

## Chapter 2

### The archbishop's response to the commissioners' questionnaire

The text with which we have to start – text  $\alpha$ , as I propose to call it – might not be the place where we would choose to start, if we had any choice. It is not an easy beginning. There are three segments – the lands of the archbishop himself, the lands of the archbishop's monks, the lands of the bishop of Rochester – which (as the sequel proves) were not all of equal interest to every copyist. There are several surviving copies – but happily only three of them have textual value, and the rest can be ignored. Of these three copies, each has a different version of the text, for as much of the text as it contains. Only one copy has the entire text; but each segment exists in two versions. There is, in short, a broken landscape ahead of us, through which we have to try to find our way. Table 6 is a map which I hope will help the reader to navigate this chapter.

segment	$\alpha 1 / C4$	$\alpha 2 / C1$	$\alpha 3 / R1$
1	70rb–1va	2va–3va	—
2	71va–2va	3vb–5ra	—
3	—	5ra–c	209r–10r

Table 6. Versions and copies of the segments of text  $\alpha$ .

I begin by giving some description of the manuscripts in question. Then I look at the differences between one version and another. And lastly I try to work out how this text is connected with the conduct of the survey.

#### **C4 = Canterbury Cathedral Archives, Reg. K, fos. 23–52, 190, 53–72**

The bound volume which is now called Register K – it was known to Somner as the *liber tuberosus*, ‘book with knobs on’ (Urry 1967, p. 375) – is a bewildering agglomeration of miscellaneous material, much of which seems to have been assembled in the time of prior Henric of Eastry (1285–1331). But it includes one booklet of much earlier date than that, and this is the only part of the volume which has any interest for us. The booklet was described by Urry (1967, pp. 17–19) and proved by him to date from about 1215 – i.e. to the period just after the monks' return from exile, when they were busy reasserting their control over the church's property.

Though I cannot be certain how the booklet is constructed, I am satisfied that fo. 23 is the beginning of one quire and

fo. 72 the end of another.<sup>1</sup> There are about 40 lines per page; the number of columns is allowed to vary – one, two or three – depending on the nature of the text. The headings have been added in red; the coloured initials, alternately red and blue,<sup>2</sup> are all in place; there is an illuminated ‘R’ at the beginning. In its pristine form this was a rather pretty manuscript, all (I think) the work of a single scribe. But some stretches of text have been very heavily amended by later hands, and the appearance of the manuscript is marred by many additions, often carelessly written. On top of that, the whole register has suffered some damage around the edges, supposed to have been caused by the fire of 1670.

For more than two-thirds of its length, as far as fo. 60v, the contents of C4 run parallel with those of a slightly earlier booklet (Reg. H, fos. 1–24), dated by Urry to c. 1205 (1967, pp. 10–14). From fo. 61r onwards, these are the contents:

- (i) A note of the quantities of goods required by way of farm for different numbers of weeks (61r).
- (ii) A list of payments due from parish churches (61v). This is an updated version of one of the lists of churches in C1 (see below); I print it in chapter 8 (pp. 230–1).
- (iii) A list of incidental payments due from the monks' manors (62r–6r).
- (iv) A list of rents arising from property in London (66v–9r).
- (v) A list of the farms to be paid from the monks' manors (69v–70r). The title and a few of the entries were printed by Urry (1967, p. 26).<sup>3</sup>
- (vi) A manor-by-manor description of the lands in Kent belonging to the archbishop and the monks (70r–2v).

This last article is the copy of  $\alpha 1$ . Apart from Urry, the first person to study it closely was F. F. Kreisler; the results of a

<sup>1</sup> The medieval foliation runs from ‘i’ to ‘lii’: fo. xi is missing (or else the number was omitted); fo. xxxii is the stray singleton, numbered 190, which has now been put back where it belongs.

<sup>2</sup> Except for a single green initial, at 70va27.

<sup>3</sup> This document purports to be describing the arrangements put in place by Lanfranc, but is obviously not contemporary. In this version at least, it seems to date from about the beginning of the thirteenth century: the only tenant mentioned by name, Herebert Deu enemi, is a man who occurs in the exchequer rolls for 1201–4 (because he held a quarter of a knight's fee in Ospringe from the king). Another copy of this text is to be found in manuscript T1 (below, p. 285).

collation of C1 and C4 are presented in an appendix to his thesis (Kreisler 1967, pp. 297–309).

As it appears here, text  $\alpha$  consists of two segments, each with its own title. Segment 1 is headed *De maneriis archiepiscopatus in Kantia, et de sullinges que sunt in eis* (70rb); segment 2, similarly, *De maneriis prioratus in Kantia, et de sullinges que sunt in eis* (71va). As in C1, the second segment concludes with a paragraph relating to Burston (7rva27–9), and the scribe stops at this point.<sup>4</sup> Whether he really regarded this as the end, or whether he was intending to make himself a new quire and then continue, as in C1, with a segment covering the bishop of Rochester's manors, it is simply impossible to say.

After the text had been completed, at least two other scribes were involved in making corrections to it.<sup>5</sup> Because their interventions never collide, it is not clear which of them was active first; from the style of the script, neither seems to be very much later than the main scribe. Hand X (to call it that) is the hand which, as well as making corrections, wrote some additions at the end – the word *Summa* at the foot of col. 72va (which would seem to have been, in his opinion, all that was needed to complete the copy of text  $\alpha$ ), and a short list of one-line entries in col. 72vb.<sup>6</sup> This is a rounder, rougher hand than the main scribe's, usually not very difficult to distinguish. Hand Y is conspicuously different: the script is small and cursive, and has a spidery look to it.<sup>7</sup>

The indications are that both scribes were altering this version of the text to bring it into line with the version represented by C1. Hand X, repairing an omission in the entry for Sandling, added the following words, just as they appear there: *ab ep'o baioc' et defendebat se in tempore E regis pro i sull'* (71rb16 = 4vb47). Hand Y, altering the entry for Sandwich, cancelled the word *postea* and replaced it with *in preterito anno reddidit*, as in C1 (71vb6 = 3vc4); and this shows that the scribe was revising the text, not just correcting mistakes.

One stretch of text in particular has been extensively reconstructed (71va31–40). There are three subparagraphs

<sup>4</sup> We might expect him at least to announce that he has reached the end of a segment by writing *Summa* here, as he did at the end of segment 1 (71va18). He did not do that. The word *Summa* does appear at the foot of this column, but it was added by another hand (see below).

<sup>5</sup> A few corrections may be the work of a third hand, rounder than the main scribe's, neater than hand X. I have not been able to make up my mind about this.

<sup>6</sup> I print this list, for what little it is worth, because it occurs only here. *Berkesore, i sull'*. *Leisdune, i sull'*. *In Essexia, Suthcherche, iiii hidas et dim'*. *Middeltime, ii hid' et dim'*. *Lellinge, xvii hid'*. *Bockinge, iiii hid' et dim'*. *In Suthfolchia, Illege, ii hid'*. *Hedlege, i hid'*. The two places in Kent are Barksore (in Lower Halstow) and Leysdown, given to the church by Henric II, in 1178 and 1173 respectively. (But the monks had a previous claim on Barksore, by virtue of a charter of king Stephan.)

<sup>7</sup> This is the hand which added a gloss *eadwardi* in the very first line (70rb3). The hand which added a similar gloss in C1, at 3va4, is probably the same. (If so, that would tend to prove that these correctors were consulting C1 itself, not some copy of it.)

following the paragraph for Eastry, and this is what they looked like at first:

*Tilemanestune est de terra monachorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro i sull', et nunc facit similiter, et ualet xxx solid'.*

... (erasure) ... *apud fenglesham dimid' sull' quod tenuit lieuenoth tempore E regis ab archiep'o, et ualet xx sol'.*

... (erasure) ... *dimid' sull' stepenberghe, quod Godwinus tenuit de archiep'o Aðzi tempore E regis, et tunc se defendebat pro dimid' sull', sicut et nunc, et ualet xxx sol'.*

But hand X has dealt violently with these entries, making additions between the lines and over erasures,

*quod Will' folet tenet ab arch'ep'o*

*Idem Will' folet h't de predicta terra ab arch'ep'o*

*Id' W' h't de predicta terra ab arch'p'o*

the effect of which is to force this stretch of text, not quite into verbal agreement, but into substantive agreement with C1 (3vb24–44).

From our point of view, these changes are changes for the worse. This copy in C4 is only of interest to the extent that it differs from the copy in C1; and corrections which were aimed at effacing that difference diminish its value for us. In dealing with this manuscript, therefore, I look only at what was written by the original scribe, ignoring any alterations that were made by other hands.

By the end of the thirteenth century, this booklet had been brought together with the other quires that constitute Reg. K, and the copy of  $\alpha$ 1 thus came to be juxtaposed with a sequence of excerpts from D and DB relating to the monks' manors in Essex, Suffolk, Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Surrey and Sussex (Reg. K, fos. 73r–v). That juxtaposition makes it easy to prove that the other surviving copies of  $\alpha$ 1 are derived from Reg. K, and therefore of no textual value.

These other copies are of segment 2 only, the segment of special interest to the monks. It turns up again first in a late thirteenth-century manuscript, a single quire (so it seems) which eventually became part of another composite register (Canterbury Cathedral Archives, Reg. P, fos. 42–9). This book was damaged around the edges, presumably in the fire of 1670;<sup>8</sup> for the most part, however, the text is perfectly legible, though here and there a few letters have been lost. The main scribe filled the first nine pages (42r–6r); he supplied the headings, in bright red ink, but not the coloured initials with which each paragraph was intended to begin. Under the title *De maneriis prioratus in Kancia, et de sullingis que sunt in eis* (42r1), he copied segment 2

<sup>8</sup> Another component of Reg. P (fos. 11–34) is the booklet which I call C5 (below, p. 280). That booklet suffered much more severely than the quire in question here.

word for word as it appears in Reg. K. Then (omitting the little list added at this point by hand X) he continued with the excerpts from D and DB, as they appear in the following quire of Reg. K. Except for the heading *De Coggeshale* (44v15), there is nothing to warn us that we are starting on another county. As far as the survey of the manors in Kent is concerned (42r1–4v14), it is obvious at once that this copy derives from Reg. K,<sup>9</sup> because it incorporates all the corrections made by hands X and Y. The evidence could not be clearer.

Though the Reg. P scribe does not give the impression of writing carefully, his copy is a very accurate one. But there are a few small mistakes – fortunately so, because they mean that the rest of the story can be dealt with in a few words. From Reg. P, the same stretch of text was copied into a third, slightly later register, now BL Cotton Galba E. iv (fos. 30r–2v);<sup>10</sup> and from there it was printed by Bandinel (1813, pp. 100–3). There is only one statement here which stands in need of proof, that Galba was copied from Reg. P; and that is implied by the fact that any significant variants which occur in Reg. P recur in Bandinel's edition.<sup>11</sup> Besides these, the printed text has numerous other errors.<sup>12</sup> Presumably some are the fault of the Galba scribe, some of Bandinel's copyist, some again of his compositor; but I cannot say how the blame should be apportioned. Since I do not see that the question is of any interest, I have spared myself the trouble of working out the answer.

## C1 = Canterbury Cathedral Library, Lit. E 28

This is a manuscript comprising just eight single leaves – eight leaves, however, of quite extraordinary size. Vertically they measure more than 540 mm, horizontally more than 390 mm. Even folded in half, they would be the size of an unusually large book; unfolded, they are about as large of the largest books that medieval scribes could make.<sup>13</sup>

It is a good question why anyone would think of creating a manuscript which looks more like a portfolio than a book. The question was put by Cheney (1983) – who, many years before, had helped with the production of the facsimile edition – and the answer which he suggested seems sure to be right. These leaves were not intended to stand alone. They were meant to be inserted into a textus – a gospel-book or something similar – from which they would imbibe

<sup>9</sup> As was recognized by Kreisler (1967, p. 224).

<sup>10</sup> So cited by Kreisler (1967, p. 14); I have not seen this manuscript myself.

<sup>11</sup> For instance, in the Orpington paragraph, where C4 has *quidam liber homo* (72va2), Reg. P has *quidem homo liber* (44r18); and the latter reading is the one which turns up again in Bandinel (1813, p. 102).

<sup>12</sup> The sub-paragraphs for Finglesham and Statenborough (Bandinel 1813, p. 101) are especially corrupt.

<sup>13</sup> C1 was published in facsimile by Douglas (1944) – not in colour, nor at full size. Though Douglas omitted to say so, the facsimile is only two-thirds the size of the original. The measurements reported by Cheney (1983, p. 11) are 542 × 395 mm.

an odour of sanctity. Not a single leaf has been discovered which might be part of this hypothetical textus; so we cannot say to what degree the design of these new leaves was modelled on that of the pre-existing book. Nevertheless, I think we can be sure that the receptacle intended for C1 was a book of which the Christ Church monks were especially proud, and that the scribe who created C1 was aiming to produce a piece of work which would stand comparison with it. So far I agree with Cheney; I differ only in thinking it unlikely that the intention was ever achieved.<sup>14</sup> In my opinion, the leaves remained unbound.<sup>15</sup>

The leaves are ruled for three columns, with 54 lines in each. Proportionally the lines are rather close together (the spacing is about 7.5 mm), and the script is not inordinately large. The quantity of text which the scribe had to copy could easily have been fitted into six leaves of this size; even after leaving spaces here and there (including one whole column), the scribe had only ten lines remaining when he started on the recto of the seventh leaf. Thus almost two whole leaves were surplus to his requirements. Since the eighth leaf was not discarded, it was evidently not thought unwelcome for some space to be available here, in case it might be found useful by subsequent scribes (as in fact it was). For this scribe, however, reaching this point (7ra10) meant that he had reached the end.

After that he went back to the beginning and started inserted brightly coloured initials in the spaces which he had left for them. (This is the sort of feature which may perhaps have been imitated from the book into which C1 was expected to be inserted.) Four colours were used; there are a few omissions and numerous irregularities, but the normal rota is red, blue, green, purple.<sup>16</sup> Some sections of the text are lists of short items, and here every line or almost every line begins with a coloured initial; elsewhere every paragraph does.

Once the initials were finished, the final step would have been to insert the headings in the spaces that had been reserved for them. In this respect the scribe's intentions are not always precisely clear. Sometimes he seems to be using blank spaces simply to separate one paragraph from another, without any thought of using these spaces for headings (e.g. in columns 1rc–va and 5va–c). Where the space

<sup>14</sup> If these leaves were indeed bound into a textus, it becomes a question how they and they alone could survive. One has to be willing to suppose, for instance, that they were 'saved by some antiquary' (Cheney 1983, p. 13) when the textus was taken apart – and that having been saved they were donated to the Dean and Chapter.

<sup>15</sup> I explain the reason below; but there is a consequential point which ought to be mentioned at once. If it is true that the leaves did not get bound, it will follow that they did not get trimmed around the edges; so the hypothetical textus would not have been quite as large as C1.

<sup>16</sup> In a few places, where the rota had started going wrong, the scribe wrote small coloured letters in the margin to get things under control. At 6ra45, for example, a small green letter is the cue for a blue initial. It is these small letters – not the capitals, which are too plain to offer much scope for individuality – which satisfy me that the initials are the work of the main scribe.

happens to come at the top of a column, however, the intention is unambiguous, and that happens seven times. (One line was left blank at the top of columns 1vb, 2rb, 3rc and 5rc, two lines at the top of columns 2rc, 2va and 3vb.) For one reason or another, the original scribe failed to supply the headings (my guess would be that he was waiting to be provided with some gold foil);<sup>17</sup> and that failure created a quandary. Because these leaves were not quite finished, it became a question whether they were finished enough – finished to the point that they were ready to be inserted into the hypothetical textus. It seems to me (as I have said) that in fact they remained unbound, at least for the time being.

As far as I know, the scribe has not been identified in any other manuscript.<sup>18</sup> He writes a heavy, laboured sort of script, easy to read but not very pleasant to look at. (Perhaps it is worth wondering why a rather mediocre scribe was entrusted with a task of such importance.) One foible which occurs throughout is a failure to get the spacing right where *s* is followed by an ascender: thus *Ans fridus mas leclerc* (6rb53) or *Os bertus pais forire* (6rc11) look like four words each, not two. The scribe can cope with English place-names, even when they are spelt in an English manner. He is not disconcerted by insular characters (ash,<sup>19</sup> eth, thorn, wyn), when he comes across them; *k* and *y* are part of his repertoire.<sup>20</sup>

One feature of this scribe's work which has attracted comment before, from Ward (1933), Douglas (1944), and others, is his proclivity for making mistakes – small mistakes, affecting just one or two letters – which are so very obviously wrong that it looks like an act of perversity to make them. Since many of these errors occur in the place-names, we might think of explaining them on the assumption that the scribe was ignorant of English. For example, the *m* in *Fremgaham* (6vb1) looks to us like an obvious mistake. (On the previous page the name is *Frenigeham* (6rc9); further down the same column it is *Frenigaham* (6vb46); the place in question is Farningham.) No English-speaking scribe would have thought that *Fremgaham* was a well-formed name; to a foreigner it might have seemed no odder than all the other odd names which he was having to copy. Though there may be some truth in it, this explanation does not

<sup>17</sup> The red headings which appear in these spaces were inserted by somebody else; I discuss them further on. (The same scribe added a little red *Æ* against the blue *E* which begins the Sandling paragraph (4vb44). He was protesting (I suppose) that the Latin character ought not to have been used as a substitute for English *Æ*.)

<sup>18</sup> I withdraw the suggestion (Flight 2006, p. 111) that he may have been a professional employed for the purpose. At the time I was doubtful whether his script could be said to have a Christ Church look to it; but Tessa Webber assures me that it does, and I am happy to defer to her opinion.

<sup>19</sup> It is another of his foibles, however, that sometimes, by inadvertently adding an extra stroke, he turns an *æ* into an ampersand.

