

A Matter of Choice

by Suzanne Marshall

2000

It is a sunny day in Castile^[1], June 6, 1428. The spectators sit expectantly on the scaffolding, the sound of horses, men and metal filling the air. God the Father enters the list,^[2] the gold of his apparel shimmering around him. Accompanying him, his apostles, each bearing a scroll and one of the instruments of the Passion.^[3] Setting aside scroll and cross, they reach for lance and sword and stand patiently awaiting the challengers. A hundred years earlier and a continent away, an audience in England eagerly awaits the arrival of the defender of the tournament. They are not disappointed as the Pope enters the list, followed closely by twelve cardinals.

Although these may be the most spectacular examples of religious disguise in medieval tournaments, they are by no means singular. The chronicles abound with knights dressing as abbots, monks, and religious pilgrims. In an age when religion and the accoutrements of religion were taken very seriously, these choices of disguise are startling. Questions cannot help but come to mind as words written hundreds of years ago conjure up images of the pope jousting, tonsured monks swinging swords, and canons attacking foes with pilgrims' staves. Violence and Christianity, always strange bedfellows, are once again juxtaposed. Were these disguise choices mere novelties? Simply frivolous jests and whims? Considering the importance of tournaments, there must have been more to it than that. Although the minds of men long dead cannot be known, by examining the available facts, it may be possible to come closer to answering the question of why these knights chose religious attire as their disguises.

The tournament as a distinct form of martial sport first appeared in the eleventh century. Initially, the tournament or *hastilude* was most often a melee^[4] and differed little from actual warfare. Knights fought in melees for military training, and for the ransom and goods gained by capturing other knights. Jousting in single combat does not appear until the thirteenth century.^[5] Not until the desire for personal recognition and honor overwhelmed the desire for booty did single combat become prevalent and records of disguise wearing begin to appear. Disguises did find their way into the melee format, such as the *behourd*^[6] held at Boston Fair in 1228 when an "army" of monks fought an "army" of canons, but it was primarily a development of the individual battles of the joust and the *pas d'armes*.^[7] It is also in the *pas d'armes* that the most elaborate forms of disguise are found.

The *pas d'armes*, consisting of a formal challenge and elaborate, usually allegorical, storyline, is built upon the "chivalric value which placed individual achievement above all else."^[8] Gaining popularity in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, it is the most inherently theatrical form of the tournament, and so not only lends itself to, but almost demands, the contrivance of disguise.

The cost, in both time and money, of mounting a successful tournament is staggering. By the time disguises became commonplace, a tournament and the banquets and entertainment associated with it, absorbed "the greater part of the income of some nobles."^[9] Records for the town of Ghent in Burgundy show that in 1370, over twenty percent of the town's yearly income was spent on festivals, tournaments and pageants.^[10] Expenses include the building of lists and houses, prizes (usually jewels and gold), the cost of heralds used to proclaim the event, lavish decorations, feasts and pageantry. Even if one could not assay the expense of hosting a tournament (which by the fifteenth century had become so expensive that only royalty and the wealthiest of nobles could afford to do so), the expense of tourneying itself was prohibitive. Costumes were lavish and costly. At one event held in 1475, some jousters were clad in costumes made with as much as twenty pounds of pearls.^[11] Good horses were also difficult to come



by, and so expensive that they were often borrowed. The knights often traveled tremendous distances. In 1435, Juan de Merlo was recorded as complaining about how few courses he was allowed to run at a tournament, despite the fact that he had traveled such a great distance and at such great expense.^[12]

As tournaments become more elaborate, the time necessary to prepare for such an event increased. Heralds had to be sent throughout the countryside and to other countries. In 1358, Edward III sent heralds throughout France, Germany, Brabant, Flanders and Scotland at great expense in order to proclaim a round table.^[13] If one is inviting knights from foreign countries, there must be sufficient time for them to arrive with their retinues. In 1477, Wilhelm of Saxony regretfully turned down an invitation to a tournament because he had not been given enough time to prepare.^[14] Elaborate scenery had to be built, and complicated story lines and scripts often had to be composed. Unless held at a permanent list, the list and its scaffolding have to be constructed.^[15] It was a time-consuming and cost-prohibitive undertaking. Obviously, those spending the time and money on such an event believed that it was worth the expense. The tournament was seen as a valuable commodity to those hosting it and their money and effort displayed how seriously they took it.

