

# Appendix I

## Lambeth Palace Library MS. 1212 and the lost cartulary of Christ Church, Canterbury\*

Lambeth Palace Library 1212 is a large and very impressive register which originated in the archbishop's treasury at Canterbury (Du Boulay 1966, pp. 4–9). The bulk of it was written in the 1270s; but one portion of it is earlier than that, and there are numerous additions as well, some of them as late as the 1320s. As is proved by a note in this manuscript (fo. 64v), the treasury was housed in Saint Gregory's priory, outside the north gate of the city. It was the treasurer and his staff who had custody of the archbishop's archive, and the documents copied into this register were mostly kept there.

The book has a complicated history. Before it became a book, Lambeth 1212 was a collection of separate booklets, made up of separate quires. Some of the quires became transposed, while they remained unbound; but these rearrangements can very easily be reversed, thanks to the clerk who numbered the leaves (writing small arabic numerals at the top centre of each recto page) before they started happening. If the quires are put back into the sequence they were in at the moment when the leaves were numbered, the result will look something like Table 22.<sup>1</sup> Since that moment, one quire (*q*) has been moved; one quire (*c*) has been taken apart; and two quires (*l* and *r*) have each been inserted into a preceding quire (*l* into *k*, *r* into *p*). It also emerges that one whole quire (between *u* and *w*) has been lost. Essentially this was all worked out by Holtzmann (1930–1, pp. 197–9).

One of the booklets which came to be included in Lambeth 1212 is a portion of an earlier register (quires *k–l*), a rather elegant piece of work, obviously distinct from the rest. Perhaps this booklet originated in the treasury; at least it is clear that the scribe who compiled it was somebody who had access to the archbishop's archive. What it contains is a collection of charters dating from between the 1070s and the 1220s; but the script is thought to be appreciably later than that, perhaps *c.* 1240–50.<sup>2</sup> The booklet owes its

survival to the fact that it was subsequently used (apparently on just one occasion) as a guide-book for a search of the archive. Against many of the entries a note has been added recording that the search was successful (*Hec inuenitur*, 'This is still there'); against one (fo. 105r), a note recording that it was not (*Hec deest*, 'This is missing'). In one of the other booklets, a paragraph added at the foot of the page (fo. 30v) ends with a note explaining that there is a problem with this document: the sealed original is not available, and the text has been copied instead from an 'old register'.<sup>3</sup> As Major (1950, p. 159) observed, that seems sure to be a reference to quires *k–l*, where the text in question is indeed to be found (fo. 104r).

Though I have not looked at the palaeographical evidence as closely as it deserves, it seems to me that in scanning through Lambeth 1212 one soon begins to recognize the work of four successive groups of scribes, associated (as the documents they copied prove) with four successive archbishops: Robert Kilwardby (1273–8), Johan Pecham (1279–92), Robert Winchelsey (1294–1313), Walter Reynolds (1313–27). Apparently this has to mean that the staff of the treasury (the clerical staff at least) was replaced whenever the archbishopric changed hands: the treasury clerks were appointed by the archbishop, and their tenure ended with the death (or resignation) of the archbishop who had made the appointment. The only official whose name had much chance of being recorded was the treasurer himself; and it does seem to be arguable – from the data collected by Du Boulay (1966, pp. 396–8) – that each new archbishop appointed a new treasurer.<sup>4</sup> The script differs, from one group of scribes to the next; so does the level of competence, as far as one can judge of it from the work that they did here. To put it briefly, Kilwardby's clerks were excellent; Pecham's were pretty bad; Winchelsey's were pretty good; Reynolds's were mediocre.

The bulk of Lambeth 1212 was obviously the work of a team of scribes working for archbishop Kilwardby. In

\* This paper was written several years ago, and I had hoped that it would have been published long before now. Since it has not, I print a revised version of it here.

<sup>1</sup> In constructing this table I have had to depend on the collation reported by James (1932, pp. 828–9), which, in a few places, does not add up correctly; so a small amount of guesswork is involved. The modern foliation suffers from one hiccup: four numbers (151–4) were accidentally repeated.

<sup>2</sup> This is the date suggested by Major (1950, p. 158). For the rest of Lambeth 1212, the date she suggested was 'probably about 1260–70', but this

estimate errs slightly on the early side, as the contents prove (Du Boulay 1966, p. 5).

<sup>3</sup> *Hec non habetur sigillata set transcripta est de registro ueteri inter cartas Iohannis regis*. The original was later discovered to be in the bishop of Rochester's archive, and a note to this effect was added by a different hand: *Istud originale remanet penes episcopum Roffensem*.

<sup>4</sup> Kilwardby's treasurer was Thomas de Lindestede: a copy of a letter addressed to him occurs in Lambeth 1212 (fo. 206r).

*The lost cartulary of Christ Church*

quires	medieval foliation	17th-century pagination	modern foliation	booklets
<i>a–b</i>		1–12	1–6	
<i>c</i>	1–13	14–18, 25–48, 19–22	8–10, 14–26, 11–12	royal charters
<i>d</i>	14–25	49–74	27–39	
<i>e</i>	26–33	75–92	40–8	non-royal charters
<i>f</i>	34–41	93–108	49–56	
<i>g</i>	42–53	109–30	57–67	
<i>h</i>	54–64	131–54	68–79	agreements
<i>i</i>	65–74	155–74	80–90	
<i>j</i>	75–8	176–85	92–6	
<i>k</i>	79–86	186–93, 218–25	97–100, 113–16	‘old register’
<i>l</i>	87–99	194–217	101–12	
<i>m</i>	100–3	226–33	117–20	
<i>n</i>	106–17	234–59	121–33	papal letters
<i>o</i>	118–26	260–77	134–42	
<i>p</i>	127–34	278–85, 294–301	143–6, 151–4	
<i>q</i>	135–49	376–409	188–204	‘landbooks’
<i>r</i>	150–3	286–93	147–50	
<i>s</i>	154–65	304–27	152A–4A, 155–63	copy of ‘old book’
<i>t</i>	166–77	328–51	164–75	
<i>u</i>	178–89	352–75	176–87	
[v]	[190–203]			
w	204–14	410–31	205–15	memoranda (cont.)

Table 22. Quires of Lambeth 1212 restored to the order determined by the medieval foliation.

booklet after booklet, the original text ends in the mid 1270s; all documents later than the 1270s are more or less obviously the work of different scribes. When Kilwardby’s clerks took over the treasury, in 1273, they were appalled by the state that the archive was in at the time. (They may have been too polite to say so, but their actions express their sentiments plainly enough.) Nobody really knew what charters and other documents ought to exist, or where they were to be found. Over the next few years, Kilwardby’s clerks brought order out of chaos. They tracked down the originals, classified them, numbered them, transcribed them, and finally deposited them in their proper place, within the storage system that they had devised.<sup>5</sup> As was first discovered by Collins (1948, p. 241), the few originals which still survive have numbers on their backs which resulted from this reorganization of the archive; but the principal product was Lambeth 1212 itself – or, to be more precise, the collection of booklets from which Lambeth 1212 was assembled later. This is where the treasury clerks made their copies of all important documents, so that in future they could consult them here, without having to handle the originals.