<sup>20</sup> But the insular form of *r* did catch him out (unless, what is possible, the error existed already in his exemplar). As Ward (1933, p. 61) pointed out, the strange name *Aqus* (1rc52) is sure to be *Acris* misread. Squinting at this word, one can see how the *r* splits apart, the first element joining with *c* to make *q*, the second with *i* to make *u*. Probably the *p* in *Norðcip*' (1va1) is also an *r* misread.

meet the case. It does not account for errors like the *m* in *Gmðhyrste* (1va24). One does not need any knowledge of eleventh-century English to know that this cannot be right: whatever the language may be, this sequence of letters is impossible to pronounce. And yet, deliberately, distinctly, an *m* is what this scribe wrote.

The answer is, I think, that the scribe was under instructions to copy the text exactly as he found it. He was not to exercise even the slightest discretion; he was to copy what he saw, or thought he saw, regardless of whether it seemed to him to make sense. And that is what he did. Though put into a format which is entirely new, the text itself is a letter-by-letter reproduction, as mechanically accurate as the scribe can make it,<sup>21</sup> of the text which he had in front of him. If the exemplar was carelessly written, so that sometimes *u* looked more like *n* or *l* looked more like *l*, the apparent reading is the one which this scribe felt himself obliged to copy; and some of the documents in front of him were indeed quite carelessly written.

This last remark prepares the way for the observation that the contents of the manuscript are something of an anticlimax. What this scribe had been given to copy was a batch of mundane business records, not intended and hardly suitable for the reverential treatment that they were accorded here.

The contents consist (as I count them) of ten separate documents:

- (i) A list of cash payments due to the archbishop at Easter from priests and churches (1ra–b).
  - (ii) A note of certain payments due to Christ Church from the abbey of Saint Augustine (1rc).
  - (iii) A list of churches with their subordinate churches (1rc–va).
  - (iv) A list of the payments from churches which used to be due before archbishop Lanfranc changed things (1vb).
- The first four articles are all printed in chapter 8 (below, pp. 228–30).
- (v) A list of incoming payments of Peter's pence (1vc).
  - (vi) A synopsis of  $\alpha 2$ , giving just the names of the manors and their TRE assessments (2rb–c). Printed below (p. 66).
  - (vii) The copy of  $\alpha 2$  (2va–5rc), first printed (minus the Rochester segment) by Somner (1640).
  - (viii) Some excerpts from the preliminary section of the DB booklet for Kent (5va).<sup>22</sup>

<sup>21</sup> The errors in this manuscript are reminiscent of the errors that occur in a piece of printed text which has been put through a scanner. Anyone who has surfed the web will have come across examples of that.

<sup>22</sup> The excerpts are these: *Per totam ciuitatem* ... from 2ra32–3, *Archiepiscopus calumniatur* ... from 2ra42–3, *De adulterio* ... from 1rb30–3,

(ix) A list of the payments due to the archbishop from his domain manors (5va–c). This document alone is not confined to Kent: it includes the archbishop's manors in Surrey, Middlesex and Sussex (in that order).

(x) An epitome of DB-Ke, not including chapters 2–4 or 13, incorporating a few extraneous facts (5vc–7ra). Printed below as chapter 6.

One of these articles (vii) accounts for slightly more than half of the total quantity of text, a second (x) for almost a quarter. The other eight documents are all fairly short: fitted into this format, the shortest (ii) runs to 13 lines, the longest (ix) to 94 lines. Presumably we should visualize these shorter documents as slips or sheets of parchment of various sizes. The two longer documents, however, would probably consist of booklets – possibly of more than one quire in the case of article (vii).

It looks as if this collection of documents was put together in the archbishop's household, not inside the monastery: the clearest sign of this is the presence of a list of the archbishop's domain manors (ix), taken together with the absence of a similar list for the manors belonging to the monks. Three of the documents (vi–viii) cannot be earlier than 1086; another (x) cannot be earlier than 1088 (below, p. 206). At the end of article (iv) we find a sentence saying that the arrangements in question had been discontinued by archbishop Lanfranc, and the phrase 'of blessed memory' attached to Lanfranc's name is proof that he was dead. This sentence reads like the sort of explanatory remark which might have been added to an existing document, perhaps only just before it was handed to this scribe. But in any case it goes to prove that C1 cannot have been written till after Lanfranc's death in May 1089.

When Lanfranc died, perhaps even before he died, people must have started wondering who the next archbishop would be. They were left in suspense for a very long time. Months went by, years went by, and still the king made no move towards choosing a new archbishop. Finally, almost four years later, it was decided (God knows why) that Anselm abbot of Le Bec was the right man for the job. Even then it took until September 1093, four years and four months after Lanfranc's death, before the archbishop elect was ready to come to Canterbury,<sup>23</sup> another three months before he was willing to let himself be consecrated.

Except in vague terms, we are not told what was happening in Canterbury during this lapse of time. Up to a point, we know without needing to be told, because the rules were plain enough. As soon as the archbishop died, his domain manors – that is, the manors listed in article (ix) – would be

taken into the king's hands; and there they would stay, managed by the king's agents, for the king's profit, for as long as the vacancy lasted. The archbishop's knights (a category which included the bishop of Rochester) would remain in possession of the manors that they held in feod: for the time being, any services normally owed to the archbishop would be paid to the king instead, but otherwise nothing would change. It was the archbishop's monks who would find themselves in a difficult position – not just the monks, but also (though no one cared much about them) the numerous servants who depended on the monks for their livelihood.

A contemporary witness (as I take him to have been) tells us that Christ Church – meaning the monks – did indeed 'suffer many hardships'.<sup>24</sup> But the new archbishop was already in office by the time that these words were written. Having allowed himself this backward glance, this shudder at the thought how bad things had been, the writer preferred to look hopefully ahead. There is a passage in Edmer's *Historia Novorum* (ed. Rule 1884, p. 26) which tells us more; but Edmer, though he had lived through these events, did not write his account of them till much later (not before 1109), and many things had happened in the interim which might have affected his judgment.

The nub of the matter was the king's refusal to allow any special treatment for the manors which, while Lanfranc was alive, had been assigned to the maintenance of the monks. Perhaps it was pointed out to the king that the monks' manors were (mostly) listed separately in the records of the survey of 1086; if the point was put at all, it was put in vain. The agents who arrived to take charge of the archbishopric put themselves in possession of the monks' manors, together with the archbishop's domain manors. They 'estimated what was needed for the bare subsistence of the monks' and paid them no more than that. Out of this allowance the monks had to find their food and drink and their clothing; they also had to find their servant's wages. However generous this allowance was (it was probably not very generous), it would, of course, have seemed inadequate to the monks. According to Edmer, the situation became so desperate that it was necessary for some of the monks to be sent to other monasteries;<sup>25</sup> possibly (though Edmer does not mention it) some of the servants had to be retrenched as well.

It was, arguably, Lanfranc's fault that the monks found themselves in this predicament. We do not know whether they took this view themselves; possibly some of them did and some did not. The hard fact is, however, that Lanfranc had failed to provide the monks with the sort of writ-

*Quidam prepositus* ... from 2ra43–8. The last excerpt can be found printed in parallel with the passage from DB in Flight (2006, p. 35).

<sup>23</sup> We are told, by someone who thought that a word of apology was needed, that there were 'many reasonable causes' for this delay.

<sup>24</sup> Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 173, fo. 32v, published in facsimile by Flower and Smith (1941). The passage is quoted in Flight (2006, p. 111).

<sup>25</sup> Edmer does not say which monasteries he has in mind; the obvious places would seem to be Rochester and Saint Alban's, perhaps Saint Augustine's, perhaps even Caen and Le Bec. Vague though it is, this remark of Edmer's may be of some significance – in relation to the spread of the Christ Church style of script, for example.

ten documents which might have afforded them some protection after he was gone. Nor was it just the monks of Christ Church who were left in this exposed condition. The priests of Saint Gregory's church,<sup>26</sup> the inmates of the two hospitals founded by Lanfranc – they too might have been more secure if they had been provided with some documents which the king's agents would have no choice but to respect. It seems (to me) astonishing that no such documents were issued. Perhaps they would have made no difference. Perhaps the most explicit document that one can imagine – a diploma approved by the king, witnessed by numerous bishops and barons, endowing the monks with certain named manors and safeguarding their right to these assets during a vacancy – would still have been disregarded by Willelm II. Yet there were some among Lanfranc's contemporaries who would have thought that a diploma such as this was something worth having: it could not do any harm, and conceivably it might do some good. Apparently Lanfranc thought otherwise.

This is the context, so I suggest, for the production of manuscript C1. By some means, the monks had got hold of the records of Lanfranc's administration.<sup>27</sup> There was nothing here which would deter the king from the course on which he was set; but it was not unreasonable to hope that the next archbishop might make it his policy to restore everything to the state which had existed on the day when archbishop Lanfranc was alive and dead. As their hardships increased, the monks held onto this hope; and sooner or later the decision was made that any documents which might be useful for that purpose should be put in order and preserved for posterity, in a suitably awe-inspiring form. In short, I think it likely that the manuscript dates from 1089×94 – perhaps from near the end of that interval, when there was already some light at the end of the tunnel.<sup>28</sup> So far as C1 can be said to have had an author (somebody had to choose the documents, or at least to put them in order), prior Henric would have been the man.

The manuscript's subsequent history need only be briefly described. At some uncertain date, red headings were supplied for articles (vi) and (vii), where spaces had been left for headings by the original scribe. The hand has been identified by Gullick as that of a scribe who rubricated several manuscripts which had been written at Christ Church at the end of the eleventh or beginning of the twelfth century, but which had not been rubricated by the scribes who wrote them (Gullick and Pfaff 2001, p. 291). It looks (to me) as if he was, at some precise moment, in or not long after

<sup>26</sup> It is, I hope, no longer necessary to say that the 'foundation charter' for Saint Gregory's (Brett and Gribbin 2004, no. 1) is a forgery.

<sup>27</sup> I see it said – by Brett and Gribbin (2004, p. xxxi), for example – that Lanfranc died at Canterbury. He was certainly buried there; I am not sure if it is known for a fact that he died there.

<sup>28</sup> The vacancy is said to have lasted for 'four years, nine months and nine days'. That seems to imply that things did not return to normal, from the monks' point of view, till March 1094.

C4	C1
De maneriis prioratus in kantia, et de sullinges que sunt in eis.	INCIPIVNT MANERIA MONACHORVM IN CENT.
De northewde.	—
De Estreia, et de geddinges.	DE EASTREGE.
De Tilemanestune.	DE TILEMANNESTVNE.
De fenglesham.	—
De Stepenberghe.	—
De Bocland.	—
De Sandwich'.	DE SANDWIC.

Table 7. Rubrics for the first few paragraphs in segment 2 of text  $\alpha$ .

the 1120s, instructed to check through the monks' book-collection, adding rubrics in any books where they were missing, so that the books could be bound.<sup>29</sup>

For some manuscripts, this scribe would have had to retrieve the exemplar (or another copy of the same text) if he was going to get the wording right. In C1, however, there is nothing which he could not easily have invented for himself, on the spur of the moment. By and large, the rubrics write themselves:<sup>30</sup> so we cannot read much into the fact that the headings in C1 are mostly the same as the headings in C4. On the contrary, it is more likely to be significant that sometimes they fail to agree. To the extent that there is room for them to do so, the rubrics do tend to vary between C4 and C1. Table 7 gives the headings from the beginning of segment 2, as they appear in those manuscripts, and the reader will see that they differ at many points. Apparently it must be true, for at least one set of headings, that the rubricator was making them up as he went along. The point to hold onto is this. In C4 the headings are properly part of the text, as it was designed and executed by the original scribe; in those circumstances, I can see no justification for omitting them. The C1 headings are in a different case. It is a matter of judgment whether to include them or not, and I have preferred to drop them.

One small fact is more important than it looks. On fo. 2r this scribe inserted three headings, the last of them at the top of column 2rc: *HEC SVNT MANERIA MONACHORVM IN CENT*. The end of this heading, *CHORVM IN CENT*, is offset on the opposite page, at the top of column 1va. That simply means that the second leaf was turned over and placed on the first leaf before the ink was dry. The significant point is that the second leaf was skewed with respect to the first one, by an angle of about 4 degrees, at the moment when

<sup>29</sup> In this paragraph I am relying on the facts reported by Gullick; but the interpretation which he placed on them does not seem convincing to me. In particular, the manuscript from Durham, cited by Gullick as proof that this scribe was at work before 1096, does not, to me, prove anything of the kind. On the contrary, the evidence suggests that this manuscript was still at Christ Church in the 1120s, and did not migrate to Durham till after that. The doubts which I expressed about it before (Flight 1997a, p. 188) have strengthened, not weakened, since then.

<sup>30</sup> Anyone who doubts this should make up their own set of headings, and then compare them with the headings in C1.

they came into contact; and that makes it virtually certain that the leaves were unbound at the time.<sup>31</sup>

In the course of time, the blank pages at the end were mostly filled up by two later scribes. One of them added article (xi), a list of the archbishop's knights (7rb–c),<sup>32</sup> which forms a suitable appendix to the original contents. A further batch of documents (xii–xvii) was added by another scribe again (7va–8vb). They all date from the time of prior Alan (1179–1186); the hand could be, and presumably is, contemporary.<sup>33</sup> So far as they tell a story, prior Alan is the hero of it. (In the first document, for instance, we are told how he had no choice but to embarrass the archbishop publicly, in his own cathedral, on Palm Sunday in 1181.) After making himself obnoxious once too often, Alan was removed from the scene by being made abbot of Tewkesbury (where he seems to have come to lead a quieter and happier life). Just before he left Christ Church (so I suppose), he made sure that the monks whom he was being forced to abandon would have some permanent record of his achievements; and this is the place that was chosen for the purpose.

By the 1180s, then, the manuscript had reached its present form. There was still some space remaining at the end, including one whole column (8vc), but nobody ever made use of it. At some moment in the thirteenth century,<sup>34</sup> articles (i–xi) were copied from C1 into another manuscript, the lost cartulary which I call C3. (Whether articles (xii–xvii) were copied as well is a question which cannot be answered.) From C3, this whole stretch of text, except for article (x), was copied into manuscript T1, a booklet produced in the

<sup>31</sup> It is not absolutely impossible for two bound leaves to be brought into contact in this way. In order to make it happen, however, one has to form a triangular pleat down the middle of the second leaf (while the ink is still wet) before letting it touch the first leaf; and anyone perverse enough to do this would need at least three hands.

<sup>32</sup> Douglas's (1944) discussion of this list – which should be read alongside Colvin's (1964) discussion of a later list (c. 1170) – is not altogether satisfactory. Most of the names appearing here are (so far as we know) the names which would be expected to occur in a list drawn up in the 1090s; but there are some anachronisms – most obviously the name 'Biset' (7rb32), appearing where one would expect to find the name of Ansgot de Rovecestre. In the form in which we have it, I do not think that this list can be earlier than c. 1160.

<sup>33</sup> Very briefly, these are the contents: (xii) a narrative account of an incident which took place at Christ Church on 29 March 1181 (7va); (xiii) a narrative account of the sequence of events which began with the death of Walter bishop of Rochester on 27 July 1182 and ended with the humiliation of his successor (7vb–8ra); (xiv) a charter of archbishop Ricard (Cheney and Jones 1986, no. 85) relating to Eynsford church, with three lines of narrative by way of introduction and five lines by way of conclusion (8ra–c); (xv) a charter of Willelm de Einesford, recounting the history of the dispute over Eynsford church and saying that he is happy with the outcome (8rc–va); (xvi) a charter of prior Alan and the convent of Christ Church, making Willelm de Einesford an honorary member of their community (8va–b); (xvii) a charter of Willelm de Einesford, saying that he has been fully indemnified for the hundred marks which he lost through standing surety for archbishop Thomas (8vb). Throughout this stretch of text, the coloured initials are missing.

<sup>34</sup> Not until after the gloss *s. ædwardi* had been added to the Ulcombe paragraph (3va4). This insertion is important for tracking the transmission of the text.

archbishop's treasury in the time of archbishop Kilwardby (1272–1278). These facts are discussed in greater detail in Appendix I (below, pp. 285–7). I mention them here only to make the point that the copies found in T1 are of no textual value: they derive (at second hand) from the copies in C1.

Did anything ever come of the plan to insert C1 into a textus? When the rubrics were added, the leaves were still loose; and it is probably fair to infer that they were being kept (like the other books which were rubricated by the same man) in one of the cupboards in the cloister which constituted the library, while their intended receptacle was doubtless kept (with the other textuses) in the church. Yet it would, I suppose, have been obvious to a twelfth-century monk (as it was to Cheney) what thought had existed in the mind of their creator. At any moment, therefore, if the will had existed, the original plan could still have been carried out. I see no reason to believe that it ever was; what happened, I think, was something rather different. Perhaps towards the end of the twelfth century,<sup>35</sup> somebody implemented his own version of the plan. Inspired by the idea behind C1, but not much impressed with its workmanship, he produced a new set of leaves (more elegantly written, more sumptuously decorated, as we may imagine them to have been) containing the same or a similar collection of documents; and these were the leaves which were finally bound into the textus – the 'great textus' mentioned in a charter of archbishop Hubert's (Cheney and John 1986, no. 389).<sup>36</sup>

Once that had been done, there could no longer be any thought of binding C1. Even so, the leaves seemed worth keeping and were kept. They were, I suppose, rolled up together (the natural thing to do with a batch of sheets of this size) and put on a shelf in the library. Once in a while, it seems, they were taken down – on one occasion to be collated with C4, on another occasion to be copied into the cartulary. But after that they remained on the shelf, untouched and more or less forgotten, until they were discovered by William Somner.

## R1 = Strood, Medway Archives and Local Studies Centre, DRc/R1, fos. 119–235

This is another famous manuscript, a handsome cartulary compiled in the 1120s by one of the best and best-known Rochester scribes. The title which he provided for it is *Privilegia ecclesiae sancti Andreae hrofensis concessa* (fo. 119r), 'Privileges granted to the church of Saint Andrew of Rochester', and that is the title by which I refer to

<sup>35</sup> Not, I suspect, till after prior Alan's time. Alan, it seems, was still under the impression that sooner or later C1 was going to be bound.

