. 179-181.

of the Archbishop by Mr. Morris (now, I believe, a member of the Jesuit society), that John and Peter Becchetti, Augustinian hermits of Fabriano, who flourished about the year 1400, appear to have attained the honour of beatification in the Roman Church.\* Bucelinus, in 1665, mentions among those who had assisted him in compiling his "Notitia Germaniæ," "Jerome Fabriani, Baron de Becket, of the family of St. Thomas of Canterbury."† At Verona, which is also named by Cola, there is in the church of St. Thomas of Canterbury the tomb of John Baptist Becket, who is said in the inscription to have been of the Archbishop's family;‡ but I do not know the date.

After mentioning the various families of Becchetti, Cola goes on to name, as the most conspicuous of the Archbishop's connections then living, "Signor Comendatore di Malta, Andrea Minerbetti, of Florence," in whose family the baptismal name of Thomas was always kept up, and the festival of the Saint was celebrated with great solemnity. Cola does not explain the nature of the supposed relationship between the St. Thomas and the Minerbetti family; but some light is thrown on the subject by a letter published in "Notes and Queries" in 1860. "A certain Italian marquis," says the writer, "told me that his mother had been the last descendant of the noble Pisan family of Minabekti" (so the correspondent of "Notes and Queries" spells the name), "and that the origin of this family was, that, after the death of St. Thomas of Canterbury, a younger brother ran away from England and settled at Pisa; that he called himself *Becket*

\* Pp. 386-7, 442.

† For this reference I am indebted to Professor Stubbs.

‡ Murray's Hand-book for North Italy, 257, ed. 1854.



*minor*, which in due time was transformed into the name given above.”\*

This looks to me like bad etymology, and bad history too, although some countenance is given to the story by the Miss Horners, who in their valuable book entitled “Walks in Florence,” tell us that “the Archbishop’s family is supposed to have been so cruelly persecuted in England that they had to fly their country, and about the end of the twelfth century to have established themselves in Lucca, from whence they removed to Florence.”† That the Archbishop’s relations were persecuted for his sake after his death is a statement quite opposed to facts, although we have seen that, seventeen or eighteen years later, his nephew Ralph was imprisoned for his own personal doings. And possibly this nephew may have removed to Italy as being a more favourable soil than England for his Hildebrandine opinions. But I still think that, if any of the Archbishop’s relations settled in Italy, it was more likely during his exile than after his death.

The authoresses of “Walks in Florence” tell us that “the name Minerbetti is supposed to be a corruption of that of Becket;” and this, I suppose, we must accept, although we may altogether distrust the theory as to *Becket minor*. In any case, it is certain that the Minerbetti were a family of note at Florence. “Messer Ruggiero Minerbetti fought on the Guelphic side at the battle of Montaperti, 1260;” another Minerbetti, who bore the Archbishop’s name of Thomas, is mentioned as a contemporary of Dante;‡ and “thirty

\* Second series, ix. 63.

† ii. 211.

‡ Balbo, Vita di Dante, Turin, 1839, vol. i. 313.

members of the family filled the office of prior of the republic between 1283 and 1531.”\*

I must apologize for the unsatisfactory character of a paper which contains perhaps less of certainty than of uncertainty; but possibly the scattered notices which I have collected may be turned to account by some more skilful investigator.

#### LETTER OF POPE ALEXANDER III.

“Alexander episcopus, servus servorum Dei, dilecto filio W. Senonensi electo salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.

“Quanto te circa opera pietatis et misericordiæ magis sollicitum esse cognoscimus, tanto te pro his confidentius nostris precibus sollicitamus qui tuo noscuntur beneficio indigere. Inde est quod liberalitatem tuam pro dilecto filio nostro Gilleberto, nepote venerabilis fratris nostri Thomæ, Cantuariensis episcopi, sollicite et attente rogamus, quatinus pro reverentia beati Petri et nostra benefi[cium] quod Gaufrido consobrino ejus intuitu et compassione prædicti archiepiscopi d[e tua] camera constitueris singulis mensibus percipiendum memorato Gilleb[erto Bono] niæ† studentem concedas; et quod tibi placuerit ut facias uno tempore anni insimul assignari, ut hoc commodius possit percipere, et in mittendis nuntiis non debeat prægravari, et nos quoque sinceritati tuæ uberrimas exinde teneamur

\* Walks in Florence, l.c.