Kilwardby’s clerks were the authors of Lambeth 1212. The idea, the design, the execution – all were due to them. How many hands were at work I cannot say. The stretch of text

which I have looked at most closely (see below) was written, as far as I can tell, by just two scribes; but I am doubtful whether that is true for every booklet. By and large, the scribes involved were following a standard procedure. They used gatherings of twelve leaves each, ruled for roughly forty lines per page, with wide margins for any annotation which might be needed. In some places, where the nature of the text invited it, they used a columnar format,<sup>6</sup> but most of the time they wrote across the whole width of the page. Every document they chose to transcribe was transcribed in full. A short description of it was entered in a table of contents, keyed to a marginal number in the main text, and a note was added stating where the original was to be found. The classification imposed on the archive is reflected in the organization of Lambeth 1212. There is a separate booklet for each of four classes of formal documents: one for royal charters (*Carte regum*), one for non-royal charters (*Carte aliorum quam regum*), one for agreements (*Composiciones*), and one for papal letters (*Priuilegia et bulle*). Within each booklet the scribes brought the record up to date; in some of the booklets they started making additions,<sup>7</sup> as batches of incoming documents were delivered

<sup>6</sup> One such page (fo. 170r) is reproduced by Hoyt (1962, pl. XIV).

<sup>7</sup> Sayers (1966) overlooked this point. Since some of the documents in question date from very near the end of Kilwardby’s time in office, and since she was mistakenly regarding them as part of the original text, she thought it likely that Lambeth 1212 was compiled by the clerks who arrived with Kilwardby’s successor.

<sup>5</sup> The new organization of the archive, so far as it can be reconstructed from marginal notes in Lambeth 1212, is described by Sayers (1966, pp. 98–9).

to the treasury. The intention was for each separate booklet to continue expanding indefinitely in the future, new quires being added at the end whenever necessary. But that plan was brought to a sudden end, in spring 1278, when the news arrived of Kilwardby's transfer to Rome.<sup>8</sup>

All in all, the manuscript covers a lot of ground, and different parts of it will be of interest to different people. For anyone interested in the pre-conquest history of Christ Church, the most immediately relevant booklet is the one which forms most of quire *q* (fos. 191–204).<sup>9</sup> Originally this was a quire of 12 (fos. 192–203), and the final leaf (fo. 204) was the start of a second quire. (There is a catchword to prove it at the foot of fo. 203v.) Before the scribe had filled this leaf (before he had even started on the verso, in fact), a change of plan supervened and the booklet was discontinued. The unused sheets of the second quire were removed; the outermost sheet was kept, folded back to front, and wrapped around the first quire, so as to turn it into a quire of 14 (fos. 191–204). The blank leaf thus brought to the front was used for the table of contents (fo. 191v), and for adding one more document (fo. 191r). For the heading we have to look at what was initially the first page of the first quire (fo. 192r). It reads: *Transcripta de codicellis primariis siue cartis terrarum antiquitus dictis landboc*, 'Copies of original documents or land charters (which in English were) anciently called "land books"'. More than twenty documents follow,<sup>10</sup> all of them (so it appears) copied word for word directly from the originals in the Christ Church archive. In the majority of cases, the originals are still in existence; and Lambeth 1212's copies are then of no value, except as proof that such documents were thought to be of some interest at the time, and as a means of assessing the scribe's accuracy. For several charters, however, Lambeth 1212's copy is the only one, or the only one which gives the text in full.<sup>11</sup> As far as I have checked his work, the scribe appears to have been honest and accurate enough (except that he did not hesitate to modernize the spelling). He is, of course, not answerable for the authenticity of the documents he copied, only for his transcription.

The following booklet (quires *r–u*) is the one which I have looked at most closely. It consists of three quires of 12 leaves each (fos. 152A–4A, 155–87), prefaced by a quire of 4 for the table of contents (fos. 147–50). Quire *r* was transposed, after 1323 (see below), and the table thus became separated from the booklet to which it relates. The text is the work of two scribes, both of them highly competent. Scribe 1 wrote the whole of the main text (begin-

ning on fo. 152Ar and ending on fo. 184v), with (so far as I have checked his transcription) very few mistakes; he left spaces for coloured initials, but these were never supplied.<sup>12</sup> Scribe 2 added much peripheral material – headings, marginal notes, and the whole of the table of contents (fos. 147r–8v). This second scribe was evidently very familiar with the material, and I would guess that he had supervised the project throughout, intervening personally towards the end to add these finishing touches.<sup>13</sup>

The contents fall into three sections. The first and largest (ending on fo. 177r) is (1) a copy of the Christ Church cartulary which I call C3, and which I propose to discuss in some detail below. That occupies the whole of the first two quires and overlaps into the beginning of the third. Leaving one page blank (which means, 'And now for something completely different'), the same scribe resumes by copying out (2) a series of documents relating to the financial affairs of Christ Church. The first of these (fos. 178r–80v) is the report of an investigation into the costs involved in maintaining the army of servants employed by the monks; that investigation took place, we are told, in 1276–7. To this is appended a batch of shorter memoranda (fos. 181r–2v) bearing on other aspects of the priory's cash-flow.<sup>14</sup> Leaving another page blank (which carries the same message as before), the scribe continues by entering (3) a list of the churches and other benefices in the archbishop's gift (fos. 183v–4v); a note at the foot of the first page tells us that this list reflects the situation existing in 1272–3, when Kilwardby first arrived.<sup>15</sup> A note added at the end of this list is a specimen of the work of Pecham's clerks (fo. 184v). The remaining pages (fos. 185r–7v), originally left blank, were filled up later with additions by Winchelsey's clerks; blank spaces in the preliminary quire were also made use of by them (fos. 148v–9r), and by Reynolds's clerks after that (fos. 149v–50v).

This addition by Reynolds's clerks – which consists of extracts from the proceedings of the Exchequer in September and October 1323 – is of some incidental interest, because it helps to explicate the sequence of events which turned the original collection of booklets into the existing book. The text continues from the last page of quire *r* (fo. 150v) onto an added leaf at the front of quire *s* (fo. 151A). It was not until after that, therefore, that quire *r* became transposed (in consequence of which a marginal note was added on

<sup>8</sup> Kilwardby resigned the archbishopric in June 1278, after being made cardinal bishop of Porto. (He died at Viterbo in September 1279.)

<sup>9</sup> The three preceding leaves (fos. 188–190) seem all to be singletons, technically part of this quire but not part of the booklet.

<sup>10</sup> In Sawyer's (1968, p. 58) list of the contents of Lambeth 1212, this booklet begins with no. 230 and ends at the end with no. 981. The added document on fo. 191r is Sawyer's no. 50.

<sup>11</sup> In Sawyer's list (see previous note), the items not marked with a dagger are mostly known from the copy in Lambeth 1212 alone.

<sup>12</sup> The missing letter is written in this space, in small script, as a cue for the rubricator. Perhaps the intention was for the coloured initials all to be inserted at once when the booklet had expanded to the point that it was ready to be bound.

<sup>13</sup> It is conceivable that scribe 2 was the treasurer himself, whose name is known (above, note 4). I do not press the point.

<sup>14</sup> The titles are listed by James (1932, p. 833).