<sup>36</sup> There are only two things known about this book: before 1203 it contained a survey of the monks' lands; after 1203 it also contained a copy of this charter. (The wording is explicit: the convent has put its seal to the original 'and has caused a copy of it to be entered in the great textus where there is also a survey of their lands', *et eius rescriptum in textu magno ubi et terrarum suarum descriptio annotari fecit*.) Cheney was hoping to find some trace of this textus. He thought that he had failed. If I am connecting the dots correctly, he came closer than he realized.

it.<sup>37</sup> (For some reason which escapes me, historians prefer to call it by a name which is neither authentic nor apt.) An excellent facsimile edition is available (Sawyer 1962).

In its pristine form, the manuscript consisted of four booklets, and documents dating from (or referring to) the period which interests us – the reigns of Willelm I and Willelm II – were contained in booklet 2. This booklet comprised two quires (numbered VII–VIII by the scribe himself): the first survives intact (fos. 168–75), but the second has been very badly cut about. As I reconstruct it (Flight 1997a, fig. 4), booklet 2 would originally have looked like this:

fos. 168–76; one or two leaves missing;<sup>38</sup> fos. 209–10; one leaf missing; fos. 211–12; one leaf missing (replaced with fo. 213); fo. 214; one leaf missing (replaced with fo. 181); fo. 182

Cutting out or replacing whole leaves was not enough to achieve the desired result. Some of the original leaves that were allowed to survive had to pay for their survival by being partially erased. Though the details are hidden from us, it seems clear enough what was happening. A fairly large number of documents, thought to be worth copying in the 1120s, became so much of an embarrassment later that they had to be suppressed. The originals were (we may assume) destroyed or purposely mislaid; the cartulary was expurgated. Whatever the motives for it, the treatment was brutally effective. We are never going to know what it was that the monks decided, on second thoughts, not to let us know.

Among the surviving documents, only one is directly relevant,<sup>39</sup> a survey of the bishop's manors (fos. 209r–10r). By and large, it runs parallel with segment 3 of  $\alpha 2/C1$ , but it differs from that version in many points of detail, and on one point of substance. I call this Rochester version  $\alpha 3$ .

The document or documents preceding this one was or were suppressed: counting backwards from the start of  $\alpha 3$ , we find four erased lines (209r1–4), one or two missing leaves, and another eight erased lines (176v17–24).<sup>40</sup> It is a tantalizing thought that some important evidence may have been lost here; but (unless someone can decipher some of the

<sup>37</sup> I have one correction and one addition to make to my description of the manuscript (Flight 1997a, ch. 2). (i) The suggestion made there (p. 23) that some of the entries on fo. 202r were written by the main scribe is wrong. None of them were. (ii) The extra line which has been added at the foot of fo. 192v, presumably when the following leaf was removed, was written by the main scribe. Rather sadly, this tends to prove that he himself began the work of mutilating the manuscript.

<sup>38</sup> Quire VIII has been damaged so badly that we cannot be sure how many leaves it had originally. It may have been a quire of 12; it may have been a quire of 10 with an extra singleton tucked in towards the back.

<sup>39</sup> Three others, all from this same booklet, are printed in chapter 7 (below, pp. 222–3). The list of parish churches (below, pp. 240–2) comes from booklet 4.

<sup>40</sup> At which point we arrive at the end of a long document (175v–6v) recounting the dispute between bishop Gundulf and sheriff Picot with regard to some land in Cambridgeshire.

erased text) that is not a thought which I see any point in pursuing. The document following  $\alpha 3$  was not suppressed: it is a record of the benefactions of Willelm I, drawn up, no doubt, very shortly after his death (210r–v).

There is no other copy of  $\alpha 3$  known to me; but there does exist a derivative text, which likewise survives only as a single copy,<sup>41</sup> in an early thirteenth-century register (R3, fo. 66v). The text has been drastically shortened, to the extent that from our point of view it ceases to have any value, but not to the extent that its ancestry is doubtful. The entry relating to Bromley, for instance, has been reduced from this:

*Brunlega se defendebat in tempore eaduardi regis pro vi solinis, et nunc pro iii, et est appreciatum xviii lib', et tamen ep's habet inde de firma sua xx libras et xviii solid', et hoc idem manerium est ipse hundredus.*

to this:

*Brumlega defendit se pro tribus suling', et hoc idem manerium est ipse hundredus.*

What little interest this text possesses derives from a few interpolated passages which tell us something about the holdings on the monks' manors belonging to the bishop's knights. (We are told, for example, that the assessment of three sulungs for Wouldham includes 'the sulung of Little Wouldham and the half sulung of Robert le Neveu'.)<sup>42</sup> But this is early thirteenth-century information, too late to be relevant for us.

Before looking more closely at the differences between  $\alpha 1/C4$  and  $\alpha 2/C1$ , we can simplify matters by making two preliminary observations. First, without looking very hard, we can see that six whole paragraphs are differently placed: all six are in segment 1 in C4, in segment 2 in C1. It is not obvious which ordering is more authentic than the other. Because of this uncertainty, and because the difference in placement is bound to entail some difference in the wording, it seems safest, for present purposes, to disregard these paragraphs.

Second, in dealing with C4, some allowance has to be made for the relative lateness of the manuscript. Without looking at all, we can feel fairly sure that the scribe will have modernized the spelling, to some degree. There is at least one feature of the text, as it appears in C4, which seems certain to have originated in C4 itself. Halfway through, the scribe starts using the perfect tense – *habuit* not *habet*, *tenuit* not *tenet* – in passages which refer to anyone other than the archbishop or the monks. This happens first in the paragraph relating to Eynsford, in the sentence concerning

<sup>41</sup> It was printed, not very accurately, by Thorpe (1788, p. 2).

<sup>42</sup> *Wldeham defend' se pro iii sullin' cum sullino de parua Wldeham et dimid' sull' Rob' nepot'*. This is one of the entries added at the end by a second scribe (Flight 1997a, p. 82), who had to do some work on this copy to knock it into shape.

the portion of the manor swallowed up by the lowy of Tonbridge. The scribe writes *et ex eo h't* – and then he stops, changes his mind, obliterates 't with an oversized *a*, and completes the word as *habuit* (71rb26): 'And from it Ricard of Tonbridge holds ... or, rather, used to hold as much as is worth three pounds.' From this point onwards, in this sort of context, he uses the perfect tense nearly all the time.<sup>43</sup> Towards the end, the word *reddit* gets the same treatment, and again we can actually see the scribe changing his mind. In the Farningham entry he writes *reddit* – and then he alters the *t* into a large *d'* (72va10), so that the word becomes *reddid'* (for *reddidit*, 'used to pay'). I suppose that he found it absurd to continue using the present tense in statements which were so manifestly out of date, but in any case the fact itself seems plain: it was this scribe, writing this copy, who decided to change the tense of some of the verbs. Discrepancies of this sort are a surface phenomenon, therefore, and we can cheerfully ignore them.<sup>44</sup>

Subject to these limitations, all variants which look as if they might be significant are listed in Table 8.<sup>45</sup> In view of the number and nature of the discrepancies, the conclusion to be drawn from this table seems clear enough. We are dealing with two different versions of the text, rather than with two copies of a single version. Each version contains some information (proved to be authentic by the fact that it appears in DB) which is absent from the other. This is obviously true for  $\alpha 2$ ; not quite so obviously, it is true for  $\alpha 1$  as well (71vb38, 72ra33, 72rb30). That is why I have felt compelled to print both copies. If the choice had been left to me, I should have preferred to conclude that C4 was just a defective copy of C1, perhaps with a few unimportant interpolations; and then I should have written it off. But the facts are too recalcitrant for that.

Even so, the differences do not cut very deep. Almost everywhere, the two versions are as nearly identical as can be expected, given that some allowance has to be made for variations introduced by the copyists concerned (especially on the part of the C4 scribe, who allowed himself some latitude for editing the text). They report the same facts; they use the same formulas. If one version has an explanatory remark – such as *quia archiepiscopus habet aliud ad suam propriam carucam* (70vb23 = 3ra13) – or an abnormal turn of phrase – such as *et nunc pro totidem* (71ra30 = 3rb46) – the other version is, very nearly, certain to have it too.

They also share many defects, large and small. Among

<sup>43</sup> But a corrector has put some of these verbs back into the present tense. The last alteration of this kind occurs in the Mersham entry (72ra29); after that the corrector gave up.

<sup>44</sup> This applies to some other discrepancies too, such as C4's use of *dominicum* in preference to *dominium*. Some numerals which are oddly expressed in C1 (such as *c lib' et vii, lx sol' et x*) are normally formed in C4 (*c et vii lib', lxx sol'*); no doubt they were regularized by the C4 scribe.

<sup>45</sup> The erasures in C4 were made for the purpose of assimilating the text to C1 (above, p. 34). Though we do not know what C4 said originally, we can be sure that it said something different from C1: otherwise there would have been no need for the erasure.

their larger flaws, both versions fail to report the current assessment for certain manors (Reculver, Gillingham, Maidstone, Wrotham); both omit to tell us how much Lyminge or Maidstone is worth. At the other end of the scale, both versions twice have the present tense *habet* where the context requires a past tense (70va38 = 2vc36, 70vb25 = 3ra16). The examples quoted are all from segment 1, but (as the reader may wish to verify) similar comments apply to segment 2 as well. Thus, to a large extent, either copy can serve as a check on the other.

For segment 3, instead of comparing C1 with C4, we have to compare it with a copy from Rochester,  $\alpha 3/R1$ , from which, conversely, segments 1–2 are missing. To all appearances,  $\alpha 3$  is just an edited version of this segment of  $\alpha 2$ . Collating the copies that survive, we find only two large discrepancies. The first is that one whole entry is differently placed: in C1 the Frindsbury paragraph comes right at the beginning (5ra16), which means that it seems to be covered by the statement 'These manors are in Axstone hundred' (5rb2); in R1 it keeps company – as it should – with the other paragraphs relating to Shamell hundred.

The other large difference affects the opening sentences of every paragraph. The wording used here in C1 (consistent with that used for segments 1–2) runs something like this:

*Sutfliote est manerium ep'i rofensis et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro vi sull' ...*

In R1 the wording has been simplified, and the order of the constituent phrases has become highly unstable. In his first paragraph, the compiler of  $\alpha 3$  simplifies only slightly, retaining the phrase *manerium epi' hrofensis*,<sup>46</sup> but putting it in apposition to the place-name:

*Suthfleta manerium ep'i hrofensis se defendebat in tempore eaduardi regis pro vi solinis ...*

But after that he simplifies more drastically, letting it be taken for granted that all these manors belong to the bishop of Rochester, and giving only the place-name:

*Stanes se defendebat pro vi solinis in tempore eaduardi regis ...*

For the rest, the wording is mostly word for word the same as C1. The only exception to this rule is the Trottiscliffe paragraph, both versions of which are anomalous; since they also disagree as to the facts, their divergence appears to reflect some difference of opinion regarding the manor's assessment (below, p. 70).

Whatever their significance may be, the differences between one version and another are not large – in particular, not large enough to alter the fact that text  $\alpha$  should be read as the response to a questionnaire (Flight 2006, p. 113). The paragraphs of  $\alpha$  were framed as replies to a set sequence of

<sup>46</sup> The *hr* spelling is probably the R1 scribe's; he seems to have insisted on it (below, p. 290), where he felt he could.

The survey of Kent

$\alpha 1 / c4$		$\alpha 2 / C1$	
70rb8	∅	2va12	tenitune
23	vii de stursete tantum	44	unum iugum uuic et est de terra monachorum sc'ę trinitatis
25	∅	48	In fordwic habet archiep's vii mansuras terre que modo non faciunt seruitium ad mare ut in tempore E regis
30	tenet inde i sull' ab archiep'o in feodo	2vb5	habet i sull'
31	et wibertus et arnoldus suus filius habent inde	6	wibertus et arnoldus habent
37	Ad berham est hundredus	16	et est in hundred de berham
70va1	∅	25	id est suurtling
71ra11	reddit	3rb9	ille qui tenet reddit inde
23	∅	33	i sull' et d'
25	postea tenuit	37	nunc tenet illud
25	a lanfranco	37	ab isto lanfranco
26	∅	39	et dimidio
36	lanfrancus	3rc5	iste lanfrancus
40	ipsum reddit	11	illud reddit inde
71rb5	∅	20	de firma
20	∅	40	pro ii sull'
25	∅	51	et nunc tenet radulfus filius hospaci ab archiep'o
29	∅	3va6	tenet comes de o' de archiep'o et
71va12	In hundredo de cornhille habet archiep's i sull' de prebenda sc'i martini	14	∅
18	Summa ... ( <i>blank</i> ) ...	36	Tota summa clxxx et vii sull' et dimidium
26	∅	3vb11	Hoc manerium est de hundred de cantuarberia
31	Tilemanestune	24	willelm' folet tenet i manerium tilesmannestune ab archiep'o et hoc
34	... ( <i>erasure</i> )... apud fenglesham dimid' sull'	31	Iste idem will' habet de predicta terra dimidium sull' ab archiep'o in fenglesham
37	... ( <i>erasure</i> )... dimid' sull' stepenberghe quod godwinus tenuit de archiep'o ađzi tempore E regis et tunc se defendebat pro dimid' sull' sicut et nunc	37	Iste idem will' habet adhuc ab eodem archiep'o et de predicta terra monachorum stepenberga quod se defendebat tempore E regis pro dimidio sull' et nunc facit et godwinus tenuit illud in tempore E regis ab archiep'o ađzi
71vb2	monachorum ... eorum	48	sc'ę trinitatis ... monachorum
6	postea	3vc4	in preterito anno reddidit
7	∅	5	et in isto anno debet reddere lx et x lib' et allecia sicut prius
8	... ( <i>erasure</i> )...	10	lx et xvi plus
12	In leth de estreie est hundr' de edesham quod est in eodem manerio	19	∅
19	∅	34	Hoc manerium habet hundred in se ipso et in læd est de æstraie
24	Hic finit leth de burwarleth	50	∅
38	et tamen reddit xxvii lib'	4ra26	∅
72ra18	set postquam illud tenuit	4rb12	per gablum et postquam ep's habuit hoc dimidium sull'
33	et se defendit pro i sull'	41	∅
36	∅	48	i sull'
72rb15	in feodo	4va38	∅
17	monachorum ... eorum	43	sc'ę trinitatis ... monachorum
18	∅	45	similiter fuit et
30	et nunc pro vii	4vb11	∅
72va11	∅	4vc7	et nunc similiter
39	∅	5ra11	Tota summa cxxx et iii sull' et dimidium

Table 8. Variants for segments 1–2 of text  $\alpha$ .

questions; and therefore they conform to a regular pattern. In its simplest expression, the pattern looks like this:

Northfleet is the archbishop's manor, and in the time of king Eadward it defended itself for six sulungs, and now for five, and it is appraised at 27 pounds (71ra9 = 3rb6).

The same pattern applies throughout, except that the first clause is modified appropriately, from one segment to the next: 'Reculver is the archbishop's manor', or 'Eastry is the monks' manor', or 'Southfleet is the bishop of Rochester's manor'. (An extra clause appears in segment 2, telling us how the income from the manor is assigned: 'for the monks' food', or 'for their clothing', as the case may be.)

Though all of the paragraphs in segment 3 fit into that simple pattern, in segments 1 and 2 there is more variety. Some of the larger manors include subordinate holdings. If that is the case, the paragraph continues with a number of sub-paragraphs giving some basic information for each holding: the name of the tenant, the number of sulungs, the value. Some of the smaller manors belong in their entirety to one of the archbishop's tenants. If that is the case, the paragraph begins differently, with a statement of the pertinent facts, TRE and now. For example:

Brasted (is a manor which) Wlnod cild held from the archbishop in the time of king Eadward, and now Haimo holds it from archbishop Lanfranc, and then it defended itself . . . (71ra24 = 3rb35).

It seems to have been doubtful, in some instances, whether a manor should be described in a sub-paragraph or in a paragraph by itself. If that doubt was not resolved, a manor could end up by being described twice. Graveney, for example, is described in a sub-paragraph (70va40 = 2vc42) appended to the paragraph for Boughton under Blean; but it is also described in a separate paragraph (72va13 = 4vc12), at the end of segment 2. It was held 'in feod from the archbishop' by one of the archbishop's men; but it was recognized as 'the monks' manor' none the less, and the tenant accordingly paid a farm to them.

The last five paragraphs in segment 2 (Graveney among them) are all repetitious. In three cases it is stated explicitly that the sulungs mentioned here are included in the assessments previously reported: Loose and Hunton are to be counted with the monks' manor of East Farleigh, Burston with the archbishop's manor of Maidstone. But the details tend to differ. That is most obviously true for the holding called Burston. In a sub-paragraph appended to the Maidstone paragraph (71ra1 = 3ra46) we have been told that there are two men who have one sulung of this manor, and that they pay 192 pence to the altar of the Holy Trinity (i.e. to the monks), though the sulung is worth more than that. In this paragraph at the end (72va27 = 4vc43) we are given some additional information (that the place in question is Burston, that the two men who own it are named Wulfric and Cole), but also some information which does not square with what we were told before (there is half a sulung there, not a whole sulung, and the owners pay 100 pence, not 192 pence). In short, we are being given a different account of the facts, only partly compatible with the

first one. Perhaps we might imagine that one account came from the monks of Holy Trinity, the other from the men of Maidstone. At all events, the upshot seems to have been that the compiler of text  $\alpha$  had two discordant statements in front of him, and – not being in a position to decide between them – included them both as they stood.<sup>47</sup>

It was obviously intended to provide information regarding the hundred to which each manor belongs; but some lack of coherence is evident in this respect too. The normal policy (the policy followed more frequently than not in segments 1–2, invariably in segment 3) is for the information to be given at the end of the paragraph. In the case of Gillingham, for instance, we are given the usual facts; and then we are told that 'this manor is in the hundred of Chatham' (70vb39 = 3ra43).<sup>48</sup> If, however, the next manor belongs to the same hundred, the statement is postponed to the end of that paragraph – and then postponed again, if need be, until the end of the hundred in question is reached. Thus we are not immediately informed which hundred Otford belongs to. To find that out, we have to scan ahead until we find a statement which covers Otford; and this comes at the end of the Sundridge paragraph, where we are told that 'these manors are in the hundred of Codsheath' (71rb1 = 3rc13). Conversely, if we want to know what is meant by 'these manors', we have to scan backwards until we run up against a contradictory statement – in this case the statement 'This manor is in the hundred of Westerham', at the end of the Brasted paragraph (71ra27 = 3rb41). There are some hiccups,<sup>49</sup> but this policy works well enough, most of the time, as far as the hundreds are concerned. (The best indications, though a few do occur, are miserably inadequate.) The odd thing is that a minority of the paragraphs in segments 1–2 are very differently treated. Right at the beginning, we are told explicitly which lest and which hundred we are in. The Lyminge paragraph, for example, starts like this: 'In Limwarleth, in the hundred of Loningborough, the archbishop has in his domain a manor (called) Lyminge which in the time of king Eadward . . .' (70va14 = 2vb46) – after which the rest of the paragraph conforms to the usual pattern (barring the fact that in this particular paragraph the values are all unreported). I do not understand the reason for this variation.