Although originally intended for military training, by the time the use of disguises became common, tournaments had become much more than military maneuvers. They had rather become “complex, symbolic ceremonies, frequently laden with polemical or propagandistic intent,”^[16] used by the royalty and nobility to strengthen their positions both politically and socially. An extreme example of this is seen when certain nobles

sat downe in councell, and after much talke & conference had about the bringing of their purpose to passe concerning the destruction of King Henrie, at length by the aduise of the earl of Huntington it was deuised, that they should take vpon them a solemne iusts to be enterprised ... when he (King Henry) should be most busilie marking the martiall pastime, he suddenlie should be slaine and destroyed^[17]

This assassination plot is not successful, but it does bring to question how many “accidental” deaths at tournaments were not so accidental. The fact that tournaments were usually held on great public and political occasions such as coronations, diplomatic meetings, royal entries, and weddings, stresses the political element inherent in this public display of military prowess. God the Father does not come out to joust at any generic tournament; he appears in the list at the wedding between the royal families of Castile and Portugal. Tournaments were deliberately held at such critical events and consciously used as political propaganda.

The social significance of the tournament should not be underestimated. To the knight himself, it was considered the “central ritual of chivalry.”^[18] It is an enormous element of the knightly culture and an “essential part of the cult of Christian knighthood.”^[19] The tournament was a crucial defining event to the knight. In order to even become a knight, an aspirant had to complete the three mestiers d’armes. The first is the joust, the second, the tournament, and the third, war.^[20]

The spectators took the joust no less seriously, as is evidenced by the opinion of the French chivalry expressed by an anonymous writer in 1444 Paris:

They did not hold jousts or tournaments as men used to do, or any feats of arms, for fear of getting hurt—in short, all the French lords had become more like women than men, valiant only against the poor, unarmed working men and merchants.^[21]

To the writer, the fact that the nobles no longer held jousts diminished them as lords and as men. By this



time, the tournament has become instrumental in defining an entire class of people, not only to those physically involved, but to the spectators as well. The tournament gave meaning to a warrior class that, in the face of peasant levies armed with pikes and handguns, was becoming increasingly unnecessary in war. Now that war itself no longer justified the existence of the aristocracy, the tournament was used to justify the existence of an essentially obsolete warrior class. Although the actual ability to wage war in single combat was no longer necessary, the perception that one can do so was vital to one's place in society. The tournament was no longer about war; it was now about perception.

Tournaments removed themselves further from the actual field of war as the usefulness of the warrior aristocracy decreased. The hastilude was still used to demonstrate personal prowess, but the prowess is demonstrated, not to win a war, but to win attention and fame. The earliest record to indicate play-acting as part of a tournament is from 1278, when an Arthurian festival was held at Le Hem in Picardy.^[22] By the fourteenth century this "role-playing and play-acting [became] part and parcel" of the joust and tournament.^[23] By the fifteenth, there was an emphasis on splendor and display, most often using a literary framework.^[24] Louise Olga Fradenburg believes that it is during this development that there was "a movement from war to the imitation of war."^[25] It was, as Fradenburg so eloquently states, "a desire to display the power of violence rather than to exercise it."^[26] Because of this, Fradenburg sees the tournament as belonging to "a decadent and frivolous aristocracy confined to the dramatization of its former glories."^[27] By dramatizing war and violence, the tournament becomes a place where fantasy and disguise are not only accepted, but also expected.

Contributing to this development was the growth and acceptance of the chivalric romances. Indeed, most of the early tournament disguises of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries are of Arthurian heroes. Arthurs, Percivals, and Galahads abound. By taking the role of a legendary chivalric hero, the knight acted out the life of honor integral to the Christian knight of the Middle Ages. It is as if by playing Arthur, the knight was imbued with the power of the legend of Arthur. The appearance of nobility and honor bestow the actuality of these characteristics upon the man.

The Middle Ages were a time when the external was thought to clearly demonstrate the interior. No beautiful lady can be bad; no handsome king can be evil. One only needs to look through the many chronicles to see this dependence on appearance. This is especially true of the knightly class. Knighthood itself depended upon the possession of certain things. To be a knight one must have a horse, armor and appropriate weapons. One must look the part in order to be the part. It is "an idea of self that exists through its appearance."^[28] It is necessary "to be seen as what one is in order to be."^[29] The perception of being not only bestows the reality of being, but also validates being.