<sup>15</sup> He was consecrated in February 1273, still 1272 by the thirteenth-century reckoning. Some entries in this list have been updated by later scribes – the entry relating to Wingham, for example, against which someone has scribbled the remark *Mutata in preposituram et sex prebendas*, 'Changed into a provostship and six prebends' (fo. 183v). That plan originated with Kilwardby; Pecham brought it to fruition (Fowler 1926, p. 233).

fo. 150v referring to fo. 151A as ‘the fifth following leaf’), and not until after that that Lambeth 1212 was bound.<sup>16</sup> Perhaps the binding was done by Reynolds’s clerks, the last who made any significant additions to it; perhaps it was done by the clerks who arrived with the next archbishop, Simon Meopham. It happens to be a known fact that Meopham’s clerks reorganized the archive again (Churchill 1929; Sayers 1966, pp. 99–101), and that might explain why they took no interest in Lambeth 1212 – no active interest, at least. Whoever made the decision, the upshot was that the existing quires in their existing order – quire *v* had gone astray, quires *k–l* had been included – were delivered to the binder, and the binder turned them into a book. Lambeth 1212 ceased to be a living record. Bound and shelved, it became a book of reference, more and more out of date as time passed by.<sup>17</sup>

It remained at Canterbury at least until the 1540s – somebody copying extracts from it then referred to it as ‘the old white book’ (Barnes 1959, p. 59) – but not long after that it became a collector’s item. For a time it must have belonged to Lord Lumley (d. 1609), whose name is written at the foot of the first page; then it was acquired by Archbishop Bancroft (d. 1610) for the library which he was creating at Lambeth Palace. In 1648 that library was shut down, and its books were transferred to Cambridge; in 1664 they were returned to Lambeth Palace; by then, it seems, this particular book had gone missing. Since it turns up next in the library of Roydon Hall (in East Peckham, Kent), we have to infer that it was appropriated by Sir Roger Twysden (d. 1672).<sup>18</sup> In December 1681, without doubt, it belonged to Twysden’s son Sir William Twysden (d. 1697): that is when Sir William’s librarian numbered the pages (and wrote a note on a flyleaf saying that he had done so). Fifteen years after Sir William’s death, the title, house and estate (as much as was left of it) were inherited by his younger son and namesake, Sir William Twysden (d. 1751). Soon after that, the Roydon Hall library was put up for sale; and by March 1715 it had been bought by Sir Thomas Saunders Sebright (1692–1736), of Beechwood (in Flamstead, Hertfordshire).<sup>19</sup> During Sir Thomas’s time, the Twysden

manuscripts were fairly easy to get at – Hearne (1719) and Wilkins (1721) both thank him for access to them – but after that they seem to have dropped out of sight. Finally, in April 1807, part of the Beechwood library was sold by auction (Leigh and Sotheby 1807), and that is when three of the Twysden manuscripts, including this one, were acquired for Lambeth Palace Library.<sup>20</sup> There it was re-acquired as manuscript 1212.

## The lost Christ Church cartulary

The medieval archive of Christ Church contained a very large number of pre-conquest charters. Many of these documents survive. Some are still in Canterbury; some were acquired by early modern collectors of medieval manuscripts. A few more are known to have existed in the seventeenth century and have only gone missing since then. Reassembled as far as it can be, this collection of documents forms the chief source of evidence for working out the early history of the church (Brooks 1969, 1984, 1995).<sup>21</sup>

As well as preserving the originals, the monks used them for compiling a cartulary, and this too is a significant text, in more than one respect. It is important, most obviously, because it includes edited versions of several documents which do not survive in any other form. But it is also important in itself, as an example of the sort of archival research which medieval monks might think of undertaking. It has generally been called a cartulary, and I see no objection to that name; but I think that it might better be described as a calendar, at least in its original form. In this form the text, whatever we call it, was meant to serve as a guide to the contents of the church’s archive. By its nature it was a composite text, pieced together from many others; but it was also (originally) a single text, compiled on one occasion for one purpose. It needs to be treated as such, and evaluated as such, before being decompiled. Here I am echoing the opinion expressed by Fleming (1997, pp. 85–6), which seems to me exactly right.<sup>22</sup>

sold and that the Twysden manuscripts might still be available; but that hope was quickly dashed (Wright and Wright 1966, pp. 3–4).

<sup>20</sup> The three manuscripts in question are nos. 1211–13 (Todd 1812, p. 264): 1211 (a Qur’an obtained from Istanbul by Sir Paul Pindar as a present for Sir William Twysden, Roger’s father) was lot 1149; 1212 was lot 1220; 1213 (James 1932, pp. 834–40) was lot 1192. I am grateful to Ms Emily Walhout of the Houghton Library at Harvard for a photocopy of the sale catalogue, and to the Lambeth Palace librarian, Dr Richard Palmer, for confirming these identifications.

<sup>21</sup> I am indebted to Professor N. P. Brooks for a copy of those sections of his thesis which relate to the Christ Church cartulary, and for his comments on a draft of the present paper.

<sup>22</sup> But I cannot speak at all favourably of her edition (Fleming 1997, pp. 109–52). For each paragraph, Fleming seems to have started with a transcript of T1, and then to have overwritten this with a transcript of C5, so far as C5 is legible. The justification for that procedure escapes me. In any case, though Fleming’s text may be useful – if one ignores the editorial clutter – in forming a rough idea of the contents of C3/C5 (as far as the end of C3/A1), it is not to be relied on in detail. Neither the transcription nor the collation approaches the level of accuracy which ought to be aimed for, given all the technical advantages that a modern editor enjoys.

<sup>16</sup> A marginal note on the last page of quire *p* (fo. 154v) refers to the second leaf in quire *r* (fo. 148) as ‘the second following leaf’. That note must have been made before quire *r* was transposed; but it cannot have been made till after quire *q* had been transposed, and that did not happen till after the leaves had been numbered. If the text which continues from the last page of quire *u* (fo. 187v) onto the first page of quire *q* (fo. 188r), is, as I suppose, the work of one of Winchelsey’s clerks, it will follow that the foliation is earlier than 1313.

<sup>17</sup> In the early sixteenth century, somebody went to the trouble of making a copy of Lambeth 1212, reorganizing the contents to some extent; the resulting manuscript is Oxford, Bodleian Tanner 223 (which I have not seen). That this manuscript was copied directly from Lambeth 1212 is a well-established fact (Collins 1948, pp. 240–1; Major 1950, p. 158; Kreisler 1967, pp. iii–iv); so it has no textual value. The only question worth asking, it seems, is why the copy was made.

<sup>18</sup> Twysden was detained at Lambeth (where the palace had ceased to be a palace and become a prison) in 1643–5.

<sup>19</sup> News of the sale reached the Earl of Oxford’s librarian, Humfrey Wanley. At first it was thought possible that only the printed books had been

The original, which I call C3, was still in existence in the late thirteenth century, but has disappeared since then. It has to be reconstructed from three surviving copies:

A1 = Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 189, fos. 195–201 plus part of another leaf, 11 × 7.5 inches (Davis 1958, no. 163); from Saint Augustine's, later twelfth century. Printed in full by Twysden (1652, cols. 2207–26)

C5 = Canterbury Cathedral Archives, Reg. P, fos. 11–34, 7.5 × 5 inches (Davis 1958, no. 163A); from Christ Church, early thirteenth century

T1 = London, Lambeth Palace Library 1212, fos. 147–50, 152A–4A, 155–77, 12.5 × 9 inches (Davis 1958, no. 159); from the archbishop's treasury, circa 1275. Many paragraphs printed, in disconnected form, by Kemble (1848), Haddan and Stubbs (1871), Birch (1885–93), and others

As far as I can see, the textual evidence is consistent with the view that all three copies derive independently from C3. At least it is certain that C5 does not derive from A1, and that T1 does not derive from either A1 or C5.