As I commented before (Flight 2006, pp. 111–12), the provenance of this text seems clear from the fact that the ordering of the paragraphs in segment 1 coincides with

<sup>47</sup> The sulung called 'Almsland' is also described twice: under Lyminge in segment 1 (70va19 = 2vb54), separately in segment 2 (72ra32 = 4rb39). Here again the details do not tally.

<sup>48</sup> Some of these statements make use of a formula which seems rather awkwardly constructed: *Hec maneria habet archiep's in hundredo de Calehelle*. The sentence would read more easily back to front: *In hundredo de Calehelle habet archiep's hec maneria . . .*. And in that form it looks like a line from a cadastrally organized list: 'In the hundred of . . . the archbishop (monks, bishop) has (have) the manor(s) of . . .'

<sup>49</sup> For instance, we are not told that Darenth and Eynsford are in Axstone hundred, or that Ulcombe is in Eythorne hundred.

that used in another text – article (ix) in manuscript C1 (above, p. 37) – which can only have been produced in the archbishop’s household, and which (except in this respect) seems to have no connection with the survey of 1086. On that topic I have nothing to add. But there is some other evidence which tends towards the same conclusion. Now and then, text  $\alpha$  seems to be giving us a view of the facts different from that which was accepted and put on record by the commissioners. The manor of Sandling is listed here among the lands of the archbishopric (71rb15 = 4vb44), but the commissioners found (as DB reports) that it belonged to the bishop of Bayeux. The manor of Stowting is stated here to belong to Willelm de Arcis (70va6 = 2vb34), but the commissioners found that it was held by the count of Eu. The existence of Codsheath hundred, taken for granted here (71rb1 = 3rc13), appears not to have been admitted by the commissioners. Because our ignorance of the circumstances allows us so much freedom to guess at the reasons for them, discrepancies like these are easily explained away. Nevertheless, taken all together, they suggest to me that we are seeing things from somebody else’s point of view – specifically from the archbishop’s.

To this extent, I think we can feel sure of our ground. Text  $\alpha$  is the archbishop’s response to a questionnaire which came from the commissioners – the commissioners responsible for carrying out the investigations which were needed to construct the B text. In a sense, therefore,  $\alpha$  is a joint production. Some of the decisions which gave this text its shape were made by the commissioners. Its scope was determined by them: it should confine itself to Kent. Its content was dictated by them: these were the questions to which they wanted answers, at this stage in their proceedings. Beyond that point, text  $\alpha$  is the work of the people who knew the answers – the officials engaged in the management of the archbishop’s estates.

Having come this far, I think we can go a little further. Sooner or later, we shall have to ask ourselves why  $\alpha$  exists in two versions; perhaps this is the right moment for that. A plausible answer might be that the shorter version,  $\alpha_1$ , is a preliminary draft, and that the longer version,  $\alpha_2$ , is the finished product. But we cannot say that without considering the consequences. On this view of the case, the fact that  $\alpha_2$  survived would imply that it was returned to the archbishop, after the commissioners had finished with it; and it would then become conceivable that some or all of the additions appearing in this version were made by the commissioners’ scribes, while they had the original in their hands.

With that thought in mind, we need to look more closely at the variants listed in Table 8. The passages appearing in the right-hand column are not all to be regarded as additions in  $\alpha_2$ : some share of them, no doubt, should be diagnosed as omissions from our copy of  $\alpha_1$ .<sup>50</sup> The majority, however,

<sup>50</sup> One large omission from C4, sure to be accidental, occurs in the Sandling paragraph (71rb16 = 4vb47). This variant is not listed in Table 8, because Sandling is one of the paragraphs which got transposed.

seem sure to be genuine additions – corrections or clarifications inserted in this version of the text.

If we listen carefully enough to what these additions are saying, I think we can hear voices speaking which do not emanate from the archbishop’s household. One sentence especially,

In Fordwich the archbishop has seven measures of land which now do not do service at sea as they did in the time of king Eadward,

sounds discordant to me: it sounds like a complaint from the men of Fordwich. ‘The archbishop’s tenants have stopped paying their share, and therefore the rest of us have to pay something extra.’<sup>51</sup> Reading the added passages in the description of Sandwich, I think I can hear the men of Sandwich speaking. ‘Well, yes, that used to be true. Last year we did indeed pay the archbishop fifty pounds. But this year we are supposed to be paying him seventy pounds – plus, of course, the usual number of herrings.’ In these passages, unless my ears are deceiving me, we overhear some snatches of the conversation which went on, while the B text was being put together, between the commissioners and the spokesmen for the hundreds.

The additions which distinguish  $\alpha_2$  from  $\alpha_1$  were, I suspect, mostly made by the scribes who accompanied the commissioners. These scribes had the original of  $\alpha_2$  in their possession; once in a while (by no means systematically) they inserted some annotation of their own. The same explanation might apply to one omission too: the sentence referring to the prebend in Saint Martin’s church (71va2) could have been cancelled by these scribes, on the grounds that this and the other prebends were held from the church’s patron, not directly from the king. And it could have been their decision as well that certain paragraphs should be transferred from segment 1 to segment 2.<sup>52</sup> Nevertheless, even on the most generous assessment, their contribution would not have amounted to much. To a very much larger extent,  $\alpha_2$  is still the work of the archbishop’s scribes. In reading text  $\alpha$ , especially in version  $\alpha_1$ , we can be confident, nearly all the time, that we are reading a text which was put together in the archbishop’s household, in the early months of 1086.

Even so, there are some aspects of the evidence – three in particular – which look as if they ought to be significant, but for which I can find no adequate explanation. I should not be dealing fairly with the reader if I were to leave this unsaid.

First, I do not understand why some of the paragraphs in segments 1–2 depart from the normal pattern by starting

<sup>51</sup> The corresponding passage in DB is attached to the description of Fordwich, which (because the town belonged to Saint Augustine’s) is included in chapter 7 (DB-Ke-12rb22).

<sup>52</sup> But perhaps we might prefer to make an exception for the Sandling paragraph.

with a sentence which locates the manor in the cadastral frame (above, p. 43). (This is true for both versions, by and large. There are some discrepancies between  $\alpha 1$  and  $\alpha 2$  – most notably in the paragraphs for Adisham and Newenden – but I do not see that they help us to crack the puzzle.) Looking at the Pluckley paragraph (70vb29 = 3ra23), I can imagine that it may have originally conformed to the normal pattern (as the paragraphs before and after it do), before being reconstructed with a different beginning. But I see no similar signs elsewhere. Besides, even if this were the right explanation for Pluckley, I should still be at a loss to explain why only some paragraphs, or why these particular paragraphs, were rewritten in this way.

Second, I do not understand why six paragraphs are differently placed, all included in segment 1 by C4, in segment 2 by C1. It is conceivable that they were moved into segment 1 by the C4 scribe himself, who certainly did allow himself some scope for editing the text, and may perhaps have taken the liberty of reorganizing it as well. (A variation on this theory would be that these paragraphs had been marked for transposition in the exemplar from which he was copying, and that he was just following instructions.) The manors in question are all places which, by the thirteenth century, had ceased to be of any interest to the monks; so perhaps it might have seemed more rational to transfer them to segment 1. As far as the textual evidence is concerned, we cannot hope to find any clue unless the transposition was botched to some extent – i.e. unless the damage done to the text by extracting a paragraph from one segment and inserting it into the other was not fully made good. The paragraph for Sandling, as it appears in C4, has a blundered sentence at the end (71rb17); since that sentence makes perfect sense in C1, where it refers to Orpington as well as Sandling (4vb44), we may take this as a sign that the paragraph was originally part of segment 2. On the other hand, the sentence at the end of the Preston paragraph, which is redundant in C1 (4va6) but not in C4, is a hint that the paragraph for Leaveland was moved in the opposite direction, from segment 1 into segment 2; and in that case the transposition would have to have been made early on, before C1 was written. In short, the indications are slight; such as they are, they are also contradictory. Given that (given too that Sandling was a special case), I find it impossible to arrive at any firm conclusion.<sup>53</sup>

Third, I do not understand why the order of the paragraphs in segment 3 is, very nearly, the same as in DB-Ke. In most respects, this segment runs parallel with segments 1–2. The same categories of information are reported; the same wording is used. C1 gives a total at the end of this segment, just as it does at the end of the others; it even has

<sup>53</sup> One question arises which I need to note but will not try to answer. Was the reorganization of the text connected with a pseudo-historical theory which the monks had developed by this time, to the effect that they had, voluntarily, surrendered a share of their land to archbishop Lanfranc, to help him make provision for his knights – ‘which is why to this day there is not one knight on all the land of the monks, but only on the land of the archbishop’?

the strange word *rubitoniensis*, which appears once here (5ra17), once near the end of segment 2 (4vc3), never (to my knowledge) in any other text. And yet, in this respect, there is divergence. Segments 1–2 have an ordering of their own, quite different from DB's; segment 3 has (almost) the same ordering as DB. Since that ordering was only brought into existence when the B text was compiled, we have a problem.

Less obviously, there is another feature which sets segment 3 apart. In all probability, a more detailed description of these manors would have revealed a pattern of tenure resembling that which is recorded in segments 1–2. Just like the archbishop, the bishop of Rochester had to make provision for his monks. Somehow or other, he also had to find ten knights for the archbishop – his share of the sixty knights which the archbishop had to find for the king. (If he chose, he could pay for them out of his own pocket; but sooner or later, just like the archbishop, he created tenancies charged with some proportion of the load.) It is, however, very difficult to say how far this sort of pattern would have taken shape by the time of the survey. If Rochester's early thirteenth-century annals can be trusted – and probably they can be – the monks arrived in 1083 (R3, fo. 27v); so they were already there when the survey took place. It is clear that some allocation of lands had been made to them well before 1089, because archbishop Lanfranc (who died in that year) had already approved one change in that allocation (R1, fo. 172r–v).<sup>54</sup> The allocation of lands to the bishop's knights is a matter about which we are very poorly informed. Several holdings were certainly or probably created by bishop Gundulf, some of them on his domain manors, some of them on the monks' manors; but Gundulf survived until 1108, and – to be brief – it is impossible to decide how many of these holdings existed in 1086.

That difficulty arises from the fact that we get no help from either  $\alpha$  or DB. As far as DB is concerned (though the DB scribe himself did not understand this), the absence of more detailed information is unsurprising. It is in keeping with the policy followed throughout the survey. From the king's point of view, the bishop of Rochester was a sub-tenant, and it was not necessary to inquire into the arrangements that he had made for his monks and knights and other sub-sub-tenants. That information was not worth collecting (at the price of a vast amount of extra effort), because it was not relevant.<sup>55</sup> From the archbishop's point of view, by contrast, the bishop of Rochester was a tenant,<sup>56</sup> and the information would be needed every time that a bishop died. Thus, in a description drawn up by one of the archbishop's officials, we might expect to find some interest being shown

<sup>54</sup> The monks acquired the nearby manor of Wouldham in exchange for a manor in Suffolk which had proved to be inconveniently remote.

<sup>55</sup> More precisely, it would only become relevant if the bishop died while the archbishopric was in the king's hands – and that, though it might possibly happen, would happen only very rarely. (In fact it did happen twice in the twelfth century, in 1137 and 1184.)

<sup>56</sup> In other words, the bishop was *tenant en chief* with respect to the archbishop, just as the archbishop was *tenant en chief* with respect to the king.

in the assignment of lands to the bishop's sub-tenants. But that is not the case. Unlike segments 1 and 2, segment 3 has no depth: it is as flat as the description that we find in DB (even flatter, in fact, because at one point DB goes deeper and  $\alpha$  does not).

These two DB-like features of segment 3 – the ordering of the paragraphs and the absence of tenorial depth – distinguish it so clearly from segments 1–2 that we are, I think, permitted to suppose that it had a different ontogeny. Taking advantage of the doubt which exists as to whether this segment was included in  $\alpha 1$ , we can construct an explanation for it without feeling obliged to force the same explanation onto the rest of the text – in a word, without letting the Rochester tail wag the Canterbury dog. One theory which would fit the facts might look something like this. The man who had written segments 1–2 decided, some time later, to write a similar description of the bishop of Rochester's manors. He used the same format and language that he had used before (even allowing himself, just once, to repeat the word *rubitoniensis*); but he took the ordering of the paragraphs and all the items of factual information from some version of the survey text (a version, we should have to think, which unlike DB had the hundred headings all in place). I am satisfied that this is a viable explanation (as the reader can confirm by making the experiment);<sup>57</sup> whether it is the right one, or something close to the right one, I hardly feel able to say.

Some of these problematic features are discussed in greater detail in the comments at the end of this chapter (below, pp. 66–70). The reader may find those comments helpful, as far as they go – or else may prefer to ignore them, so as to be able to take an unprejudiced view of the evidence. Sooner or later, I have no doubt, fresh eyes will see further, and see more clearly, than mine.

I print all three versions line for line, as they appear in the manuscripts. For the reasons already indicated, I ignore the alterations made by other hands in manuscripts C4 and C1 – the numerous corrections added to C4, the red headings added to C1. The reader, I hope, will take my word for it that these additions do nothing but distract attention from the evidence which really counts.

The transcription aims to be tight, but there are some scribal tricks which I have not thought it necessary to imitate. The C1 scribe, after leaving space for a coloured initial, writes the next letter or the next few letters as small capitals. (At 2va3, for example, he leaves a space for the initial and writes *TVRSæte*.) This looks well enough when written by hand, but in print it becomes unsightly, and I have disallowed it. The R1 scribe, admirable in every other respect, has one annoying mannerism: whenever the start of a new sentence happens to fall at the start of a new line, he pushes

the beginning of the first word out into the margin – which makes it look as if he is starting a new paragraph when in fact he is just acting out of habit. So I have disallowed this trick as well. All the scribes concerned felt free to shorten some words – especially recurrent words, like 'saint' or 'archbishop' or 'shilling', which no one could possibly misread. In dealing with these abbreviations, I have followed the same sort of rules that I use for DB-Ke (below, pp. 95–6).

The pages or columns are labelled, and every fifth line is numbered. I use these numbers for reference, and suggest that the reader should adopt the same policy. Blank lines are marked with colons at the beginning, so that they too can be counted. (But a colon at the end of a word denotes the punctuation mark called *punctus elevatus*.) Brackets enclose any particles of text (including the coloured initials) which show any sign of having been altered or added; brackets surrounding empty space represent erasures. Where some explanation is needed, an asterisk refers to the notes which appear at the end of each text.

<sup>57</sup> But it is not a complete solution: for example, it does not tell us how the Frindsbury paragraph got itself misplaced in  $\alpha 2/C1$ .