Then what of the question of the knights who chose to be seen as religious figures? Clearly, this practice did not impress the Church and the clergy. They most certainly did not believe in the axiom that "imitation is the sincerest form of flattery." In fact, from the very beginnings of the tournament, the Church opposed the practice. The ninth canon issued by the Church at the Council of Clermont in 1130 states:

We firmly prohibit those detestable markets or fairs (*nundinas vel ferias*) at which knights are accustomed to meet to show off their strength and their boldness and at which the deaths of men and dangers to the soul often occur. But if anyone is killed there, even if he demands and is not denied penance and the *viaticum*, ecclesiastical burial shall be withheld from him^[30]

This stand against tournaments continues and was reiterated until the early fourteenth century, when Pope Clement V lifts the ban on tournaments. Yet, even in 1434, at the famous *Passo Honroso* festival



held at the bridge of Orbigo, Suero de Quinones had to request permission to bury a knight in sacred ground that has been killed during the tournament. The local bishop refused his request, indicating that, in some areas, involvement in a tournament was still grounds for refusing Christian burial as late as 1434.^[31] This dislike of tournaments is evidenced even in countries such as England, where in 1194, in direct opposition to the Church ban, King Richard officially licensed tournaments. Even with this long history of “legal” tournaments, the chronicles repeatedly made complaints that tournaments foster vice and corruption. This is not surprising when one takes to mind the writers of these chronicles are monks. Obviously, the ecclesiastic society was not pleased with the aristocracy’s new sport.

This clerical opposition to tournaments makes the knight’s choice of religious garb even more curious. It seems doubtful that they choose these costumes to honor the men who seemed intent on belittling, if not eradicating, their favorite pastime. One chronicler, Johannnis of Trokelowe, describes the disguises as “*dedecore habitus monchalis*,” clearly indicating his displeasure with the knight’s choice of monk’s garb.^[32] That the religious figures being imitated did not take these imitations as flattery strongly indicates that they were not done to honor the clergy. It is much more likely that the tournament gives the knights a venue to vent their dissatisfaction with the pretensions and demands of the ecclesiastic community.

Regardless of this, we cannot forget the importance of religion to the Christian knight. A knight’s primary duty was to defend the faith, and it is not surprising that there was a marked resemblance between the duties of a priest and those of a knight. Nor did the piety that so permeated the culture stop at the list. Even at the tournaments themselves, piety is observed. In 1332 all the knights went to St. Paul’s Cathedral and offer oblations prior to jousting.^[33] In 1352, the prize for a tournament was a golden thorn that symbolized Christ’s crown of thorns.^[34] In a tournament in April of 1446, each knight made the sign of the cross as he entered the list. The vows of the *pas d’armes* are rich with not only chivalric, but also religious, language. By dressing in religious garb, the knight is not mocking Christianity, although he may be mocking certain members of ecclesiastic society.

With appearance being so important, religion being a cornerstone of chivalric culture, and the event of the tournament being crucial and defining, brushing off disguise choices as whims or novelties seems inappropriate. The social and political significance and the great length of time and expense that went into planning a tournament encourages the belief that these disguise choices were deliberate and pertinent. If a person’s appearance carries such weight, great thought must go into the choice of disguise. We have now returned to the original question: Why did knights choose religious garb?

When God the Father entered the jousting list in Castile in 1428, it was part of the tournament being held to celebrate the forthcoming marriage of King Juan’s daughter to Duarte, the heir to Portugal.^[35] It is King Juan himself who appeared in the lists dressed as God the Father. His household knights followed him, dressed as the apostles, each bearing a scroll with the appropriate apostle’s name on it (for example Pero Nino is St. Paul) and one of the instruments of the Passion.^[36] In order to understand Juan’s choice of disguise, the history of the relations between Castile and Portugal must be examined.

The relationship between Castile and Portugal was unquestionably stormy.^[37] The events that were to influence the tournament of 1428 began long before the tournament was even a glimmer of a thought in Juan’s mind. Although conflicts between Castile and Portugal really go back to the creation of Portugal as a monarchy, a history of events beginning in 1383, when King Fernando of Portugal died, will provide enough background to the 1428 tournament. Fernando’s only surviving child was his daughter Beatriz, who was married to Juan I, King of Castile. The wedding writ had specified that if Fernando died with no male heir, the child of Juan and Beatriz would inherit the crown of Portugal. However, since Juan and Beatriz had yet to have a child, Fernando’s widow, Leoner Teles, a Castilian, was to act as regent.