The earliest manuscript, A1, consists of a single quire, bound up as part of a book which came, without any doubt, from Saint Augustine's.<sup>23</sup> At first sight it may seem surprising to find a copy of a Christ Church cartulary here, but I see no reason not to think that A1 was written by a scribe from Saint Augustine's, given access to the original. One detail tending to confirm this is the fact that in A1 (and A1 alone) Saint Augustine's name is written in capital letters, wherever it occurs. The manuscript dates from the second half of the twelfth century.<sup>24</sup> It is a neat piece of work, in the same hand throughout, and in good condition; its defect is that it gives only an abbreviated version of the text. Most paragraphs have been shortened, more or less drastically. It also turns out, from collation with the other manuscripts, that A1's text, even where it is unabridged, is not particularly accurate.

C5 is the worst copy in some respects, in others perhaps the best. With the rest of the register in which it was eventually bound, this booklet suffered damage around the edges in the Canterbury fire of 1670, and parts of the text were destroyed or rendered illegible. Even in an undamaged condition, C5 would not have inspired much admiration. The text, by a single scribe throughout, is very untidily written. Spelling mistakes and other small slips are numerous. On the other hand, there do not seem to be many large errors. For all his faults, the scribe does appear to have been

capable of copying correctly, so far as the substance was concerned. The dating of C5 is uncertain; opinions vary between the late twelfth and the early thirteenth century.<sup>25</sup> I am inclined to think that C5 may be later than it looks. The scribe who wrote it was, I suspect, not accustomed to writing the formal sort of script that he uses here, and had to make a special effort. Now and then, his script begins to sprout curlicues which look as if they might date, say, from c. 1220–40; but then (so it seems) the scribe remembers his instructions and reverts to a laboured imitation of a plain twelfth-century script. For present purposes, the dating of C5 does not need to be exactly determined; but eventually it would be good to know, not just when, but also why and for whom this copy was being made.

T1 is the latest but in detail often the most reliable copy. Unlike A1 and C5, which can only be dated approximately, from the style of the script, T1 can be dated precisely. Together with most of the rest of Lambeth 1212, this booklet resulted from a burst of activity in the mid 1270s, while Robert Kilwardby was archbishop (see above). The locus for this activity was the archbishop's treasury in Canterbury, the staff of which had access to the Christ Church archive (the collection of documents of which the monks had custody) as well as to the separate archive for which they themselves were responsible. As has been said already, two scribes worked on this copy. Scribe 1 wrote the whole of the main text, numbering the paragraphs as he went along; scribe 2 added headings and notes, made corrections here and there, and wrote the table of contents. Among his other contributions, this second scribe supplied a title for the text, *Memoranda cartarum et conciliorum Arch' C' et ecc'e Cant'*, 'Memoranda of charters and councils of the archbishopric and church of Canterbury', and specified the exemplar from which it was taken, *Transcripta de veteri libro Cantuar'*, 'Copied from an old Canterbury book' (fo. 152Ar). This 'old book' was presumably C3 itself, made available to the archbishop's officials, perhaps released to them on loan.

As evidence for reconstructing C3, this third and last copy suffers from one major disadvantage, because here, with the best of intentions, the contents were quite extensively rearranged. In A1 and C5 the order of the paragraphs is identical; and by inference that was the order existing in C3. Plainly enough the intention had been for the documents to be arranged in chronological sequence, but in C3 that intention was only imperfectly realized. In T1 an effort was made to improve the order, where it was obviously wrong, but again the attempt was only partially successful. At the end of paragraph 48, there is a note added by scribe 2 saying that this entry ought to have been placed further on, *Istud debet esse infra Dccccxii* (fo. 161r); there is a matching note at the end of paragraph 65, *Hic debet esse quod est supra xlviij* (fo. 163r). These notes seem to prove that it was the scribes working on T1 who were responsible for re-

<sup>23</sup> This book contains the manuscript of Willelm Thorne's chronicle of Saint Augustine's, written in the 1390s. A section of Thorne's narrative (Twysden 1652, col. 1772) is derived from a text that occurs in A1 (Fleming 1997, pp. 114–15); apparently that is the reason why A1 got bound up here.

<sup>24</sup> Fleming (1997, p. 86), following Brooks (1969), dates A1 to the mid twelfth century, c. 1150. I am not well acquainted with manuscripts from Saint Augustine's (I do not know, for instance, when scribes there stopped writing *e* and started invariably writing *e*, as the A1 scribe does), but on general grounds would prefer a rather later date, perhaps c. 1160–80.

<sup>25</sup> This booklet was dated to the later twelfth century by Urry (1967, p. 75), whose opinion is not lightly to be disregarded.

organizing the contents, and for numbering the paragraphs accordingly.<sup>26</sup>

As well as the abbreviation peculiar to A1 and the rearrangement peculiar to T1, a comparison between the three manuscripts elicits one other large fact. The text appears to have expanded over time. Every document appearing in A1 appears also in C5 and T1 (often in a longer form); every document appearing in C5 appears also in T1. On the other hand, there are several documents included in the later copies which do not appear in the earliest one, several more included in the latest copy which do not appear in the earlier ones.<sup>27</sup> I see no reason for resisting the obvious conclusion. If the original survived, it would, I suppose, display the same sort of appearance which is observable in Lambeth 1212, and in many other books of similar type, where documents were continually being added, singly or in batches, over some more or less protracted span of time. In the absence of the original, we catch only accidental glimpses of this process of accretion, as successive copies (A1, C5, T1) record successive moments in the evolution of the exemplar (C3/A1, C3/C5, C3/T1).<sup>28</sup> The contents of C3, in state C3/C5, are listed in Table 23. What happened to C3, after the 1270s, we have no means of knowing.

Of C3's format – the size of the pages, the arrangement of the text, the quantity of decoration – I have not been able to discover any definite hint. The only copy which may possibly have been meant to resemble the original in general appearance is C5. We might venture to suppose, in a tentative way, that C3 looked like a handsomer version of C5. In all three copies, space is left for a coloured initial at the start of each new paragraph; in all three copies, these spaces remain blank. On the assumption that anything true for every copy was true for the exemplar too, no doubt we shall think it safe to infer that C3 was meant to be adorned with coloured initials; whether we go so far as to infer that the initials were missing there too is a more delicate question.

<sup>26</sup> In two places a paragraph was overlooked, and had to be added (by scribe 1) in the margin. At the foot of fo. 164v is a paragraph (Sawyer no. 959) marked for insertion between paragraphs 76 and 77. At the foot of fo. 165v is an explanatory remark (Sawyer no. 1647) which ought to be attached, as it is in C5, to paragraph 83.

<sup>27</sup> To be precise, there are eight documents absent from A1 which are present in C5 and T1 (Table 24). Taking them one by one, we cannot hope to say for certain whether the document was omitted from A1, accidentally or on purpose, or whether it was added to C3 after A1 had been copied off. For methodological reasons, the latter view is the one that we ought to prefer (because it is more conservative): any document in this category is to be regarded as an interpolation or addition in C3/C5 unless somebody can show some good reason for thinking otherwise. (To make the case, a two-pronged argument is needed: it has to be shown that the document in question is rather unlikely to have been omitted from C3 but rather likely to have been omitted from A1. The arguments sketched out by Fleming (1997, pp. 89–90) seem inadequate to me.) The same considerations apply to those documents absent from A1 and C5 but present in T1 (Table 25).

<sup>28</sup> I use a simplified notation here, citing just the earliest copy for each state of the text. Written out in full, the notation would be C3/A1C5T1, C3/C5T1, C3/T1.