α1 / C4-70rb

- ( De maneriis archiep'atus in kantia, et de sullinges que sunt )  
 ( in eis. ) ( De Stursete. )
- ( S ) tursete est manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E  
 regis se defendebat pro vii sullinges, et nunc similiter, et  
 est appreciatum \*hoc est in dominico xl lib'. Et nunc habet ar- 5  
 chiep's xxv burgenses, qui reddunt x sol' de gablo. Et ex  
 hiis supradictis \*viii sulling' habet Godefr' dapifer unum sulling'  
 de archiep'o et est appreciatum c sol'. Adhuc autem et uitalis habet  
 inde unum iugum terre de archiep'o, et est appreciatum xx sol'. Hai- 10  
 mo uero similiter tenet inde dimidium sulling', quod tenuit alric big-  
 ge a priore arch' in tempore E regis, et est appreciatum c sol'.  
 Robertus de hardres tenet inde i iugum terre ex hiisdem  
 sull', et est appreciatum xxx sol', et ex hiis vii sull' habet ar'ep's  
 i sull' apud sc'm martinum, et de eodem sull' habet Rad' camerarius in 15  
 feodo medietatem de ar'ep'o, et ualet iiii lib'. Et d'nicum ualet  
 vii lib'. Et in Cantuar' sunt vii burgenses, qui redd' huic ma-  
 nerio viii sol' et iiii \*de gablo. Et item sunt ibi xxxii man-  
 sure, et unum molendinum, que tenent clerici sc'i Gregorii ad  
 eorum eccl'iam. Ibique manent xii burgenses qui redd' eis xxxv 20  
 sol', et molendinum redd' v sol'. Adhuc etiam tenet ailwar-  
 dus iii iuga in natindon', unde redd' tempore E regis et adhuc  
 redd' altari sc'e trinitatis xii sol', et est appreciatum xl solid'.  
 Albold uero tenet de supradictis sull' vii de stursete tantum  
 quod est appreciatum xxx sol'. Hic finitur hundredus de 25  
 Stursete. ( De Wingham. )
- ( W ) ingeham est proprium manerium archiep'i, et in tempore  
 E regis se defendebat pro xl sull', et nunc pro xxxv,  
 et ualet c lib' hoc quod archiep's inde habet. Et ex hisdem sull'  
 habet Will's de archis unum sull' fleotes ab archiep'o in feodo,  
 et ualet vi lib'. Et uitalis tenet inde i sull' ab archiep'o 30  
 in feodo et ualet xlv sol'. Et Wibertus et Arnoldus suos filius:  
 habent inde iii sull', et ualet xii lib'. Et heringod habet inde  
 i sull' decem agros minus, et ualet xl sol'. Et Godefridus archi-  
 balistarius habet inde i sull' et dimid', et ualet c sol'. ( De B[urn]e. )
- ( B ) urne est proprium manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E regis 35  
 se defendebat pro vi sull', et nunc similiter, et est appreciatum  
 xxx lib'. Ad berham est hundredus. ( De P[etham]. )
- ( P ) etham est proprium manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E  
 regis se defendebat pro vii sull', et nunc similiter, et est appre- 40  
 ciatum xx lib'. Et ex istis sull' habet Godefridus dapifer dimid'

α1 / C4-70va

- sull', quod pertinet ad uestimenta monachorum. Et Nigel-  
 lus habet i sull' et i iugum terre, que est apreciata lx sol'.  
 Hoc est in hundredo de petham. ( De Aldintune. )
- ( I ) n hundredo de bilichold: habet archiep's i manerium  
 Aldintune, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro xxi 5  
 sull', et nunc pro xx, et ualet c et vii lib'. Et ex hiis habet  
 Will's de archis i manerium Stutinges, quod alferre te-  
 nuit de archiep'o, et tunc defendebat se pro i sull' et dimid',  
 et nunc pro i, et ualet x lib'. Item ex supradictis sull' de aldin- 10  
 tune habet archiep's dimid' iugum et dimid' uirgam in limenes,  
 et ualet xii lib', et tamen qui tenet redd' xv lib' de firma.  
 In Rumene sunt xxv burgenses qui pertinent ad al-  
 dintune. ( De Limminges. )
- ( I ) n limuarlet in hundr' de noniberghe habet archiep's

- in suo d'nico i manerium limminges, quod tempore E regis  
se defendebat pro vii sull', et nunc similiter. Robertus filius  
Watsoni habet ex hiis ii sull' in feodo. Et Robertus de har-  
des dimid' sull'. Et osbertus peisforera dimid' iugum.  
Et in marisco de Rumene i sull' elmesland, de ele-  
mosina monachorum sc'e trinitatis, et non est de supradictis  
sull'. Et de isto sull' habet Will's folet i iugum, id est  
Sturtune. Et de eodem sull' habet supradictus Rob' tria iuga,  
i. Odgareswike et Castwisle et Eaddruneland. (Racl'. )
- (R) aculf est manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E regis  
se defendebat pro viii sullinges, et est appreciatum  
xlii lib' v sol'. Tres minutes minus. (De Northwde. )
- (N) \*o(r)thwde est manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E regis  
se defendebat pro xiii sull', et nunc similiter, et est ap-  
preciatum li lib' v sol'. Ex hiis sullinges habet Vitalis  
de Cantuar' i sull' et i iugum, et in tanet i sull'  
et dimid'. Et etiam in macebroc habet xii agros et dimid'  
sull' ab archiep'o, Et ezi lamerch, et tota hec terra est ap-  
preciata xiiii lib' vi sol' vi d'. Hec maneria habet ar-  
chiep's in hundredo de ipso Raculf. (De Boctune. )
- (B) octune est manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E  
regis se defendebat pro v sull' et dimid', et nunc  
similiter, et fuit appreciatum in tempore E regis x libr',  
et archiep's habet inde c et xv sol' iii d' de gablo. Nunc  
autem ualet xx lib', set tamen redd' xxv lib' de firma,  
et archiep's habet suum gablum sicut prius. Ric' constabu-
- α1/C4-70vb
- larius habet inde i manerium grauenai in feodo ab archiep'o,  
quod in tempore E regis se defendebat pro i sull', et nunc  
similiter, et ualet vi lib'. Hanc terram habet archiep's in hun-  
dredo de boctune. (De Leuelande. )
- (L) euelande est terra archiep'i, quam ricardus constabu-  
larius tenet in feodo ab archiep'o. Et Decanus Cantuar'  
habuit et tenuit eandem terram, et in tempore E regis  
se defendebat pro i sull', et nunc similiter, et ualet xx sol'.  
Hec terra est in hundredo de feueresham. (De Tenham. )
- (T) enham est manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E  
regis se defendebat pro v sull' et dimid', et nunc  
similiter, et est appreciatum l lib'. Dimidium sull' terre te-  
net Godefridus de malling' in Scapaie ab archiep'o, quod  
ualet iiii lib', et tamen reddit c sol'. Oswaldus uero tenuit  
hoc idem sull' ab archiep'o cantuar' in tempore E  
regis. Hanc \*predictam habet archiep's in hundredo de  
tenham. (De Lenham. )
- (L) enham est manerium archiep'i, quod Godefridus de  
mallinges tenet de eo in feodo, et in tempore E regis  
se defendebat pro ii sull', et nunc similiter, et ualet viii  
lib'. Et tamen redd' xii lib' x sol' de firma. (De Cerring'. )
- (C) erringes est manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E  
regis se defendebat pro viii sull', et nunc pro vii. Quia  
archiep's habet aliud ad suam propriam carucam. Et ualebat  
in tempore E regis xx lib'. Et habet inde archiep's iiii  
lib' vii sol' de gablo. Nunc uero ualet xxx lib', set  
tamen reddit xl lib' de firma, et archiep's habet inde ga-  
blum sicut prius. (De Plukele. )
- (I) n hundredo eodem et in lest de wiwarlet habet archiep's i  
manerium Plukele in d'nico, quod in tempore E regis se de-

- fendebat pro i sull', et nunc similiter, et ualet vi lib', et tamen reddit xx lib' de firma. Hec maneria habet archiep's in hundredo de Calehelle. ( De Gillingeham. )
- ( G ) illingeham est manerium proprium archiepiscopi, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro vi sull'. Et est appreciatum hoc quod archiep's habet inde in d'nico xviii lib'. Et hoc quod Asketillus de ros et Robertus brutinus habent xl sol'. Et tamen reddit archiep'o de firma xxv lib' xix sol'. Hoc manerium est in hundredo de chetteham. ( De Meidestane. )
- α1/C4-71ra
- ( M ) eidestane est proprium manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro x sull'. Ex hiis tenet Radulfus i sull' quod est appreciatum l sol'. Et Will's frater Gundulfi ep'i ii sull' et sunt appreciata x lib'. Et ansketillus de Ros i sull' quod est appreciatum lx sol'. Et duo homines habent inde i sull', qui reddunt altari sc'e trinitatis xvi sol', et tamen ualet illud sulling' xx sol'. Hoc manerium habet hundredum in se ipso. ( De Northflete. )
- ( N ) orthflete est manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro vi sulling', et nunc pro v. Et est appreciatum xxvii lib'. Set tamen redd' xxxvii lib' de firma. Et infra leugam de Tunebrege est inde tantum, quod est appreciatum xxx sol'. Hoc manerium et mepeham iacent in hundredo de toltentru. ( De Bixle. )
- ( B ) ixle est manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro iii sulling', et nunc pro ii. Et est appreciatum xx lib', et reddit xxx lib' et viii sol'. Et est in hundr' de almes tre. Et in dimid' led de Sutune \*iiii sull'. ( De Earheth. )
- ( E ) arheth est manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro iiiii sull', et nunc similiter. Et osuuardus tenuit illud ab archiep'o in tempore E regis, et est appreciatum xvi li'. Et tamen reddit xxi lib'. Hoc manerium habet archiep's in hundredo de litelet. ( De Bradestede. )
- ( B ) radestede tenuit Wlnod child ab archiep'o tempore E regis. Et postea tenuit haimo a Lanfranco archiep'o, et tunc se defendebat pro i sull' et nunc similiter, et est appreciatum xvii lib'. Istud manerium est in hundr' de hostreham. ( De Otteford. )
- ( O ) teford est manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro viii sull', et nunc pro totidem. Et est appreciatum lx lib'. Et hoc quod haimo inde tenet est appreciatum lxx sol'. Et hoc quod robertus interpret et \*Godefridus de ros inde tenent viii lib' x sol'. Et hoc quod \*Rob' de tunebreg' inde tenet x lib' et xxiii porcos. ( De Sunderh. )
- ( S ) nderherste est manerium archiep'i, quod Godwinus tenuit tempore E regis iniuste, et archiep's Lanfrancus explacitauit illud contra ep'm baiocensem iuste per concessum regis. Et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro i sull' et dimid', et nunc similiter, et est appreciatum xviii li', et tamen qui tenet ipsum reddit xxiiii lib' et unum equitem

α1/C4-71rb

de firma archiep'o. Hec maneria sunt in hundredo de codesede. ( De Wrotham. )

- ( W ) rotham est man' ar'ep'i, et in tempore E regis se defen-

- debat pro viii sulling', et est appreciatum xxiiii lib', et tamen  
 ille qui tenet redd' inde xxxv lib'. Et de hiis predictis 5  
 viii sulling' tenet Will's dispensator i sull' quod est ap-  
 preciatum iii lib'. Et gosfridus de ros aliud quod est appreciatum  
 iii lib'. Et faremannus i sull' et dimid', et est appreciatum  
 c sol'. Et hoc quod ricardus habet: xv lib'. Hic finit hun-  
 dredus de Wrotham. ( De Mallinges. ) 10
- ( M ) allinges est man' arch'i, et in tempore E regis se de-  
 fendebat pro ii sull', et nunc similiter, et est appreciatum ix  
 lib'. Et tamen reddit de firma arch'o xv lib'. Hoc manerium  
 habet archiep's in hundr' de Lauerkefeld. ( De Sendlinge. )
- ( W ) luiet tenuit sendlinge ab archiep'o in tempore E 15  
 regis, et nunc tenet hugo nepos herberti \*( )  
 et dimid', et nunc similiter, et est appreciatum viii lib'. Hoc  
 manerium \*sunt in hundr' de elmestrie, et \*sunt in medio  
 Leth de \*suthtu( ) ( De Derente. )
- ( D ) erente est man' arch'i, et defendebat se in tempore E 20  
 regis, et nunc similiter, et est appreciatum xv lib'. Et x sol'  
 habet inde ricardus infra castellum suum, et tamen archiep's habet in fir-  
 ma sua xviii lib'. ( De Eineford. )
- ( E ) ineford est man' arch'i, et in tempore E regis defendebat 25  
 se pro vi sull', et nunc similiter, et est appreciatum xx lib',  
 et ex eo \*habuit ricardus de tunebrig' tantum quod est appreciatum  
 iii libr'. ( De Hulecumbe. )
- ( H ) ulecumbe tenuit ælferus in tempore E regis de archiep'o,  
 et defendebat se pro ii sull' et dimid', et nunc defendit  
 se pro ii sull', et est appreciatum xi lib'. ( De Niwindenne. ) 30
- ( N ) iwindenne est man' arch' quod in tempore E regis te-  
 nuit Leofric de arch'o, et pro i sull' se defendebat et  
 subiacebat \*saluude, et nunc est appreciatum viii lib' \*x sol'  
 de Gersuma. Hoc man' est in limwarlet in hundredo  
 de silebrichtindene. ( De Saltwde et Hedhe. ) 35
- ( I ) n limwarlet in hundredo de hede tenuit hugo de  
 muntfort i manerium Saltwde de archiep'o, et comes God-  
 winus tenuit illud. Et tunc se defendebat pro vii sull',  
 et nunc sunt v, et tamen non scottent nisi pro iii. Et in burgo  
 de hede sunt cc et xxv burgenses qui pertinent huic manerio 40

α1/C4-71va

de quibus non habet hugo nisi iii forisfacta, et est appreciatum  
 xxviii lib' vi sol' iiiii d'. ( De Langeport. )

- ( I ) n langeport \*ten[uit] robertus de rumene i sull' et dimid'  
 de archiep'o, quod archiep's \*( ) diraciocinavit contra ep'm  
 baiocensem, et Godwinus comes tenuit illud, ibique pertine- 5  
 bant ac pertinent xxi burgenses, de quibus rex in mare  
 habet seruitium. Ideoque quieti sunt per totam angliam, excep-  
 tis tribus forisfactis que habet robertus in rumene. Adhuc uero perti-  
 net ibi i iugum terre, et hec omnia ualent xvi lib'.
- ( A ) rchiep's habet iiiii prebendas apud niwentune, et 10  
 sunt appreciate vi lib'.
- ( I ) n hundredo de Cornhille habet archiep's i sull' de pre-  
 benda sc'i martini.

:  
 :  
 :  
 :  
 Summa,  
 :

15

	( De maneriis prioratus in kantia, et de sullinges que ) ( sunt in eis. ) ( De northewde. )	20
( N )	orthewde est manerium monachorum sc'e trinitatis, et est de cibo eorum, et est de hundredo de cantuaria, et in tempore Edwardi regis se defendebat pro uno sull', et ei subiacent c burgenses iii minus, qui reddunt viii lib' vi d' de gablo, et est appreciatum xvii lib'.	25
( De Estreia, et ) ( de geddinges. )	( E ) streia est man' monachorum, et de cibo eorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro vii sull', et nunc similiter. Et in alia parte sunt dimid' sull' et i iugum et v acre Gedinges, et ualet xxxvii lib' x sol' iiii d' inter totum.	30
( T )	ilemanestune est de terra ( De Tilemanestune. ) monachorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro i sull', et nunc facit similiter, et ualet xxx solid'.	
( I ) *	( ) apud fenglesham ( De fenglesham. ) dimid' sull' quod tenuit lieuenoth tempore E regis ab archiep'o, et ualet xx sol'. ( De Stepenberghe. )	35
( I ) *	( ) dimid' sull' stepenberghe, quod Godwinus tenuit de archiep'o Ađzi tempore E regis, et tunc se defendebat pro dimid' sull', sicut et nunc, et ualet xxx sol'. ( De Bocland. )	40
α1/C4-71vb		
( B )	oclande se defend' pro i iugo. Hic finit hundredus de Estreia.	
( S )	andwiz est man' monachorum, et est de ( De Sandwich'. ) uestitu eorum, et est leth et hundredus in se ipso et reddit regi seruicium in mari sicut douoria. Et homines illius uille antequam rex eis dedisset suas consuetudines, reddebant xv lib'. Quando autem archiep'c recuperauit, reddebant xl lib' et xl milia de allecibus, et postea l lib' et allecia sicut prius. In tempore E regis erant ibi ccc *(et) vii mansure. Nunc autem *( )	5
( M )	oneketune est *monachorum manerium, et de cibo eorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro xx sull', et nunc se defendit pro xviii, et est appreciatum xl lib'. Hoc manerium est in hundr' de tanet.	10
( I )	n leth de estreie est hundr' de edesham, quod est in eodem manerio.	
( E )	desham est man' monachorum, ( De Edesham. ) et de cibo eorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro xvii sull', et nunc similiter, et de gablo redd' xvi lib' et xvi sol' iiii d', et ualet xxx lib' de firma et c sol' de gersuma, et ex hiis sull' habet robertus filius watsoni ii, id est egethorn, qui ualent vii lib', et tamen qui tenet redd' ix lib'. Et rogerus *ten[uit] ex hiis i sull' ad bereham, quod ualet iiii lib'. ( De Iecham. )	15
( I )	echam est man' monachorum et de cibo eorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro iiii sull', et nunc similiter, et est appreciatum xxxii lib'. Et hoc quod will's de hedesham *hab[uit] scilicet i sull' ad rokinges, ualet vii lib'. Hoc manerium est in hundr' de dunhamford. Hic finit leth de burwarleth. ( De Sesaltre. )	20
( S )	esaltre est burgus monachorum, et de cibo, et proprie de coquina eorum, et Blittere tenuit illud de monachis, ibique est terra ii carucarum, et est appreciatum c sol'. Hoc manerium in nullo hundredo est. ( De Chertham. )	25
( C )	*her(t)ham est man' monachorum, et de uestitu eorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro iiii sull', et nunc similiter, et est appreciatum xxv lib', et tamen reddit xxx lib'. ( De Godmeresham. )	30
( G )	odmeresham est man' monachorum, et de uestitu eorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro viii sull', et est appreciatum xx lib', et tamen reddit xxx lib'. Hic finitur hundredus de Feleberghe. ( De Chert. )	35

- ( C ) hert est man' monachorum, et de uestitu eorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro iii sull', et nunc similiter, et est appreciatum xx lib', et tamen reddit xxvii lib'. Ipsum chert est hundredus. ( De litlechert, et de pette. )
- ( L ) itlechert est man' monachorum, et de cibo eorum, 40
- α1 / C4-72ra
- quod in tempore E regis se defendebat pro iii sull', et nunc pro ii et dimid', et ualet viii lib'. Ex hiis sull' \*hab[ui]t Will's hermeфриdidi dimid' sull' i. pette ab archiep'o in feodo, et redd' inde altari sc'e trinitatis xxv d' pro omnibus consuetudinibus, et ualet xl sol'. ( De Apeldre. ) 5
- ( I ) n leth de limware iacet hundredus de blaketune, in quo robertus de rumene \*ten[ui]t ad firmam i manerium \*apedre, et est de cibo monachorum sc'e trinitatis, et in tempore E regis defendebat pro ii sull', et nunc pro i, et ualet xii lib'. Set tamen redd' xvi lib' xvii sol' vii d'. ( De Welles. ) 10
- ( W ) elles est man' monachorum, et est de cibo eorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro vii sull', et nunc pro v, et ualet xx iiiii lib' et iiiii d', et tamen reddit xl lib' de firma. \*Ho(c) manerium et litlecherth, sunt in hundr' de calehille. ( De Holingeburne. ) 15
- ( H ) olingeburne est man' monachorum, et de cibo eorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro vi sull', et nunc similiter. Et de isto manerio tenet ep's baiocensis dimid' sull' de archiep'o. Set postquam illud tenuit, nunquam redd' inde scottum, et est appreciatum hoc manerium inter totum xxx lib'. ( De Boctune. ) 20
- ( R ) atel tenuit boctune de archiep'o, et defendebat se in tempore E regis pro dimid' sull', et istud dimid' sull' est et fuit de vi sull' de holingeburn'. Postea autem tenuit illud radulfus fil' thoroldi ab archiep'o, et est appreciatum xl sol'. Hec maneria sunt in hundredo de heihorne. ( De merseham. ) 25
- ( M ) erseham est man' monachorum, et de cibo eorum, quod tempore E regis se defendebat pro vi sull', et quando archiep's eum recepit: pro v et dimid', et modo pro iii. Et Hugo de mundford \*hab[ui]t ex hiis unius medietatem, et ualet xviii lib'. Hoc manerium iacet in limwarlet in hundredo de langebrege. ( De Elmesland. ) 30
- ( R ) odbertus fil' watsonis tenuit de priore cantuar', elmesland ad firmam, et se defendit pro i sull', et precepto eiusdem prioris redd' firmam sacriste eiusdem eccl'ie. ( Werthorn'. )
- ( I ) n limwarlet et in hundr' de hamme habent monachi i man' werehorne, de uestitu eorum, et est appreciatum lx sol'. 35
- ( De Broke. ) ( I ) n leth de wiwarlet et est hundredus, tenuit Robertus de rumene i manerium \*bro( ) ad firmam, de cibo monachorum, et pro i sull' se defendebat, et nunc pro dimidio, et ualet iiiii lib'. ( De Berewiche. ) 40