Leoner's Castilian nationality did not sit right with some of the Portuguese, specifically Joao, the late King Fernando's illegitimate half-brother. In 1383, Joao broke into the royal palace and murdered the deceased king's chancellor. The widow-regent Leoner wisely fled and turned to her son-in-law, Juan of Castile, for aid. In January of 1384, Juan invaded Portugal. However, in March, as the Castilians laid siege to the town of Lisbon, the plague broke out and decimated the Castilian camp. Juan was forced to retreat to Seville. This gave Joao the opportunity he needed. By April of 1385, he had managed to convince the majority of Portuguese nobles that he was the rightful heir and was proclaimed king of Portugal. Shortly after, the English arrived with reinforcements for Portugal and an ulterior motive. In August of 1385, the small Portuguese army of 7,000 annihilated the 32,000-strong Castilian force at the battle of Aljubarrota. Juan left Portugal in defeat, once again leaving Joao in power.^[38] However, the tension did not end there.

It is now time to discover the ulterior motives of the English when they arrived in 1385 with their longbowmen and entered into a pact of friendship with Portugal. John of Gaunt, son of Edward III of England, came to Portugal in 1387 to try to claim the throne of Castile for himself. Though his attempt failed, before Gaunt left, his daughter Philippa married King Joao. Their firstborn child was Duarte, for whom the wedding celebration was held in 1428.

This tale is truly a tangled web of marriage, power and ambition. There can be little doubt, even viewing such an abridged history, that there was no love lost between Juan of Castile and Joao of Portugal. It is clear that the message Juan was sending to Joao when he entered the tournament lists dressed as God the Father is that he was still the supreme sovereign of Portugal.

It is in England, shortly after the feast of Saint John the Baptist in 1343, that Robert Morley, one of King Edward III's household knights, defended the field at Smithfield for three days against all comers while dressed as the Pope and accompanied by twelve cardinals.^[39] It is an interesting choice of disguise. Edward's reign had been marked by tremendous tension between the English king and the papacy. The thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were marked by the English church asserting itself and demanding less papal control. Although never rejecting the spiritual authority of the Holy See, the English church did show its dissatisfaction with such secular controls such as the Church's heavy taxation of English clergy and the pope's appointment of foreigners to the benefices of England. These actions were seen as threatening to the financial well-being of the English church, and through it, England itself, by removing large amounts of money from England. The situation was exacerbated by the Pope's new residence in Avignon, where the English believe he is heavily under the influence of the French king. King Edward had repeatedly complained to the Pope with little results. This long-standing conflict eventually resulted in the Statute of Provisors in 1351.^[40]

It is in this environment, less than a year after King Edward had a known argument with the pope, that the Smithfield tournament took place.^[41] Considering the preparation time for a tournament of this size, it is not inappropriate to believe that preparations for Smithfield started shortly after the argument between Edward and the Pope. It is likely that Robert of Morley's choice of disguise was heavily influenced by the political climate of the time and was an obvious political statement to not only the English people, but also to the pope himself.

Other examples of religious disguise abound. As early as 1146 at St. Olmer, there is an account of Jehan, Seigneur de Haubordin, holding a pas for six weeks against all comers with six companions, all calling themselves *pelerins* (pilgrims).^[42] An account from 1226 tells of a knight dressed in black monk's robes wearing a tonsured wig on his helm entering the list to fight Ulrich von Lichtenstein.^[43] Ulrich was shocked at the knight's appearance and refuses to fight him, though it must be noted that at the time he



refused to fight the disguised monk, Ulrich himself was dressed in drag as Lady Venus, complete with a long golden wig.^[44] Horrified monks tell the story of the seven knights who jousting as the Seven Deadly Sins in Cheapside in 1362.^[45] The Great Chronicle of London tells of two men appearing on horseback on February 13, 1511, “wyth a pylgrymmys long staff in his hand, and a pylgrymmys hat upon his head.”^[46] The Holinshed Chronicle identifies this man as

the marquesse Dorset and Sir Thomas Bullen like two pilgrims from saint Iames, in taberds of black veluet, with palmers hats on their helmets, with long Jacobs staves in their hands^[47]

It is in the Chronicles of Henri Knighton that we hear of a hastilude at St. Botholph’s, in which one side fought in the guise of monks while the other side fought in the guise of canons. At this particular melee, things got out of hand and the disguised monks and canons burned a large part of the town down. Fortunately, the ringleader, Robert Chamberlin, was caught and killed. In the spirit of true chivalry, he refused to identify any of his accomplices.^[48]

It is simplistic to say that the deliberate choice of religious disguise in the medieval tournament was based on a whim or novelty. It is equally simplistic to say that all religious disguises were based on political motivations. It is more realistic to assume that each event had its own reasoning, most of which will never be known. That disclaimer having been stated, it is clear that in a large number of cases in which a knight chose religious garb, there was political motivation.