As far as the text is concerned, the earliest state which we can hope to visualize is C3/A1, the state existing when the earliest copy was made. But I think it is clear that C3/A1 was already some distance away from the original, say C3/0. It ends with two post-conquest documents – one charter of Henric I, one of archbishop Anselm – which seem so out of keeping with the compiler's purpose (so far as we can judge of it from the rest of the text) that they are fairly sure to have been added by somebody else.<sup>29</sup> Because we are working from copies, not from C3 itself, we cannot expect it to be easy to decide why and when C3 was first put together. One document included in C3/A1 – an uninspired piece of pseudo-historical narrative purporting to explain why the archbishops ceased being buried at Saint Augustine's and began being buried at Christ Church – is, if I read it correctly, unlikely to be earlier than the 1090s; but if anyone wished to suggest that this document was an interpolation in C3/A1, not properly part of C3/0, there would be no means of disproving that suggestion. Similarly, one recurrent feature of the C3/A1 text, the use of the formula 'primate of the whole of Britain', has been taken to imply that C3 cannot be earlier than the 1070s. For myself I do not doubt that. But if anyone wished to suggest that this formula is the leitmotiv of an interpolator (who, hypothetically, worked his way through C3/0 inserting the words *primas totius Britanniae* wherever he found a suitable context for them), again there would not be any means of disproving that suggestion.

It is not impossible that some early version of C3 was compiled in the time of archbishop Lanfranc (1070–1089), when a text like C3 would arguably have had some usefulness; and Fleming claims to have proved that this was the case. Her principal argument (Fleming 1997, p. 105) is that C3 must have been compiled before 1083 because, if he had been at work after that, the compiler would have included a paragraph mentioning the donations of queen Mathildis (who died in November that year). But this argument will only hold if we think it safe to disregard two other possibilities. First, the compiler may have been deliberately confining his attention to documents earlier than some cut-off date – 1066, 1070, or any other cut-off which would have excluded queen Mathildis. Second, he may have failed to complete his task. If we think it at all conceivable either that the compiler was not intending to cover the recent past, or that he was intending to do so but failed to reach his target, we are not going to be persuaded by Fleming's argument. The conclusion may perhaps be right, but this attempt to prove it falls short.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>29</sup> Professor Brooks suggests to me that the internal analysis of C3/A1 can be taken further than this, if one looks at the typology of the entries. I am inclined to agree; but I would prefer to see the text of C3 formally reconstructed before pursuing this line of investigation. As Fleming (1997, p. 103) points out, to understand the compiler's purpose one needs to understand not only why certain documents were included, but also why certain other documents, which presumably might have been, were not. That again is a question which I would prefer to postpone.

<sup>30</sup> Fleming (1997, pp. 100–1) has a second argument, more involved but no more convincing, which aims to prove that C3 was compiled before the

The survey of Kent

A1	C5	T1	number in T1	Birch	Sawyer	Fleming	
	11r	152Ar	1			1	Jaffé 1885–8, no. 1998
195r	11r	152Ar	2		1609	2	
195r	11r–v	152Ar	3		8	3	
195r	11v	152Ar–v	4		230	4	
195r	11v	152Av	5		1610	5	
195r	11v–12r	152Av	6		19	6	
195r–v	12r–13r	153Av–4Ar	9		22	7	
195v	13r	154Ar	10	161	1611	8	
195v–6r	13r–v	154Ar	11		90	9	
196r–v	13v–14v	154Av–5r	12			10	Twysden 1652, cols. 2209–11
196v	14v	155r	13	173	1612	11	
196v	14v	155r	15	243	38	12	
196v	14v–15r	155r	16	301	1613	13	
196v–7r	15r–v	155v–6r	19	290		14	
197r	15v	156v–7r	21	294	155	15	
197r	15v–16r	157r	22	320	1259	16	
197r	16r	157v	24		160	17	
197r	16r	155r	14	215	111	18	
197r–8r	16r–17r	158r–9r	33	385	1436	19	
198r	17r–v	157v	25	323	1615	20	
198r	17v	157v	26	329	1616	21	
198r	17v	157v	27	336	1617	22	
198r–v	17v–18r	158r	28	345	1618	23	
198v	18r	158r	29	347	175	24	
198v	18r	158r	30	367	1619	25	
198v	18r	158r	31	371	186	26	
198v	18r	158r	32	372	1620	27	
198v	18r	159r	34	374	187	28	
198v	18v	159r	35	382	1621	29	cf. Sawyer nos. 1266, 1264
198v	18v	159r	36	401	188	30	
198v–9r	18v–19r	159v	37	402	1414	31	
199r	19r–v	159v–60r	38	408	1623	32	
199r	19v	160r	40	422	1438	33	
199r	19v	160r	41	427	1625	34	
199r	19v	160r	42	420	286	35	
199r–v	19v	160r	43	446	1626	36	
199v	20r	160v	44	572	1627	37	
199v	20r	160v	45	578	1628	38	
199v	20r	160v	46	637	1629	39	
199v	20r	161r	50	733	1209	40	
199v	20v–1r	155v	18		132	41	
199v–200r	21r	155r–v	17	263	1614	42	
200r	21r	160v–1r	47		398	43	
200r	21r–v	161r	51	747	1210	44	
200r	21v	161v	54	861	537	45	
200r	21v	161v	55	881	546	46	
200r	21v	161v	56	176	31	47	
200r	21v–2r	161r–v	52	766	477	48	
200r–v	22r	161v–2r	57	1038	1632	49	
200v	22r	162r	58	1049	1633	50	
200v	22r–3r	162r–v	59	1065	1212	51	two paragraphs run together by Kemble (1848)
200v	23r	162v	60	1065	1212	52	
200v	23r	163r	63		1636	53	
200v	23r	163r	64		1503	54	
200v	23r–v	163r–v	67		1378	55	
200v	23v	163v	68		1638	56	
200v	23v	163v	69		905	57	
200v	23v	160r	39	414	1624	58	
200v	23v–4r	161r	48		1639	59	
200v	24r	161r	49	698	1630	60	
200v–1r	24r	162v	61	1102	1634	61	
201r	24r	162v–3r	62	1126	1635	62	
201r	24r	164v	72		1640	63	
	24r–v	164v	75		952	64	
201r	24v	164v	73		1641	65	
201r	24v	164v	74		950	66	
201r	24v	164v	76		1642	67	
201r	24v	164v–5r	77		1222	68	
201r	24v	165r	78		1221	69	
	24v–5v	163v–4r	70		914	70	
201r	25v	164r–v	71		1218	71	
201r	25v	163r	65		1637	72	

The lost cartulary of Christ Church

A1	C5	T1	number in T1	Birch	Sawyer	Fleming	
201r	25v–6r	163r	66		1646	73	
201r	26r	165r	80		1643	74	
201r–v	26r	165r–v	82		1089	75	
201v	26r–v	165v	83		1047	76–7	cf. Sawyer no. 1647
201v	26v	166r	86		1090	78	
201v	26v	165v	84		1645	79	
201v	26v–7r	165v–6r	85		1530	80	
201v	27r	161v	53	823	1631	81	
201v	27r	165r	79		1389	82	
201v	27r	165r	81		1644	83	
	27r–v	157r–v	23	311		84	
	27v–8r	156r–v	20	291	1258	85	
201v	28r–v	164v	[76 bis]		959	86	
	28v	167v–8r	99			87	<i>Hee sunt consuetudines ...</i>
201v	28v	166v	94			88	Johnson and Cronne 1956, no. 756
201v	28v–9r	166v	95			89	Brett and Gribbin 2004, no. 16
	29r–v	170r	103				<i>De Derenta, ii sull'</i>
	29v–33r	170r–2r					Rex tenet Derteford

Table 23. Contents of C3 in its early thirteenth-century state (C3/C5).