α1 / C4-72rb

- ( I ) n limwarlet in hundr' de strate habuit Will's de edesham de terra monachorum i man' berewich de archiep'o, quod tenuit Godricus decanus, et pro dimid' sull' se defendebat, et nunc similiter, et est appreciatum xi libr'. ( De prestune ) 5
- ( P ) restune est manerium monachorum, et est de uictu eorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro i sull', et nunc similiter, et est appreciatum xv lib'. Hoc manerium est in hundredo de faueresham. ( De Farnleghe. ) ( i. coptune. )

- ( F ) arnleghe est manerium monachorum, et est de cibo eorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro vi sull', et est appreciatum xxii lib'. Hoc quod abel monachus inde tenuit per iussum archiep'i, fuit appreciatum vi lib'. Et hoc quod ricardus inde habuit infra leugam suam: iiii lib'. Et de istis vi sull' tenuit Godefridus dapifer dimid' sull' in feodo, quod appreciatum est ix lib'. Hoc manerium habent monachi in hundr' de meidestane. ( De Peccham. ) 10
- ( P ) eccham est man' monachorum, et de cibo eorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro vi sull'. Et ex istis tenuit ricardus de tunebrege ii sull' et i iugum, et ex istis ii sull' et iugo isto: nunquam scottauit ricardus postquam habuit ea, et in tempore E regis fuit hoc manerium appreciatum xii lib', et nunc viii lib'. Et prefata pars ricardi ualet iiii lib'. Et in stutingeberga quod tenuit edricus de E rege est dimid' sull'. Vnde ipse edricus dabat scottum ad peccham spontanee, non quod pertineret ad sc'am trinitatem nec ad monachos. Hoc manerium est de hundr' de litlefeld. ( Mepeham. ) 15
- ( M ) epeham est man' monachorum, et de cibo eorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro x sull', et nunc pro vii, et est appreciatum xxvi lib', et infra leugam ricardi habetur tantum quod est appreciatum xviii sol' et viii d'. Hoc manerium habent monachi in hundredo de tolnetre. ( De Cliue. ) 20
- ( C ) liue est man' monachorum, et de uestitu eorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro iii sull' et dimid', et est appreciatum xvi lib'. Hoc manerium est in hundredo de samele. ( De Orpintune. ) 25
- ( O ) rpintona est man' monachorum, et de uestitu eorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro iii sull', et nunc pro ii sull' et dimid', et est appreciatum xxv lib'. 30
- $\alpha 1 / C4-72va$
- Et tamen reddit de firma xxviii lib', et in hoc eodem manerio tenuit malgerus ab archiep'o iii iuga terre que quidam liber homo tenuit in tempore E regis. Et hec iii iuga non scottabant cum hoc manerio, et sunt de explacitatione quam fecit archiep's contra ep'm baiocensem, per concessum regis, et illa iii iuga sunt apreciata l sol'. Et ex hiis eisdem sull' habet dirmannus dimid' sull' ad kestane. ( De freningeham. ) 5
- ( F ) renengeham est manerium monachorum et de uestitu eorum, quod ansgodus rubitoniensis tenuit ab archiep'o, et tamen \*reddid' firmam monachis. Et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro i sull', et est appreciatum xi lib'. Hoc manerium est in hundr' de clakestane. ( De Grauene. ) 10
- ( G ) rauene est manerium monachorum et de uestitu eorum, Quod Ricardus constabularius tenuit in feodo ab arch'po, et tamen reddidit firmam monachis, et pro i sull' se defend', et iacet in hundredo de boctune. ( De hlose. ) 15
- ( H ) lose est manerium monach', et de uestitu eorum, et pro i sull' se defend', quod \*monachus tenuit et redd' firmam monachis. Hoc sulling' iacet in vi sull' de fernleghe. 20
- ( I ) n swirdlinge est dimid' sull' ( De Swerlinge. ) et pertinet ad uestitum monachorum, quod Godefridus dapifer tenuit, et firmam redd'. ( De huntintune. )
- ( H ) untintune est man' monach', et de uestitu eorum, et defend' se pro dimid' sull', quod Godefridus dapifer tenuit

et firmam redd'. Istud dimid' sull' est de vi sull' de fern-  
leghe. ( De Burrechestune. )

25

( B ) urrichestune tenerunt Wluricus et Cole, et est ibi  
dimid' sull', et reddiderunt inde c den' altari sc'e  
trinitatis. Hoc dimid' sull' est de x sull' de meidestane.

### Notes

70rb5 hoc] *read* hoc quod      70rb7 viii] *read* vii      70rb17 de] *read* d' de  
70va27 ( )orthwde] *with r inserted*      70vb16 predictam] *should be* predictam ter-  
ram      71ra18 iiii sull'] *interpolated here by error*      71ra32 Godefridus] *should be*  
Gosfridus      71ra33 Rob'] *should be* Ric'      71rb16] *erasure, perhaps* i sull'      71rb18  
sunt] *should be* est      71rb18 sunt] *should be* est      71rb19] *the end of this word erased*  
71rb26 habuit] *with a* written over 't      71rb33 saluude] *should be* Saltwde      71rb33  
x] *should be* et x      71va3 tenuit] *altered*      71va4] *erasure*      71va34] *some words*  
*erased*      71va37] *some words erased*      71vb7 et] *partly erased*      71vb8] *some*  
*words erased*      71vb9 monachorum manerium] *marked for transposition*      71vb18  
tenuit] *altered*      71vb22 habuit] *altered*      71vb29 ( )hertham] *with t inserted*      72ra2  
habuit] *altered*      72ra7 tenuit] *altered*      72ra7 apedre] *should be* apeldre      72ra13  
Hoc] *with c inserted*      72ra29 habuit] *altered*      72ra38] *the end of this word erased*  
72va10 reddid'] *with d' written over* t      18 monachus] *should be* Abel monachus

α2/C1-2va

:  
:

- ( S ) tursæte est manerium archiep'i, et in tempore eadwardi regis se defendebat pro vii sullinges, et nunc similiter, et est apretiatum hoc quod est in dominio xl lib'. Et nunc habet archiep's xx et v burgenses, qui reddunt x sol' de gablo, et ex his supra dictis vii sullinc habet Godefridus dapifer unum sullinc \*de archiep'o, tenitune, et est apretiatum c sol'. Adhuc autem et uitalis habet inde unum iugum terre de archiep'o, et est apretiatum xx sol'. Hamo uero tenet inde similiter dimidium sulling, quod tenuit alric bigge a priore archiep'i in tempore E regis, et est apretiatum c sol'.  
( R ) odbertus de hardes tenet inde unum iugum terre ex isdem sull', et est apretiatum xxx sol', et ex his septem sull' habet archiep's unum sull' apud sc'm martinum, et de eodem \*sull'ino habet Radulfus camerarius in feodo medietatem de archiep'o, et ualet iiii lib', et dominium ualet vii lib'.  
( E ) t in canturberia sunt vii burgenses, qui reddunt huic manerio viii sol' et iiii denarios de gablo.  
( E ) t iterum sunt inibi xxx et ii mansure et unum molendinum, que tenent clerici sc'i gregorii ad eorum eccl'am. ( I ) bique manent xii burgenses qui reddunt eis xxxv sol', et molendinum reddit v sol'.  
( A ) dhuc etiam tenet ægelwardus iiii iuga in natinduna, unde reddidit tempore E regis et adhuc reddit altari sc'ę trinitatis xii sol', et est apretiatum xl sol'.  
( A ) lbold uero tenet de supradictis sull' unum iugum, uuic, et est de terra monachorum sc'ę trinitatis, quod est apretiatum xxx sol'.  
( H ) ic finitur hundredus de stursæte. In fordwic habet archiep's vii mansuras terre que modo non faciunt seruitium ad mare ut in tempore E regis.  
( W ) ingeham est proprium manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E regis

se defendebat pro xl sull', et nunc

α2/C1-2vb

- pro xxx et v, et ualet c lib' hoc quod archiep's \*habet inde.  
( \* ) t ex isdem sull' habet Will' de archis unum sull' fleotes ab archiep'o in feodo, et ualet vi lib'. Et uital' habet i sull' et ualet xl v sol'. Wibertus et arnoldus habent iiii sull', que ualent xii lib'. Et heringod habet inde i sull' decem agros minus, et ualet xl sol', et Godefridus archibalistarius habet inde i sull' et dimidium, et ualet c sol'.  
:  
( B ) urnes est proprium manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro vi sull', et nunc similiter, et est apretiatum xxx lib', et est in hundred de berham.  
:  
( P ) eteham est proprium manerium archiep'i, et in tempore e regis se defendebat pro vii sull' et nunc similiter, et est apretiatum xx lib', et ex istis sull' habet Godefridus dapifer dimidium sull' quod pertinet ad uestimenta monachorum, id est Suurtling. Et nigellus habet unum sull' et unum iugum terre que est apretiata xl sol', hoc est in hundredo de peteham.  
:  
( I ) n hundredo de bilicholt: habet archiep's unum manerium, Aldintune, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro xx et \*un(o) sull', et nunc pro xx, et ualet c lib' et vii. Et ex his habet Will' de archis unum manerium stutinges, quod ælfere tenuit de archiep'o, et tunc defendebat se pro unum sull' et dimidium, et nunc pro uno, et ualet x lib'. Item ex supradictis sull' de aldintune habet archiep's dimidium iugum et dimidiam uirgam in limines, et ualet xii lib', et tamen qui tenet reddit xv lib' de firma. In rumene sunt xxv burgenses, qui pertinent ad aldintune.  
:  
( I ) n limiuuarlethe in hundred de noniberge habet archiep's in suo dominio unum manerium liminges, quod tempore E regis se defendebat pro vii sull', et nunc similiter. Rodbertus filius \*Watson(is) habet ex his ii sull'

in feodo. Et rodbertus de hardes dimidium sull'. Et osbertus pasfore-ra dimidium iugum. Et in maresco		:		50
<i>α2/C1-2vc</i>		( T )	eneham est manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro v sull' et dimidio, et nunc similiter, et est apretiatum 1 lib'.	
de rumene iacet unum sull', ælmesland, de elemosina monachorum sc'ę trinitatis, et non est de supradictis sull'. Et de isto sull' habet Will' folet unum iugum, id est Sturtune. Et de eodem sull' habet supradictus Rodbertus tria iuga, id est ordgares uuice, et cassetuisle, et eadruneland.	5	<i>α2/C1-3ra</i>	Dimidium sull' terre tenet Godfridus de melling in scapac ab archiep'o, quod ualet iiii lib', et tamen reddit c sol'. Osuardus uero tenuit hoc idem sull' ab archiep'o cantuarberie in tempore E regis. Hanc p'edictam terram habet archiep's in hundret de tenham.	5
:	10	:		
( R ) aculf est manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro viii sull', et est apretiatum xl et ii lib' et v sol', tres minutes minus.	15	( C )	erringis est proprium manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro viii sull', et nunc pro vii, Quia archiep's habet aliud ad suam propriam carrucam, et ualebat in tempore E regis xx lib', et habet inde archiep's iiii lib' et vii sol' de gablo. Nunc uero ualet xxx lib', sed tamen reddit xl lib' de firma. Et archiep's habet inde gablum sicut prius.	10
:		:		
( N ) ordeuode est manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro xiii sull', et nunc similiter, et est apretiatum l et i lib' et v sol'. Ex iis sull' habet Vital' de canturberie unum sull' et unum iugum, et in tanet sull' et dimidium, et etiam in macebroc habet xii agros et dimidium sull' ab archiep'o, Et ezilamerth, et tota *terra est apretiata xiiii lib' et vi *sol et vi denarios. Hęc maneria habet archiep's in hundret de ipso raculf.	20	( I )	n eodem hundredo et in lest de wiwarleth habet archiep's unum manerium plukelai in dominio quod in tempore E regis se defendebat pro uno sull' et nunc similiter, et ualet xv lib', et tamen reddit xx lib' de firma. Hęc maneria habet archiep's in hundret de calehela.	15
:	25	:		
( B ) octuna est manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro v sull' et *dimidi(o), et nunc similiter, et fuit apretiatum in tempore E regis x lib', et archiep's habet inde c sol' et xv et iii denarios de gablo. Nunc autem ualet xx lib', sed tamen reddit xx et v lib' de firma, et archiep's habet suum gablum sicut prius. Ricardus constabularius habet inde unum manerium grauenai in feodo ab archiep'o quod in tempore E regis se defendebat pro uno sull', et nunc similiter, et ualet vi lib'. Hanc terram habet archiep's in hundret de boctune.	30	( G )	elingeham est proprium manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro vi sull', et est apretiatum hoc quod archiep's habet inde in dominio x et viii lib'. Et hoc quod anscetillus de ros et rodbertus brutinus habent xl sol'. Et tamen reddit archiep'o de firma xx et v lib' et xviii sol'. Hoc manerium est in hundredo de certaham.	25
:	35	:		
	40			30
	45			40
				45
		( M )	æidestane est proprium manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E	

<p>regis se defendebat pro x sull'. Et ex iis tenet Radulfus unum sull', quod est apretiatum l sol', et Will' frater ep'i Gundulfi ii sull', et sunt *apretiat(a) x lib'. Et anse- tillus de ros unum sull', quod est apretiatum lx sol'. Et duo ho-</p> <p>α2/C1-3rb</p>	<p>50</p>	<p>debat pro viii sull', et nunc pro totidem. Et est apretiatum lx lib'. Et hoc quod haimo inde tenet est apretiatum lx sol' et x. Et hoc quod rodbertus interpres et Gosfridus de ros inde tenent viii lib' et x sol'. Et hoc quod Ricardus de tono- brig inde tenet x lib' et xx et iii porcos.</p> <p>α2/C1-3rc</p>	<p>50</p>
<p>mines habent inde i sull', qui reddunt altari sc'ę trinitatis xvi sol'. Et tamen ualet illud sull' xx sol'. Hoc manerium habet hundret in se i- pso.</p> <p>( N ) ordflita est manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro sex sull', et nunc pro v, et est appre- tiatum xx et vii lib'. Sed tamen ille qui tenet reddit inde de firma xxx et vii lib'. Et infra leugam de tonebrig est inde tantum quod est apretiatum xxx sol'. Hoc ma- nerium, et meppaham, iacent in hun- dredo de toltentru.</p> <p>:</p> <p>( B ) ixle est manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro iii sull', et nunc pro ii. Et est ap- pretiatum xx lib'. Et reddit xxx lib' et viii sol'. Et est in hundredo de ælmestrou, et in dimidio led de sutune, *iiii sull'.</p> <p>:</p> <p>( E ) arhede est manerium *est archi- ep'i, et in tempore E regis se defen- debat pro iiii sull', et nunc similiter. Et osuuardus tenuit illud ab ar- chiep'o in tempore E regis, et est apretiatum xvi lib'. Et tamen red- dit xx et i lib'. Hoc manerium habet archiep's in hundredo de litelet, *i sull' et d'.</p> <p>:</p> <p>( B ) radestede tenuit Wlnod cild ab archiep'o tempore E regis. Et nunc tenet illud haimo ab isto lanfranco archiep'o, et tunc de- fendebat se pro uno sull' et di- midio, et nunc similiter, et est appreti- atum xvii lib'. Istud manerium est in hundredo de hostreham.</p> <p>:</p> <p>( O ) tteford est manerium archi- ep'i, et in tempore E regis se defen-</p>	<p>5</p> <p>10</p> <p>15</p> <p>20</p> <p>25</p> <p>30</p> <p>35</p> <p>40</p> <p>45</p>	<p>:</p> <p>( S ) underhersce est manerium archiep'i, quod Goduinus tenuit tempore E regis iniuste, et archi- ep's iste lanfrancus explacitauit illud contra ep'm baiocensem iuste per concessum regis, et in tem- pore E regis se defendebat pro *(uno) sull' et dimid', et nunc similiter. Et est apretiatum xviii lib', et tamen qui tenet illud reddit inde xx et iiii lib' et unum equitem de fir- ma archiep'o. Hęc maneria sunt in hundredo de codesede.</p> <p>:</p> <p>( W ) rotenham est manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E regis se defen- debat pro viii sull', et est apretiatum xx et iiii lib', et tamen ille qui tenet reddit inde de firma xxx et v lib'. Et de iis pꝛedictis viii sull' tenet Will' dispensator i sull' quod est ap- pretiatum iii lib'. Et Gosfridus de ros aliud quod est apretiatum iii lib'. Et faremanus unum sull' et dimidium, et est apretiatum c sol'. Et hoc quod Ricardus habet xv lib'. Hic finit hundredus de uurotaham.</p> <p>:</p> <p>( M ) ellingettes est manerium ar- chiep'i, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro *i(i) sull' et nunc similiter, et est apretiatum *(i)x lib', et tamen reddit de firma archi- ep'o xv lib'. Hoc manerium habet archiep's in hundredo de lauercefeld.</p> <p>:</p> <p>( D ) ærente est manerium archi- ep'i, pro ii sull' se defen- debat in tempore E regis, et nunc similiter, et est apretiatum xv lib'. Et x sol' habet inde ricar-</p>	<p>5</p> <p>10</p> <p>15</p> <p>20</p> <p>25</p> <p>30</p> <p>35</p> <p>40</p>