† This name has been completed by conjecture. That the place of study in question was distant from Sens appears from the following words, and I can hardly be mistaken in identifying it with the most famous of Italian universities.

gratiarum actiones referre. Datum Beneventi x Kal. Novembris."—MS. Cant., M. 372.

For the knowledge of this and other passages in the Cathedral documents I am indebted to Mr. Sheppard, whose labours in connection with them are now well known, through his Report to the Historical MSS. Commission, and otherwise. The date of the letter might, in so far as the place of the Pope's residence is concerned, suit 1167, or either of the next two years; but the fact that William was translated from Chartres to Sens in 1168 seems to fix it in that year.

P.S.—After the preceding article had been finally revised for the press, and (by a remarkable coincidence) on the very day when I received the Icelandic 'Saga of Archbishop Thomas,' edited by my friend Mr. Magnússon, I was favoured by Mr. Sheppard with a copy of a document which shews that the claim of kindred with the Canterbury saint was advanced in the remote island of Iceland, and was acknowledged by the prior and monks of Christchurch in 1415.

*Cant. Cathedral Register, R. 19, fol. 83.*

"Littera fraternitatis concessa Wytfrido filio Juarii de Insula de Island, &c."

Omnibz Xpi fidelibus ad quos p'sentes l're pervenerint, Joh'es Sancte Cant' Eccl'ie Prior et ejusdem loci Cap'lum sal'm in D'no sempiternam. Cum non decet devocionis odoriferam famam sub modio occultari, que cotidie in martire glorioso sancto Thoma, eciam in ultimis terre finibus, miraculorum fama clarius et crebrius elucescit, mentesque hominum ad superne claritatis aciem alicit et invitat; ad communem omnium hominum noticiam eo fervenciori desiderio cupimus pervenire, quo

nonnullos credimus ea occasione ad majoris devocionis gratiam incitari, et ut ipsius patroni nostri beata merita persequamur, et in ejus meritis confidentibus subsidium pietatis divine, quantum ad nos attinet, caritative imperciamur. Hinc est quod nos Prior et Cap'lm p'fate ecclesie, dicti martiris ministri humiles et devoti, ob devocionem et precum instanciam, quibus penes nos vir venerabilis Wytfriidus filius Juarii de Insula de Ysland pro se, matre, uxore, et liberis suis, institit, et ob favorem quo dictam ecclesiam nostram et martirem gloriosum devotissime reveretur, ex cujus propagacionis linea se asserit descendisse, caritatis intuitu sibi, suisque matri, uxori, et liberis quos nunc procreavit aut in posterum procreabit, omnium devocionum participacionem que in dicta sancta ecclesia Cantuar. die ac nocte in conspectu Altissimi exercentur aut fient inperpetuum, tam in vita quam in morte elargimur; teque Wytfriidum in domo nostra capitulari una nobiscum presentem, unanimiter, Margaretam matrem tuam, Gutredam uxorem tuam, Juarium, Edmundum, Ellendrum, Thurlacum, Ceciliam, Ulfridam, Margaritam, Ingeridam, tuos liberos, licet absentes, ad nostrarum oracionum suffragia et alia pietatis opera, ac in fratres et sorores nostras, tenore presencium, specialiter acceptamus. In cujus rei testimo' sigil' n'rm co'e p'sentibz est appensum. Dat' Cantuar' in domo n'ra capitulari vii<sup>o</sup> die mens. Octobr. secundum cursum et computacionem eccl'ie Anglicane, Anno D'ni Millesimo quadringentesimo quintodecimo.