The incidents for which we have records take place from the thirteenth century through the sixteenth century. They occur on the continent and in the British Isles. At times, it was unknown or politically unconnected knights dressed as monks or canons who seemed to be giving expression to simple annoyance at the demands or pretensions of the clergy. Other incidents were grandiose situations where knights of the king’s household, or the king himself, made obvious political statements to their opponent.

In either scenario, the element of political intent cannot be ignored. At a time when the tournament itself was used heavily for political propaganda, it is only natural that the choice of garb reflected that political intent. Understanding the importance of appearance and the importance of the tournament in medieval society helps us understand that disguise choices were not usually made lightly. (It can be hoped that Ulrich’s decision to dress as a woman was based on his sense of humor.)

It is unfortunate that much of the chronicle information on tournaments is vague, often leaving out names and places. This makes it difficult, if not impossible, to trace any political or social intent. However, the few incidents that include specifics demonstrate that political intent is undeniable. King Juan and Robert Morley are using the tournament and the disguise of the tournament to impress upon their competitors and the spectators their political agenda. These detailed records are rare, and most of the information on religious disguise is vague and anonymous. The fact that there are so many incidents of religious disguise tells us that the tension between ecclesiastic society and the knightly class had not diminished by the fifteenth century. Although the chivalric culture was imbued with Christianity, and knights vowed to defend the faith, they did not live easily with the restrictions the institution of the faith laid upon them. The choice of religious disguise, whether an army of canons burning a city, or God the Father appearing in all his glory, was part of the political agenda of tournament.



Footnotes

[1] Castile was one of the kingdoms that make up what is now Spain.

[2] The list is the arena where tournaments and jousts are fought.

[3] Richard Barber, *The Knight and Chivalry* (Woodbridge, 1970), 182.

[4] A melee is hand-to-hand fighting between groups of men. Either on horseback or on foot, a wide assortment of weapons are used including lance, axe and sword. Richard Barber and Juliet Baker, *Tournaments: Jousts, Chivalry and Pageant* (Woodbridge, 1989), 213.

[5] Jousting is single combat on horseback using lances.

[6] A behourd is a more casual form of hastilude usually fought by squires and knights in training.

[7] N. Denholm-Young, "The Tournament in the Thirteenth Century." *Collected Papers of N. Denholm-Young* (Cardiff, 1969), 115.

Pas d'armes is a very elaborate form of the tournament which became extremely popular in the fifteenth century. In the pas d'armes there was a story line, role-playing and actual combat. It was usually a defender, or tenant, vowing to hold a pas (a defined and usually allegorical space) against all comers, or venants. Barber and Baker, *Tournament*, 213.

[8] Barber, *The Knight*, 194.

[9] Strayer, 174

[10] Nicholas, David. "In the Pit of the Burgundian Theater State: Urban Traditions and Princely Ambitions in Ghent, 1360-1420." *City and Spectacle in Medieval Europe*. (Minneapolis, 1994), 285.

[11] Barber, *The Knight*, 189.

[12] *Ibid.*, 202-3.

[13] A round table is a festival with strong Arthurian overtones including behourds, jousts and sometimes melees.

[14] Barber and Barker, *Tournament*, 64.

[15] There are several incidents on record where this crucial scaffold building step was rushed. In 1315 at the dual wedding of Frederick of Austria and his brother, a scaffold collapsed injuring several spectators. Again, in Cheapside on September 22, 1331 a scaffold collapsed injuring several ladies. Barber and Baker, *Tournament*, 172,32.

[16] Bryan Holmes, *Medieval Pageant* (London, 1987), 5.

[17] Raphael Holinshed, *Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland, Vol 3* (New York, 1965) 10.