dus infra castellum suum, et tamen archiep'us habet in firma sua xviii lib'.	45	:	:	45
:		:	:	
( E ) *ine(s)ford est manerium archiep'i, et in tempore E regis defendebat se pro vi sull', et nunc similiter, et nunc tenet Radulfus filius hospaci ab archiep'o, et est appretiatum xx lib', et ex eo habet Ricardus de tonobrig	50	:	:	50
		:	:	
		:	:	
<i>α2/C1-3va</i>			<i>α2/C1-3vb</i>	
tantum quod est appretiatum iii lib'.		:	:	
:		:	:	
( H ) ulecumbe tenuit ælferus in tempore *E regis de archiep'o, et defendebat se pro ii sull' et dimid', et nunc tenet comes de o' de archiep'o, et defendit se pro ii sull', et est appretiatum xi lib'.	5		( N ) ordwda est manerium monachorum sc'ę trinitatis, et est de cibo eorum et est de hundred de cantuarberia, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro uno sull', et ei subiacent c burgenes iii minus, qui reddunt viii lib' et vi denarios de gablo, et est appretiatum x et vii lib'. Hoc manerium est de hundred de cantuarberia.	5
:				
( A ) rchiep's habet iiii prebendas ad niuuentune, et sunt appretiate vi lib'.	10			10
:				
:				
:	15		( E ) strege est manerium monachorum et de cibo eorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro vii sull', et nunc similiter. Et in alia parte est dimidium sull' et unum ioc et v *( ) æceres, gedinges, et ualet xxx et vii lib' et x sol' et *iii denarios inter totum.	15
:				
:				
:				
:				
:				
:	20			20
:				
:				
:				
:				
:				
:	25		( W ) illelm' folet tenet i manerium, tilesmannestune ab archiep'o, et hoc est de terra monachorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro i sull', et nunc facit similiter, et ualet xxx sol'.	25
:				
:				
:				
:				
:				
:				
:				
:				
:				
:	30		( I ) ste idem Will' habet de predicta terra dimidium sull' ab archiep'o in fenglesham, quod tenuit liuenot in tempore E regis ab archiep'o, et ualet xx sol'.	30
:				
:				
:				
:				
:				
:	35			35
Tota summa, c lxxx et vii sull' et dimidium. :				
:				
:				
:				
:				
:	40		( I ) ste idem Will' habet adhuc ab eodem archiep'o, et de predicta terra monachorum stepenberga, quod se defendebat tempore E	40

regis pro dimidio sull', et nunc facit. Et godwinus tenuit illud in tempore E regis ab archiep'o ædzi, et ualet xxx sol'.		:		
( B ) ocland se defendit pro i iugo. Hic finit hundret de æstrege.	45	:	( I ) echam est manerium monachorum et de cibo eorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro iiii sull', et nunc similiter, et est appretiatum xxx et ii lib',	40 45
:			et hoc quod will' de hedesham habet inde uidelicet i sull' ad rocinges, ualet vii lib'.	
( S ) andwic est manerium sc'ę trinitatis, et de uestitu monachorum et est læth et hundretus in se ipso, et reddit regi seruitium in mare sicut douera, et homines illius uille antequam rex eis dedisset suas consuetudines, reddebant	50		Hoc manerium est in hundret de dunahamford.	50
α2/C1-3vc		:		
xv lib'. Quando archiep's *archiep's recuperauit, reddebat xl lib' et xl milia de allecibus. Et in præterito anno reddidit l lib' et allecia sicut prius. Et in isto anno debet reddere lx et x lib' et allecia sicut prius. In tempore E regis erant ibi ccc et vii mansurę. Nunc autem lx et xvi plus.	5		( S ) æsealtre est burgus monachorum et de cibo et proprie de coquina eorum, et *blitt&re	
:			α2/C1-4ra	
( M ) unechetun est manerium monachorum et de cibo eorum et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro xx sull', et nunc se defendit pro x et viii, et est appretiatum xl lib'. Hoc prædictum manerium est in hundred de tenet.	10		tenet illud de monachis, ibique est terra duarum carrucarum et est appretiatum c sol'. Hoc manerium in nullo hundret est.	5
:				
( E ) desham est manerium monachorum sc'ę trinitatis et de cibo eorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro xvii sull' et nunc similiter et de gablo reddit xvi lib' et xvi sol' et iiii denarios, et ualet xxx lib' de firma, et c sol' de gersuma, et ex iis sull' habet rodbertus filius watsonis ii id est egedorn qui ualet vii lib'. Et tamen qui tenet reddit inde viiii lib'. Et Rogerius tenet ex his i sull' ad beraham, qui ualet iiii lib'. Hoc manerium habet hundret *( ) in se ipso, et in læd est de æstraie.	15		( C ) ertaham est manerium monachorum et de uestitu eorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro iiii sull', et nunc similiter, et est appretiatum xx et v lib', et tamen reddit xxx lib'.	10
:			( G ) odmæresham est manerium monachorum et de uestitu eorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro viii sull', et est appretiatum xx lib', sed tamen reddit xxx. Hic finitur hundretus de feleberga.	15
:				20
	20		:	
	25		( C ) ert est manerium monachorum et de uestitu eorum et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro iii sull', et nunc similiter, et est appretiatum xx lib'. Ipsum cert est hundret.	25
	30		:	
	35		( L ) itelcert iterum est manerium monachorum et de cibo eorum quod in tempore E regis se defendebat pro iii sull', et nunc pro ii et dimidium, et ualet viii lib', et ex iis habet Will' filius hermenfridi dimidium sull', id est pette, ab archiep'o in feodo, et	30 35
:				
:				

reddit inde altari sc'ę trinitatis xxv denarios pro omnibus consuetudinibus, *et ualet xl sol'.		medietatem, et ualet xviii lib'.	35
:	40	Hoc manerium iacet in limuuarled in hundret de langebrige.	
( I ) n *letd de limuuar iacet hundret de blacetune, in quo *Rodbertus de rumenæ tenet ad firmam i manerium apeldre, et est de cibo monachorum sc'ę trinitatis, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro ii sull' et nunc pro i, et ualet xii lib'. Sed tamen reddit xvi lib' et *xvi sol' et vii denarios.	45	:	
( W ) ælle uero est manerium monachorum sc'ę trinitatis, et est de cibo eorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro vii	50	( R ) odbertus filius watsonis tenet de priore cantuarberie ælmes land ad firmam, et p̄cepto eiusdem prioris reddit firmam secrestano eiusdem eccl'ę.	40
α2/C1-4rb		:	
sull', et nunc pro v, et ualet xxiiii lib' et iiii denarios, et tamen reddit *xi lib' de firma. Hoc manerium et litelcert sunt in hundret de calehele.	5	( I ) n limuuarlæd et in hundret de *hamine habent monachi sc'e trinitatis de uestitu eorum i manerium, Werehorne, i sull', et est appretiatum lx sol'.	45
:		:	50
( H ) olingeburne est manerium monachorum et de cibo eorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro vi sull' et nunc similiter, et de isto *m(a)n(e)rio tenet ep's baiocensis dimidium sull' ab archiep'o per gablum et postquam ep's habuit hoc dimidium sull' nunquam reddit inde scottum et est appretiatum inter totum hoc manerium xxx lib'.	10	( I ) n læd de Wiuuarlæd *et est hundret in quo tenet Rodbertus de rumenæ i manerium broc ad firmam de cibo monachorum, et	
:		α2/C1-4rc	
( R ) atel tenuit boctune de archiep'o cantuarberie et defendebat se in tempore E regis pro dimidio sull' et istud dimidium sull' est et fuit de vi sull' de holineburne. Nunc autem tenet illud Radulfus filius toroldi ab archiep'o et est appretiatum xl sol'. Hęc maneria sunt in hundret de haihorna.	20	pro i sull' defendebat se, et nunc pro dimidio, et ualet iiii lib'.	
:		:	
( M ) erseham est manerium monachorum sc'ę trinitatis, et de cibo eorum, quod tempore E regis se defendebat pro vi sull' et quando archiep's eum recepit pro v et *dimidi(o) et modo pro iiii. Et hugo de mundford habet ex iis unius	30	( I ) dem rodbertus habet in langeport de terra monachorum i sull' et dimidium de archiep'o quod idem archiep's diratiocinauit contra ep'm baiocensem, et Godwinus comes tenuit illud, ibique pertinebant ac pertinent xx et i burgenses de quibus rex in mare habet seruitium, ideoque quieti sunt per totam angliam exceptis tribus forisfactis quę habet Rodbertus in rumene. Adhuc uero pertinet ibi i iugum terre, et hęc omnia ualent xvi lib'.	5
		:	10
		( I ) n limuuarlæd et hundred de selebrichtindæne habet archiep's de terra monachorum i manerium niuwendene in dominio quod in tempore E regis tenuit leofric de p̄terito archiep'o, et pro i sull' se defendebat, et subiacebat *saltwnde, nunc est appretiatum viii lib' et x sol' garsumę.	15
		:	20
		( I ) n *limwarl&d in *hund(r)ed de strate habet Will' de edesham	25
		:	30

de terra monachorum i manerium de archiep'o, Bereuic quod tenuit Godricus decanus et pro dimidio sull' se defendebat, et nunc similiter, et est appretiatum xi lib'.	35	pro vi sull', et est appretiatum xxii lib', et hoc quod abel monachus inde tenet per iussum archiep'i est appretiatum vi lib', et hoc quod Ricardus inde habet infra leugam suam iiii lib', et de istis vi sull' tenet Godefridus dapifer dimidium sull' quod est appretiatum ix lib'. Hoc manerium habent monachi in hundred de mædestane.	35
:		:	
( I ) n *limwarl&d in hundred de hede habet hugo de munford de terra monachorum i manerium saltwode de archiep'o, et comes Godwinus tenuit illud, et tunc se defendebat pro vii sull', et nunc sunt v, et tamen non scottent nisi pro iii, et in burgo de hedę sunt cc et xxv burgenses qui pertinent huic manerio de quibus non habet hugo nisi iii forisfacta, et est appretiatum xxviii lib' et vi sol' et iiii *denari(i)s.	40	( P ) echam est manerium sc'ę trinitatis de cibo monachorum, et in tempore E regis similiter fuit, et se defendebat pro vi sull', et ex istis habet nunc Ricardus de tunebrige ii sull' et i iugum, et ex istis ii sull' et ioco isto nunquam scottauit Ricardus postquam habuit ea. Et in tempore E regis fuit hoc manerium appretiatum xii lib', et nunc viii lib'. Et p̄fata pars Ricardi ualet	40
:		:	
α2/C1-4va			
( P ) restetune est manerium monachorum et est de uictu eorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro i sull', et nunc similiter, et est appretiatum xv lib'. Hoc manerium est in hundred de *fe( )ue(r)sham.	45	( P ) echam est manerium sc'ę trinitatis de cibo monachorum, et in tempore E regis similiter fuit, et se defendebat pro vi sull', et ex istis habet nunc Ricardus de tunebrige ii sull' et i iugum, et ex istis ii sull' et ioco isto nunquam scottauit Ricardus postquam habuit ea. Et in tempore E regis fuit hoc manerium appretiatum xii lib', et nunc viii lib'. Et p̄fata pars Ricardi ualet	45
:		:	
( L ) iueland est terra monachorum quam Ricardus constabularius tenet in feodo ab archiep'o, et decanus cantuarberię habuit et tenuit eandem terram, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro i sull', et nunc similiter, et ualet xx sol'. Hęc maneria habent monachi in hundred de *fe( )ue(r)sham.	50	α2/C1-4vb	
:		iiii lib'. Et in stotingeberga quod tenuit edricus de E rege est dimidium sull' unde ipse edricus dabat scottum ad pecham spontaneę non quod pertineret ad sc'am trinitatem, nec ad monachos. Hoc manerium est de hundred de litelfeld.	50
( L ) iueland est terra monachorum quam Ricardus constabularius tenet in feodo ab archiep'o, et decanus cantuarberię habuit et tenuit eandem terram, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro i sull', et nunc similiter, et ualet xx sol'. Hęc maneria habent monachi in hundred de *fe( )ue(r)sham.	5	:	
:		( M ) epaham est manerium monachorum et de cibo eorum et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro x sull', et est appretiatum xxvi lib', et infra leugam Ricardi habetur tantum, quod est appretiatum xviii sol' et viii denarios. Hoc manerium habent monachi in hundred de toltetriu.	5
( L ) enham est manerium monachorum quod Godefridus de mellinges tenet ab archiep'o in feodo, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro ii sull', et nunc similiter, et ualet viii lib', et tamen reddit xii lib' et x sol' de firma.	10	:	
:		( C ) liva est manerium monachorum et de uestitu eorum, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro *ii sull' et *dimidi(o), et est appretiatum xvi lib'. Hoc manerium est in hundred de scamele.	10
( L ) enham est manerium monachorum quod Godefridus de mellinges tenet ab archiep'o in feodo, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro ii sull', et nunc similiter, et ualet viii lib', et tamen reddit xii lib' et x sol' de firma.	15	:	
:		( O ) rpintuna est manerium monachorum et de uestitu eorum et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro	15
( L ) enham est manerium monachorum quod Godefridus de mellinges tenet ab archiep'o in feodo, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro ii sull', et nunc similiter, et ualet viii lib', et tamen reddit xii lib' et x sol' de firma.	20		
:			
( F ) ernlege est manerium monachorum et est de cibo eorum et in tempore E regis se defendebat	25		
:			
( F ) ernlege est manerium monachorum et est de cibo eorum et in tempore E regis se defendebat	30		



appretiatum vii sol'.	25	tiatum iiii lib'.	
:		:	
( S ) utfliote est manerium ep'i rofensis, et in *tempor(e) e regis se defendebat pro vi sull' et nunc pro v, et est appretiatum xx et i lib', et Ricardus habet inde infra suam leugam ualens xx sol', et tamen hoc idem manerium reddit ep'o xx et iiii lib', et *() unam unciam auri de firma.	30	( T ) rotescliuue est manerium ep'i rofensis et defendit se pro iiii sull', et est appretiatum vii lib'.	25
:		:	
( S ) tanes est manerium ep'i rofensis et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro vi sull' et nunc pro iii, et est appretiatum xvi lib', tamen habet ep's inde in firma sua xx lib', et i unciam auri, et i mar-suinum.	35	( S ) noelande est manerium ep'i rofensis, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro vi sull', et nunc similiter, et est appretiatum ix lib'. Hęc p̄dicta maneria habet archiep's in hundredo de lauercefeld.	30
:		:	
( F ) alceham est manerium ep'i rofensis, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro ii sull', et nunc similiter, et est appretiatum viii lib'.	40	( H ) allinges est manerium ep'i rofensis, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro vi sull', et nunc pro ii et dimidio, et est appretiatum xvi lib'.	35
:		:	
( L ) angefeld est manerium ep'i rofensis, et in tempore E regis	45	( C ) ukelestane est manerium ep'i rofensis, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro ii sull' et *dimidi(o), et nunc pro ii, et est appretiatum x lib'.	40
α2/C1-5rb		:	
se defendebat pro i sull', et nunc similiter, et est appretiatum c sol'. Hęc maneria sunt in hundred clace-stane.	50	( D ) anitune est manerium ep'i rofensis, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro ii sull', et nunc pro dimidio, et est appretiatum vi lib' et x sol'. Hęc maneria sunt in hundred de scamele.	45
:		:	
( B ) runlege est manerium ep'i rofensis, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro vi sull' et nunc pro iii, et est appretiatum x et viii lib', et tamen ep's habet de firma xx lib' et x et viii sol'. Hoc idem manerium *est hundredus.	5	α2/C1-5rc	50
:		:	
( W ) oldeham est manerium ep'i rofensis, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro vi sull', et nunc pro iii, et est appretiatum xiii lib'.	10	( B ) ordestele est manerium ep'i rofensis, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro ii sull', et nunc pro i et dimid', et est appretiatum x lib', et iiii xx domus subiacebant ibi in tempore E regis, una pars illarum est apud supra dictam bordestellam, et alia pars in frendesberia, et sunt appretiate viii lib', sed tamen ille qui tenet reddit inde xi lib' et xiii sol' et iii denarios. Hoc manerium habet ep's in hundred de rouecestre.	5
:		:	
( M ) ellingetes est manerium ep'i rofensis, et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro iii sull', et nunc pro sull' et *dimidi(o), et est appre-	15		10
	20	( S ) tocces est manerium ep'i rofensis, quod Godwinus comes tenuit contra uoluntatem seruientium sc'i andree, et archiep's Lanfran-	15
			20



α3/R1-209r		dictam borgestellam, et alia pars in frandesberia, et sunt appretiate viii lib', sed tamen	
(S) uthfleta manerium ep'i hrofensis se defendebat in tempore eaduardi regis pro vi solinis, et nunc pro v, et est appretiatum xxi lib', et ricardus habet inde infra leugam suam ualens xx solid', et tamen hoc idem manerium reddit ep'o xxiiii libras, et i unciam auri de firma. Stanes se defendebat pro vi solinis in tempore eaduardi regis, et nunc pro iiiii, et est appretiatum xvi lib', et tamen ep's habet inde in firma sua xx lib', et i unciam auri, et i *marsuin. Falcheham defendebat se in tempore eaduardi regis pro ii solinis, et nunc similiter, et est appretiatum viii lib'. Langefeldada defendebat se in tempore eaduardi regis pro i solino, et nunc similiter, et est appretiatum c solid'. Hęc maneria predicta ad hundredum de clacestane pertinent. Brunlega se defendebat in tempore eaduardi regis pro vi solinis, et nunc pro iii, et est appreciatum xviii lib', et tamen ep's habet inde de firma sua xx libras et xviii solid',	5 10 15 20	ille qui tenet reddit inde xi libras et xiii solidos et iii denarios. Hoc manerium habet ep's in hundredo de hrouecestra. Stoches quod goduuinus comes tenuit contra uoluntatem seruientium sc'i andree, et archiep's lanfrancus disrationauit *eum contra ep'm baiocensem iuste, tempore regis eaduardi se defendebat pro v solinis, et nunc pro iii, et est appretiatum viii libras, sed tamen ille qui tenet reddit xiii libras et xx denarios. Hoc manerium est in hundredo de hou.	10 15 20

Notes

209r15 marsuin] *distinctly so written* 209v11 archiep's] *with archi erased* 209v14 duo] *should be* duobus 209v18 tantum] *should be* tantum quod ualet 209v22 duo] *should be* duobus 210r5 quattuor] *should be* quater 210r15 eum] *should be* id or illud

α3/R1-209v

et hoc idem manerium est ipse hundredus. Wldeham se defendebat in tempore eaduardi regis pro vi solinis, et nunc pro iii, et est appretiatum xiii lib'. Melingetes se defendebat in tempore eaduardi regis pro iii solinis, et nunc pro solino et dimidio, et est appreciatum iiiii lib'. Trotescliua defendebat se pro i solino, et adhuc facit, et est appretiatum vii lib'. Snoilanda defendebat se in tempore eaduardi regis pro iii solinis, et nunc similiter, et est appretiatum ix lib'. Hęc predicta maneria habet \*(archi)ep's in hundredo de lauorcesfelda. Hellingas defendebat se in tempore eaduardi regis pro vi solinis, et nunc pro \*duo et dimidio, et est appretiatum xvi libras. Frandesberia defendebat se in tempore eaduardi regis pro x solinis, et nunc pro vii, et est appretiatum xxv lib', et infra leugam de tonebrigge est inde \*tantum x solidos, et etiam de hallingis est tantum infra eandem leugam quod est appretiatum vii solidos. Cuclestana in tempore eaduardi regis defendebat se pro ii solinis et dimidio, et nunc pro \*duo, et est appreciatum x libras. Denituna defendebat se in tempore eaduardi regis pro i solino, et nunc pro di-

α3/R1-210r

midio, et est appretiatum vi libras et x solid'. Hęc maneria sunt in hundredo de scamela. Borgestealla defendebat se tempore eaduardi regis pro ii solinis, et nunc pro solino et dimidio, et est appretiatum x libras. Et \*quattuor uiginti domus subiacebant ibi in tempore eaduardi regis, et una pars illarum est apud supra-

## Comments

Because C1 is the only complete copy (not to speak of its being the earliest and best copy), these comments follow the order of the paragraphs as they appear there. The reader will find a concordance at the end (below, p. 71) which should make it easy to navigate between the different versions of  $\alpha$ , or between them and DB.