It seems to me, however, that C3 is later than that. The argument which I propose to make depends on finding an answer to this question: when did it become the official theory that Christ Church had been – not just ought to have been but actually had been – served by monks throughout its history? This is a complicated question: to discuss it in full would mean discussing various annalistic texts and various forgeries, the dating of which is hardly any easier to settle than the dating of C3. But there is a short cut. We can get some way towards an answer by looking at Willelm of Malmesbury's *Gesta pontificum*, and at the alterations which Willelm made in his text between the 1120s and the 1140s. By a stroke of good luck, the autograph manuscript survives: we can see directly what erasures and additions were made. From the copies that were taken from this manuscript from time to time, we can restore the passages which Willelm decided later to suppress, and we can work out the sequence of the changes that he made.<sup>31</sup>

Writing in the 1120s, Willelm was unaware of the theory that Christ Church had always been, had never not been, inhabited by monks. On the contrary, his understanding was that the monks had been brought in by archbishop Ælfric (995–1005), the clerks who were there previously having

been evicted to make way for them. He had only one sentence to say about archbishop Ælfric, and this was the substance of it.<sup>32</sup> As I read the evidence, that is the fact of the matter – the clerks were indeed thrown out, and Ælfric was indeed the man who did it – and Willelm had not yet been persuaded to see things differently. In the 1140s, however, this passage was extensively rewritten.<sup>33</sup> ‘What some people say’ about Ælfric, that he threw out the clerks and replaced them with monks (here Willelm is quoting himself), appears, he says now, ‘unlikely to be true’ (he does not positively say that it is false), because it is a known fact that there have been monks at Christ Church since the time of archbishop Laurence. As proof of this he refers his readers to the letter from pope Bonifacius to king Ethelbert which they will find quoted below (ed. Hamilton 1870, pp. 46–7), the same letter which forms the first paragraph in C3/C5. This is one of the batch of Christ Church forgeries which Willelm had obligingly included in the first edition of his book, back in the 1120s. Even if it were genuine, however, the letter would not prove the point. It would prove that king Ethelbert had intended to establish a community of monks, and that the pope had approved of his plan; but it would not prove that Ethelbert's intention was realized – still less that the community survived without interruption

foundation of Saint Gregory's church – earlier, therefore, than 1085, by which time Saint Gregory's is known to have been in existence. But the argument turns on a passage in the supposed ‘foundation charter’ (Brett and Gribbin 2004, no. 1), which is an obvious forgery.

<sup>31</sup> A new edition of the *Gesta pontificum* is said to be forthcoming; for the moment I continue to rely on Hamilton's (1870) edition. This was based on the autograph original, the manuscript which he called A (Oxford, Magdalen College 172). For the other four manuscripts collated by Hamilton, the textual relationships are (approximately) as follows: B and C reflect A's original state; E reflects a second state, not earlier than 1136; D reflects a third state, not earlier than 1140; a few alterations in A are later still. E was corrected, after 1158, to bring it into line with the latest state of A, but in its uncorrected form was earlier than D, not later. Only this last point was not quite grasped by Hamilton (1870, p. xxii), but the variants he quotes go to prove it. (Since this was written, the new edition has been published (Winterbottom and Thomson 2007).)

<sup>32</sup> ... *sedit (annis xi) Wiltunensium ante episcopum Elfricus, qui clericis a Cantuaria proturbatis monachos induxit* (ed. Hamilton 1870, p. 32). The words *annis xi*, inserted in A, are absent from B and C but present in E and D; they were no doubt always intended to be part of the text. (It should be noted, by the way, that Willelm had muddled his list of archbishops, putting Ælfric in front of Sigeric, not behind him. He never corrected that error.)

<sup>33</sup> The passage was made to read: *sedit annis xi Wiltunensium prius episcopus Elfricus, qui et ante abbas Abbendoniensis fuerat. De quo quod quidam dicunt, eum in archiepiscopatu Cantuariensi monachos proturbatis clericis posuisse, uerisimile non uidetur: constat enim monachos in aeclesia Sancti Saluatoris fuisse a tempore Laurentii archiepiscopi, qui primus beatissimo Augustino successit, sicut ex epistola Bonifatii papae ad regem Ethelbertum quae inferius ponetur constabit*. The statement that Ælfric had been abbot of Abingdon is incorrect: in fact he was a monk of Abingdon who became abbot of Saint Alban's (Brooks 1984, p. 279, with references, including Ælfric's will).



for the next five hundred years. Nevertheless, with some reluctance, Willelm was now accepting the official theory.

By the 1140s, therefore, the Christ Church monks had decided to forget that their community owed its existence to archbishop Ælfric. They had constructed an imaginary past for themselves, and they had invested their future in it. But that had only happened within the previous twenty years. In the 1120s, whatever the monks may or may not have been saying among themselves, they had not shared their thoughts with outsiders. If even Willelm of Malmesbury – well-informed and favourably disposed towards Christ Church – was allowed to remain in ignorance, we are entitled to assume that ignorance prevailed quite generally. Either the theory had not been invented at all, or else it had not yet been put into circulation.

Here we intersect with one of the preoccupations of C3's compiler. Whatever the original documents might say or fail to say, the compiler was determined to create the impression that the monastic community had maintained a continuous existence from the very beginning. Over and over again, he includes a phrase – *ad opus monachorum ibidem deo seruientium*, or something similar – asserting that some donation to Christ Church was intended specifically to benefit the monks, the monks who were there at the time and their successors. In this aspect, the cartulary is a piece of pseudo-historical propaganda. Over and over again, moreover, the compiler includes a curse, sometimes borrowing it from the original that he has in front of him, but usually inventing his own form of words – a threat that anyone infringing the terms of the donation is sure to go to hell. By deliberately repeating himself in paragraph after paragraph, the compiler drives his message home: these donations were meant for the monks, and any person who disregards that fact is inviting his own damnation.

There was, during the 1120s, a period when the Christ Church monks were seriously afraid that they might be evicted from their church. After the death of archbishop Radulf in October 1122, it soon became clear that the next archbishop was not going to be a monk, and the monks got it into their heads that without a monk as archbishop their own future would be in jeopardy (Bethell 1969). Their fears proved to be groundless;<sup>34</sup> but for a while the sense of panic was strongly felt. The early 1120s were a difficult time for the Christ Church monks. The pope had turned against them; the archbishop of York was thumbing his nose at them; the monks of Saint Augustine's were ringing their bells whenever they pleased, without waiting for the Christ Church bells to ring first; and the new archbishop was a stranger, not even a monk, imposed on them against their will. It seems to me that C3 was compiled in about 1125–30, while the monks of Christ Church were still recovering

<sup>34</sup> Here again, Willelm of Malmesbury acted as a spokesman for the Christ Church monks. Writing soon after the event, he included some angry remarks about the conduct of the election, and about the character of the new archbishop (ed. Hamilton 1870, p. 146); but later he suppressed these remarks (the passage was erased from A and is missing from E and D).

from the shock of the election of archbishop Willelm.