- [18] Barber, *The Knight*, 155.
- [19] Barber and Barker, *Tournament*, 146.
- [20] *Ibid.*, 146.
- [21] *Parisian Journal* (Oxford, 1968) 351.
- [22] Barber, *The Knight*, 166.
- [23] Barber, *The Knight*, 174.
- [24] Barber, *The Knight*, 180.
- [25] Louise Olga Fradenburg, *City, Marriage, Tournament: Arts of Rule in Late Medieval Scotland* (Madison, 1991) 194.
- [26] Fradenburg, *City, Marriage, Tournament*, 195.
- [27] *Ibid.*, 197.
- [28] *Ibid.*, 204.
- [29] *Ibid.*, 205.
- [30] C.J. Hefele & H. Leclercq, *Histoire des Councils* (Paris 1912) V.i. 729. Barber, *The Knight*, 158.
- [31] Barber, *The Knight*, 196.
- [32] Johannis De Trokelowe, *Johannis De Trokelowe et Henrici De Blaneforde, Monarchorum S. Albani, Necnon Quorundam Anonymorum, Chronica et Annales, Regnantibus Henrico Tertio, Edwardo Primo, Edwardo Secundo, Ricardo Secundo, et Henrici Quarto* (London, 1866), 165.
- [33] Barber, *The Knight*, 174.
- [34] *Ibid.*, 167.
- [35] It is interesting to note that Duarte later wrote one of the most complete manuals on horsemanship of his time. In *The Art of Good Horsemanship* Duarte goes into great detail about the techniques of jousting.
- [36] Barber, *The Knight*, 182.
- [37] The Portuguese monarchy began in the twelfth century when Alfonso VI of Castile reconquered the Countship of Portugal from the Moors and gave it to his daughter Teresa who was married to Henry of Burgundy. Under the Castilian king Alfonso X, Portuguese was reminded of this and forced to recognize Castilian suzerainty. In the early 14th century, Alfonso IV of Portugal (1325-57) invaded Castile angered by the king of Castilian's ill treatment of his daughter whom was the Castilian king's wife. In 1371, King Fernando of Portugal attempted to win the throne of Castile.
- [38] Although defeated, Castile did not reach a final lasting peace with Portugal until 1411.



[39] “cito post Nativitatem sancti Johannis baptostae, fureunt pulchra hastiludia in Smethfeld, ubi papa et duodecim cardinales per tres dies contro quoscumque tiricinium habuerunt.” Adae Murimuth Continuatio Chronnicarum (London, 1889), 146.

[40] Thomas Williams, “Edward III.” The Catholic Encyclopedia (New York, 1911) Note: The Statute of Provisors prohibited the bestowal of English benefices by the pope.

[41] Barber and Baker, Tournament, 34.

[42] R. Coltman Clephan, The Medieval Tournament (New York, 1995), 71.

[43] Christopher Gravett, Knight At Tournament (Oxford, 1988), 13.

[44] Fradenburg, City, Marriage, Tournament, 215.

[45] Barber, The Knight, 175.

[46] The Great Chronicle of London (London, MCMXXXVIII), 372.

[47] Holinshed, Holinshed’s Chronicles, Vol. 3, 560. Note: a palmer is “a medieval european pilgrim who carried a palm branch as a token of having visited the Holy Land.” American Heritage Dictionary (Boston, 1996), 1304.

[48] “ *Eo tempore clamata sunt hastiludia apud sanctum Bothulphum tempore nundinarum, et accessit una pars in habitu monachorum, et altera in habitu canonicorum; et fecerant conventionem ut postquam lusissent rapinam exercebant in nudinis: quod et fecerunt; nam ignem miserunt in tribus locis in villa sub secreto, et quum flamma coepit in altum ascendere, mercatores festinaverunt cum omni celeritate ignem extubguere, et fures medio tempore festinaverunt ex sua parte asportare meliora mercimonia quae invenerant, et portaverunt ad sua hospitia. Et alii que fuerunt de eorum consensu obviaverunt [ies, ceperunt et per diversas vias abduxerunt quae illi deportaverant]. Et sic infra breve noctis spatium crevit flamma in tantum quod magnum partem villae combussit; et hujus sceleris capitaneus auctor in domo fratrum praedicatorum quidam Robertus Chaumburleyn magni nominis homo armiger strenuus captus fuit, et ante mortam suam recognovit hujus sceleris veritatem plenaliter, sed nunquam voluit comlices suos revelare. ” Henry Knighton, Chronicon Henrici Knighton, Vel Cnitthon, Monachi Leycestrensis, (London, 1996), 280.*