In its earliest form, C3 invites comparison with a shorter text from Rochester, which also served as a calendar of the church's archive.<sup>35</sup> This text begins with an entry recording a donation made in 738 by Eadberht king of the Cantware (Campbell 1973, no. 3) and ends with an entry recording a donation by Willelm II (Davis 1913, no. 400). On the face of it, the list was drawn up after the death of Willelm II but before the death of Henric I, i.e. in the interval 1100×35. But the dating can be tightened up slightly, because the cartulary into which this text was copied is fairly sure to be earlier than 1130.<sup>36</sup> The entries here take this basic form: *Anno ab incarnatione domini ... . rex ... dedit aecclesiae sancti Andreae ... et commendauit ... episcopo*. The date is sometimes omitted, but the name of the bishop to whom the land was 'commended' is consistently included. As in C3, the compiler is putting his own interpretation on the documents that he mentions; as in C3, he makes his point by repetition – specifically by repetition of the word *commendauit*. He is insisting on the distinction between the church, which exists forever, and the bishop, who is its trustee for the time being. As at Christ Church, that distinction became critical in the 1120s, when the Rochester monks found themselves cohabiting with a bishop who was not a monk, but I do not know that anyone would have thought that it needed to be emphasized before then.<sup>37</sup>

Over some uncertain length of time, a series of additions and interpolations made in C3 (Table 24) resulted in state C3/C5, the state existing when the next copy was made. Some of these additions are in keeping with the purpose originally intended for C3; some are not.<sup>38</sup> The two texts added right at the end, though both have been much misunderstood, are not really very hard to make sense of. One is the list printed from T1 by Hoyt (1962, pp. 199–202). In that manuscript it carries the title (supplied by scribe 2) *Sulings maneriorum archiepiscopatus Cantuariensis in Cancnia*, 'Sulings of the manors of the archbishopric of Canterbury in Kent'; the only other known copy is

<sup>35</sup> R1, fos. 215r–16r. There are later versions of this list, beginning with the one which appears in a quire inserted into the same cartulary in the late twelfth century (fos. 177r–8r).

<sup>36</sup> As I have argued elsewhere (Flight 1997a, p. 31), the cartulary dates from 1122×30, the later bound being based on negative evidence – the absence of any mention of Boxley church, given to Rochester in 1130.

<sup>37</sup> One other point of resemblance to C3 is striking. This Rochester text has marginal notes giving obits for Offa (fo. 215r, 12 August), and for three recent benefactors, Willelm I, Willelm II and Lanfranc (fo. 216r). In C3/C5, similarly, there is a solitary note (perhaps marginal in C3 itself) giving obits for king Eadbald and his mother Berta (Fleming 1997, p. 109). Of course it is true that a list like this does have a commemorative aspect, but I hardly think that one can press that point as far as Fleming (1997, pp. 102–6) proposes.

<sup>38</sup> The text interpolated near the end (beginning *Hee sunt consuetudines ...*) is an interesting account of the assets of Newington church. The gist of it was reported by Du Boulay (1966, pp. 176–7); the text itself was printed, very inaccurately, by Fleming (1997, pp. 151–2). I have thought it worth printing again (above, p. 216).

The lost cartulary of Christ Church

A1	C5	T1	number in T1	Birch	Sawyer	Fleming	
	11r	152Ar	1			1	Jaffé 1885–8, no. 1998
	24r–v	164v	75		952	64	
	24v–5v	163v–4r	70		914	70	
	27r–v	157r–v	23	311		84	
	27v–8r	156r–v	20	291	1258	85	
	28v	167v–8r	99			87	<i>Hee sunt consuetudines ...</i>
	29r–v	170r	103				<i>De Derenta, ii sull' ...</i>
	29v–33r	170r–2r					<i>Rex tenet Derteford ...</i>

Table 24. Documents absent from A1 but present in C5 and T1.

the one in C5 (which has no title, only a blank line which may have been intended for one). Though Hoyt convinced himself otherwise, this list is obviously derived from DB-Ke chapters 2–4, i.e. the chapters describing the lands of the archbishopric; more immediately, it is derived from the marginal annotation that was added to a transcript of these chapters procured by the monks of Christ Church (above, pp. 92–4). The other text (beginning *Rex tenet Derteford*) is basically an epitome of DB-Ke (excluding chapters 2–4 and chapter 13) reorganized to take account of the fact that since 1088 the bishop of Bayeux has vanished from the scene. In T1 its title is *Item tocius Cancie sulinges ut uideatur*, ‘Also, sulungs of the whole of Kent, so it seems’. As well as the copies in C5 and T1, there is a copy of this text in a very much earlier manuscript (C1, fos. 5vc–7ra). This text is of no great importance, but the reader who wishes to know more about it will find it printed and discussed in detail above (chapter 6).

A further series of additions and interpolations (Table 25) – so disparate that they must surely have been made by several different scribes, on several different occasions – resulted in state C3/T1, the state existing when the last copy was made (the latest state, therefore, that we can know about).<sup>39</sup> Only a few of these additions show any regard for C3’s original purpose: by this time, C3 had become a general-purpose register, into which any sort of document might be copied, if it seemed sufficiently ancient, if it seemed sufficiently interesting.<sup>40</sup>

In the nature of the case, it is impossible to prove that documents occurring only in T1 were copied by T1 from C3; but there is a presumption in favour of that view, and I can see no indications to the contrary. Scribe 1 seems to keep copy-

ing without a break, as far as fo. 177r; when he reaches the end, he makes it clear that he has reached the end, by leaving a whole page blank. That is how he lets us know that he is about to start copying from a different exemplar.<sup>41</sup> Scribe 2, in the additions he made, seems also to be assuming that the text is continuous throughout. Most of the paragraphs peculiar to T1 are treated in the regular way (annotated in the margin, listed in the table of contents), with no hint that they are anything other than an integral part of the text. Towards the end, it is true, the treatment becomes irregular,<sup>42</sup> but I see no significance in this fact, except that the scribes were losing interest. Scribe 1 stopped numbering the paragraphs; scribe 2 wrote brief descriptions of the contents in the margins, guiding readers to the start of each new paragraph, but did not bother to make matching entries in the table of contents.

The final stretch of text in T1 (fos. 172v–7r),<sup>43</sup> all of which (titles included) I take to have been copied from C3/T1, consists of the following paragraphs:

*Hee sunt consuetudines archiepiscopi in pascha de presbiteris et ecclesiis* (fo. 172v)

*Hec sunt que debentur de Sancto Augustino singulis annis Ecclesie Christi* (fo. 172v)

*Iste ecclesie pertinent ad Sanctum Martinum de Doforis ...* (fos. 172v–3r)

*Hec est institutio antiqua ante aduentum domni Lanfranci archiepiscopi* (fo. 173r)

*Romscot de Eastkent* (fo. 173r)

<sup>41</sup> The only point at which one might think of seeing some discontinuity is at fo. 169v, where the scribe, having finished a paragraph (no. 102), leaves the rest of the page (18 lines) blank. But his reason for doing this is clear enough, I think, because the next paragraph is laid out in three columns: the scribe, I take it, preferred to start a new page before starting a new format. This next paragraph (no. 103) is also present in C5 (it is the list printed by Hoyt); so in any case it is not to be thought that a change of exemplar occurred at this point.

<sup>42</sup> The last item in the table of contents is: *CIII. De sullingis maneriorum Archiepiscopatus Cant’, et aliorum quorundam* (fo. 148v). The last three words, ‘and of some other people’, are a forlorn allusion to the epitome of DB-Ke, which scribe 2 found it hard to see the sense of.

<sup>43</sup> The penultimate paragraph is a schedule of the farms due from the monks’ manors, the same document that was copied into C4 (above, p. 33).

<sup>39</sup> The order in which the documents are listed is the order obtaining in T1: how far this differed from the order obtaining in C3 we cannot tell. (To the extent that they fall into batches, however, it is probably safe to assume that within each batch C3’s order was maintained.)

<sup>40</sup> The items numbered 96–8 relate to the question whether it is right for monks to own parish churches: these documents tend to prove that it is not just right but a thoroughly good idea. The items numbered 101–2 are part of the Becket dossier: a version of the ‘constitutions of Clarendon’, copied from Herbert of Bosham, and a version of some orders issued by the king (Knowles, Duggan and Brooke 1972), largely the same as Willelm of Canterbury’s version.

The survey of Kent

A1	C5	T1	number in T1	Birch	Sawyer	Fleming
		152v–3r	7			Jaffé 1885–8, no. 2133
		153r	8			Jaffé 1885–8, no. 2132
		166r	87		1087	
		166r	88			Bates 1998, no. 75
		166r	89			Bates 1998, no. 71
		166r	90			Bates 1998, no. 70
		166r–v	91			Bates 1998, no. 129
		166v	92			Bates 1998, no. 73
		166v	93			Bates 1998, no. 76
		167r	96			<i>Sunt nonnulli stulto ...</i>
		167r–v	97			Jaffé 1885–8, no. 4761
		167v	98			<i>Episcopus missam ...</i>
		168r–v	100			<i>Fulchestan de beneficio ...</i>
		168v–9r	101			<i>De aduocacione ...</i>
		169r–v	102			<i>Siquis inuentus fuerit ...</i>
		172r–v				<i>Hee sunt firme monachorum ...</i>
		172v–7r				<i>Hee sunt consuetudines ...</i>

Table 25. Documents absent from A1 and C5 but present in T1.

*Hec sunt maneria archiepiscopatus* (fo. 173r), *Hec sunt maneria episcopi Roffensis* (fo. 173r), *Hec sunt maneria monachorum in Kent* (fo. 173v)

*De maneriis archiepiscopatus* (fos. 173v–4v), *Incipiunt maneria monachorum in Kent* (fos. 174v–6r), *Incipiunt terre episcopatus Roffensis* (fo. 176r–v)

*Per totam ciuitatem Cant' habet rex sacam et socam ...* (fo. 176v)

*Stursete et Petham reddunt de firma ...* (fos. 176v–7r)

*De militibus archiepiscopi* (fo. 177r)

Without exception, the same items all occur in C1. Conversely, with just one exception (see below), all the texts copied into C1 by the main scribe (fos. 1ra–7ra) and by a second scribe (fo. 7rb–c) occur again in T1, in the same sequence.<sup>44</sup>

It does not need to be argued at length that T1 is derived from C1: that much is perfectly obvious. As far as we know, it was the main scribe of C1 who selected these documents (except the last one) and put them into this sequence; it was the second scribe who decided to append a list of the archbishop's knights. Decisions made by those two scribes are what gave the text its shape – the shape which it retains in T1. In detail too, features of the text which are more or less certain to have originated in C1 turn up again in T1. In C1 the entry relating to Ulcombe (the last entry in the section describing the archbishop's own lands) has two words

<sup>44</sup> The documents added by a third scribe at the end of C1 (fos. 7va–8vb) do not appear in T1. Three explanations are possible: (i) that they were not (though they might have been) copied from C3 into T1, (ii) that they were not (though they might have been) copied from C1 into C3, or (iii) that they were not added to C1 till after C3 had been copied off. The last possibility is chronologically awkward, and I am inclined to rule it out; I see no way of deciding between (i) and (ii).

added between the lines, by a later hand (fo. 3va). Somebody reading (perhaps transcribing) this entry came across a mention of king 'E', and decided that he ought to explain who this was, for the benefit of future readers less knowledgeable than himself; so (picking up his pen) in tiny script he inserted the words *s' Edwardi* (where *s'* stands for *scilicet*, 'namely'). To all appearances, those words came into existence in C1 itself, through a spur-of-the-moment decision made by someone consulting that manuscript. When we find the same words in T1 – corrupted, however, into *sc'i Edmundi* (fo. 174v) – that fact by itself is virtual proof that T1 derives from C1.<sup>45</sup>

The only question, then, is whether T1 was copied from C1 itself, or (as I suppose) from a copy of C1. This is a matter of judgment, not of proof. We may think it unlikely that scribe 1 would have managed to misread *s' Edwardi* as *sc'i Edmundi* if he had been copying directly from C1; but we cannot think it impossible.<sup>46</sup> All scribes, even the most competent, do silly things now and then. In the end, the best answer seems to be simply this. We know that T1 was being copied from C3, and there is nothing to suggest that the copyist switched to a different exemplar at the point where T1's contents begin to agree with C1's. Given that, the chances are that T1 is a second-hand copy – that this whole stretch of text was first copied from C1 into C3, and then afterwards copied from C3 into T1, along with the rest of C3's contents. It is, by the way, easier to believe that one of the monks might have been given access to C1, for the

<sup>45</sup> This evidence was noted by Kreisler (1967, p. 228). Misread as it is in T1, the passage seems to be saying that a man named Ælfer held Ulcombe from the archbishop 'in the time of Saint Edmund'. Scribe 2 has added *Nota* in the margin. It might indeed be a notable fact, if it were not quite wrong.

<sup>46</sup> A similar instance, also noted by Kreisler (1967, p. 209), is a pair of place-names, *Wy*, *Tenham*, quite distinct in C1 (fo. 1vb), which in T1 have been fused to make *Pittenham* (fo. 173r).

purpose of copying it into the priory's cartulary, than that Kilwardby's clerks might have got their hands on it.

One final complication can be quite briefly disposed of. The single text which is present in C1 but absent from the corresponding section of T1 is the same epitome of DB-Ke (*Rex tenet Derteford . . .*) which T1 has copied once already (fos. 170r–2r), from a previous section of C3. As I understand it, what happened here was this. By the time that it came to be transcribed into T1, C3 contained two copies of this text. The earlier copy, seemingly taken from the original (definitely not from C1),<sup>47</sup> was among the additions made in C3/C5; from there, some time later, it was transcribed into C5. Later again, after C5 had been copied off, somebody decided to transcribe C1 into C3, and by doing so added a second copy of the same epitome. Some time after that, C3 was transcribed into T1. When he came to the first copy of this text, scribe 1 reproduced it as a matter of course. When he came to the second copy, some pages later, he recognized it as another copy of the same text, saw no point in writing it out again, and decided (or was given permission) to omit it. The copy which scribe 1 did make was edited by scribe 2; and it is clear, from some of the corrections inserted by him, that he was checking the text against a C1-like source – either C1 itself or a copy derived from C1.<sup>48</sup> Since we have already concluded that C1 (or most of it) was transcribed into C3, and that C3 (or most of it) was transcribed into T1, it is obvious what the simplest explanation will be: that these corrections came from the copy of C1 in C3. I can see no reason not to be content with that.

<sup>47</sup> The best indication of this is the entry relating to Repton (cf. DB-Ke-12rb46), where C5 and T1 have the correct reading, *Rapintune pro i iugo*, but C1 has *sull'* instead of *iugo* (fo. 6ra).

<sup>48</sup> That these corrections derive (directly or indirectly) from C1 was recognized by Kreisler (1967, pp. 203–6). In the Repton entry (see previous note), scribe 1 had *iugo*, correctly, but scribe 2 changed this to *sull'*; so T1 is affected by an error which occurs (and seems to have originated) in C1.