At the end of each segment, C1 has a sentence reporting the total number of sulungs. These totals, which relate to the TRE assessments, seem to have been calculated from a synopsis of  $\alpha 2$  which was also copied into C1 (2rb–c), perhaps with the idea that it would serve as an index to the copy of  $\alpha 2$  itself. For reference, I print this synopsis here (Table 9), but the reader who is willing to take my advice will not spend much time on it. It is helpful up to a point; beyond that point it starts to become a distraction. (There is, for example, as far as I can see, nothing to be gained by asking why segment 3 is appended to segment 1. Probably the answer is that the C1 scribe was imitating the layout of his exemplar – but anyway how can it matter?) The information contained in these lists was all taken from  $\alpha 2$ ; the totals calculated from these lists were then inserted into  $\alpha 2$ . Taken as they stand, they add up to a grand total of 387.5 sulungs. But the totals for segments 1 and 2 both seem to err on the low side (see below), and in Rochester the total for segment 3 would have been thought to err on the high side.

Whether these numbers have any authority is doubtful; they are probably just one man's attempt to add up the figures in front of him. The numbers which counted were the totals decided by the treasury officials, after they had had a chance to collate the survey text with the most recent geld accounts. An official list dating from c. 1120 (but surviving, unfortunately, only in one late copy) gives a grand total of 392.5 sulungs for the archbishop and bishop of Rochester, 56.75 sulungs in domain plus 335.75 sulungs paying geld (Flight 2005, p. 374).

2va3) Stursete. C1 adds two facts: that Godefrid's sulung is at Thanington, and that Albold's holding consists of a yoke called Wyke.

2va48) C1 adds this: 'In Fordwich the archbishop has seven measures of land which at present are not doing service at sea as (they did) in the time of king Eadward.' The corresponding passage in DB is in chapter 7, because the men making this complaint were tenants of the abbot of Saint Augustine's.

2vb19) Petham. C1 identifies Godefrid's holding as Swarling; it is mentioned again in one of the redundant paragraphs (4vc29) at the end of segment 2. Its value is not reported. The value of Nigel's holding is given as '60 shillings' in C4, '40 shillings' in C1; it is doubtful which reading – *lx* or *xl* – is the right one.

2vb30) Aldington. Both copies of  $\alpha$  say that Stowting belongs to Willelm de Arcis; DB says that it is held by the count of Eu. (It is the count's descendants, not Willelm's, who are found in possession later.)

Stursæte	vii	Nordewede	i
Wingaham	xl	Muncetun	x( )
Burne	vi	Eastrege	vii
Petham	vii	Sandwic	
Ealdintune	xxi	Eadesham	xvii
Limminges	vii	Ieachim	iiii
Raculue	viii	Sæsealtre	
Nordewode	xiii	Certeham	iiii
Boctune	v et d'	Godmeresham	viii
Tenham	v et d'	Cert	iii
Cerringes	viii	Litecert	iii
Plucele	i	Apeldre	ii
Gellingeham	vi	Welle	vii
Medestane	x	Holingeburne, Boctune,	vi
Nordflicte	vi	Mersham	( )
Bixle	iii	Elmesland	i
Erhide	iiii	Werehorne	i
Ottoford	viii	Broc	i
Sunderhersce	i et d'	Langeport	i et d'
Wroteham	viii	Niuuende	i
Mellinges	ii	Bertune	d'
Derente	ii	Hethe, Sealtuode	vii
Emesford	vi	Prestetune	i
Vlecumbe	ii	Liofeland	i
		Leanham	ii
Freundesberi	x	Fearnlege, Hloso,	vi
Sudfliote	vi	Pecham	vi
Stanes	vi	Meapham	x
Falceham	ii	Clieue	iii
Langefeld	i	Orpintune, Sendlinge, Kestane	
Brunlege	vi	Frenigeham	i
Woldeham	vi	Graue	
Meallingettes	iii		
Trottesclieue	iii		
Snoclande	vi		
Hallinges	vi		
Cuclestane	ii et d'		
Danitune	ii		
Bordestele	ii		
Stocces	v		

Table 9. The synopsis of  $\alpha 2$  (C1-2rb–c) used for calculating the TRE assessment totals.

2va46) Lyminge. Both copies of  $\alpha$  are defective here: no values are reported, either for the domain or for any of the tenancies. The sulung called 'Almsland' is described again at the end of segment 2 (4rb39).

70va35) Boughton under Blean. Ricard's holding, Grave-ney, is described again at the end of segment 2 (4vc12).

2vc51) Teynham. Text  $\alpha$  is especially valuable here, because the manor of Teynham went missing from the survey text, somewhere along the line. Only Godefrid's holding (half a sulung in Sheppey) is reported in DB (4va7); the main entry (which probably ought to follow the one for Pluckley) is omitted.

3ra23) Pluckley. This paragraph looks as it has been reconstructed at the beginning. By analogy with the surrounding

paragraphs, we would expect it to start like this:

*Plukelai est proprium manerium archiep'i et ...*

But in fact it starts like this:

*In eodem hundredo et in lest de wiwarleth habet archiep's unum manerium Plukelai in dominio quod ...*

The phrase 'In the same hundred' is true but odd – true because Pluckley was indeed in the same hundred as Charing, odd because we have not yet been told which hundred Charing belongs to. To find that out, we have to wait for the end of the Pluckley paragraph, where a sentence of the normal kind occurs: 'These (are the) manors (which) the archbishop owns in the hundred of Calehill.'

Both copies have the phrase *in lest de wiwarleth*. Except that C4 lacks the final *h*, the spelling is the same.

Pluckley's value is given as 'six pounds' in C4, 'fifteen pounds' in C1 and DB. Probably this means that the value was misreported in  $\alpha$ 1.

3ra33) Gillingham. 'This manor is in the hundred of Chatham.' C1 seems to be confusing Chatham with Chartham (4ra7).

3ra46) Maidstone. The sulung mentioned at the end of this paragraph is Burston, described again (but said to comprise only half a sulung) in one of the redundant paragraphs at the end of segment 2 (4vc43).

3rb6) Northfleet. 'This manor and Meopham lie in the hundred of Toltingtrough.' Meopham is one of the monks' manors, described in segment 2 (4vb9). Why is it mentioned here?

3rb23) 'four sulungs'. This seems to be a marginal note, properly referring to the next paragraph, which in both copies got attached to the end of this paragraph. In C1 alone a similar note – 'one sulung and a half' – has attached itself to the end of the Crayford paragraph (3rb33).

3rb35) Brasted. The assessment is 'one sulung' in C4, 'one sulung and a half' in C1 and DB.

3rc39) Darenth. There is some confusion affecting the assessment clause. In both copies the word-order is abnormal, and only C1 has the phrase 'for two sulungs'.

3rc48) Eynsford. C1 and DB give the name of the current tenant, Radulf son of Hospac. At the end of this paragraph we ought to be told that these manors (Darenth and Eynsford) are in Axstone hundred.

3va3) Ulcombe. C1 and DB give the name of the current tenant, the count of Eu. At the end of this paragraph we ought to be told that this manor is in Eyhorne hundred.

3va10) Newington church. The archbishop's share is mentioned only incidentally in chapter 13 of DB.

In C4 alone (71va12), there is also a note of the archbishop's share of Saint Martin's church in Dover.

3va36) For segment 1, the total given is 187.5 sulungs (Table 10). But that figure seems to have been arrived at by counting 2 sulungs for Ulcombe, as in the synopsis (Table 9); and the synopsis is sure to be wrong here. Following

Stursete	7	
Wingham	40	
Bishopsbourne	6	
Petham	7	
Aldington	21	
Lyminge	7	
Reculver	8	
Northwood	13	
Boughton under Blean	5.5	
Teynham	5.5	
Charing	8	
Pluckley	1	
Gillingham	6	
Maidstone	10	
Northfleet	6	
Bexley	3	
Crayford	4	
Otford	8	
Sundridge	1.5	
Wrotham	8	
East Malling	2	
Darenth	2	
Eynsford	6	
Ulcombe	2	so C1-2rb25
	187.5	

Table 10. Sum of TRE assessments for segment 1.

$\alpha$  and DB, we need to count 2.5 sulungs for Ulcombe, and that will raise the total to 188 sulungs. Furthermore, the synopsis lacks an entry for Brasted (it ought to occur between Crayford and Otford), and this manor, as C1 and DB agree, was assessed at 1.5 sulungs. Counting that in, we get an adjusted total of 189.5 sulungs for segment 1.

In C4, the word 'Total' occurs, but it is followed by a blank. There is probably no point in asking what this means. (The first question would be: what did the C4 scribe find in his exemplar? A blank? A cancelled number? A number which he chose not to copy because he knew that it was wrong?)

3vb3) Northwood. C1 has a redundant sentence at the end. Perhaps it was added by someone who did not realize that (abnormally) the hundred was named in the body of the paragraph.

3vb15) Eastry. The two versions differed greatly (until C4 was altered) in their descriptions of the first three subordinate manors: Tilmanstone, Finglesham, Statenborough. The version represented by C4 did not give the name of the current tenant, Willelm Folet; C1 and DB do that. For Buckland, neither version gives us the name of the tenant: only DB does that.

The synopsis seems to assume (correctly, I think) that the assessments for all these manors are counted in the seven sulungs of Eastry.

3vb48) Sandwich. Here again, the two versions differed greatly (or did, until C4 was altered). The farm being paid to the archbishop is one point on which they diverge. Ac-

cording to C4, Sandwich pays him fifty pounds. According to C1, which seems to reflect some statement from the men of the town, Sandwich was paying fifty pounds up until ‘last year’ (the financial year which ended in September 1085), but is due to pay seventy pounds ‘this year’. (The word *debet* means ‘is supposed to’, ‘is about to’, or something of the sort.) The increase in the number of built-up plots is given as 76 in C1, and that is the number reported in B/xAug, as well as in DB. Originally C4 had some different number here; but the number was erased, when C4 was being made to agree with C1.

4ra22) Great Chart. C4 has a clause which is absent from C1, ‘and yet it pays 27 pounds’. This is one of the places where C4 agrees with DB against C1, and the question arises how these agreements should be accounted for. The obvious answer is that they result from errors on the part of the C1 scribe. Thus here we might think that he omitted these words accidentally, his eye having jumped from the *lib*’ at the end of the previous clause to the *lib*’ at the end of this one. Mistakes of this type are easily made by scribes who are copying hurriedly, phrase by phrase; but I doubt whether that description applies to the C1 scribe. On the contrary, it looks to me as if he was working very slowly, copying letter by letter. If we are reluctant to put the blame on the C1 scribe, there are two alternative explanations: (a) that he was copying, not from  $\alpha 2$  itself, but from a copy of  $\alpha 2$  which already had some defects; (b) that this information was omitted accidentally from  $\alpha 2$ , but nevertheless became known to the commissioners later, through some other channel. I would vote for (b).

4ra41) Appledore. The hundred is called ‘Blackton’ in both versions of  $\alpha$ , ‘Blackbourne’ in B/xAug and DB, as in all later records. Probably this was just a slip of the pen in  $\alpha 1$ : the  $\alpha 2$  scribe reproduced the error, perhaps without realizing that it was one, but the commissioners’ scribes were in a position to know better.

4ra51) Westwell. The farm being paid is ‘forty pounds’ in C4 and DB, ‘eleven pounds’ in C1. The numeral in C1 is certainly *xi* (and was so read by C3/T1); but there is a small smudge above the *i*. It looks to me as if *xi* was altered to *xl* but then altered back to *xi*. However that may be, it seems certain that *xi* is an error, and that *xl* is the correct reading.

4rb12) Hollingbourne. In the passage relating to the bishop of Bayeux’s half sulung, C4 lacks the phrase *per gablum* which is present in C1 and DB.

4rb39) Almsland. C1 lacks the clause ‘and it defends itself for one sulung’. Since the synopsis counts one sulung here, the omission appears to be the fault of the C1 scribe. But there may be some confusion at work between this and the following paragraph. DB has the same information as C4. The same sulung is also described under Lyminge in segment 1 (2vb54).

4rb45) Warehorne. C4 lacks the words ‘one sulung’. DB agrees with C1.

4rc5) Langport. In C4 this paragraph is part of segment 1 (71va3). Neither version reports, what we find reported

Northwood	1	
Eastry	7	
Sandwich		
Monkton	20	$\alpha$ and DB
Adisham	17	
Ickham	4	
Seasalter		
Chartham	4	
Godmersham	8	
Great Chart	3	
Little Chart	3	
Appledore	2	
Westwell	7	
Hollingbourne	6	
Mersham	6	$\alpha$ and DB
Almsland	1	$\alpha 1$ and DB
Warehorne	1	$\alpha 2$ and DB
Brook	1	
Langport	1.5	
Newenden	1	
Westenhanger	0.5	
Saltwood	7	
Preston	1	
Leaveland	1	
East Lenham	2	
East Farleigh	6	
East Peckham	6	
Meopham	10	
Cliffe	2.5	so $\alpha 2$
Orpington	3	$\alpha$ and DB
Farningham	1	
	133.5	

Table 11. Sum of TRE assessments for segment 2.

elsewhere, that this manor had been recovered from the bishop of Bayeux.

4rc20) Newenden. In C4 this paragraph is part of segment 1 (71rb31).

4rc40) Saltwood. In C4 this paragraph is part of segment 1 (71rb36).

4va9) Leaveland. In C4 this paragraph is part of segment 1 (70vb5), and that is where it seems to be more at home. The sentence at the end, ‘This land is in Faversham hundred’, refers to Leaveland alone. In C1 the sentence at the end is differently worded – ‘These (are the) manors (which) the monks own in Faversham hundred’ – because here it refers to Preston (4va1) as well as Leaveland. But the Preston paragraph ends with a sentence of the same type – ‘This manor is in Faversham hundred’ – which is redundant as things stand. Apparently this sentence became redundant when the Leaveland paragraph was inserted into this segment, but survives because nobody took the trouble to cancel it.

4va19) East Lenham. In C4 this paragraph is part of segment 1 (70vb18), and that is where it seems more likely to belong. C1 fails to tell us which hundred East Lenham is in;

it fails to mention the fact that East Lenham is in the same hundred as Westwell (4ra51) and Little Chart (4ra29).

4vb9) Meopham. C1 lacks the phrase 'and now for seven'. DB has the same information as C4.

4vb19) Cliffe. The TRE assessment is given as 3.5 sulungs in C4 and DB, as 2.5 sulungs in C1. The synopsis is defective.

4vb44) Sandling. Because of the difference in the coloured initial, the TRE tenant's name is differently reported – as *Wluiet* (= Wulfgeat) in C4, as *Ælfgeat* in C1. Either way, this report is contradicted by DB, which says that the manor was held by a man named Bonde. But a man named *Uluiet* does appear in DB as Hugo's predecessor at two other manors (8rb11, 8rb17); so probably we should give C4 the benefit of the doubt.

In C4 a string of eleven words has gone missing from this paragraph. This is the only large defect occurring in that copy for which, apparently, the C4 scribe is to blame. Perhaps he skipped a line of his exemplar.

The Sandling paragraph seems to be more at home in segment 2, which is where we find it in C1. The sentence at the end, 'These manors are of Helmstree hundred', covers the Orpington paragraph (4vb26) as well as this one. In C4 this paragraph is part of segment 1 (71rb15). The logical place for it would be after Bexley (71ra15), which was in the same hundred, but that is not where we find it. Also the final sentence is oddly worded – 'This manor (singular) are (plural) in Helmstree hundred' – as though somebody started altering it (from singular to plural or vice versa) but did not finish the job. And the Orpington paragraph in segment 2 lacks a sentence to say that this manor is in Helmstree hundred.

It should not be forgotten, however, that Sandling was in a category by itself. The archbishop was not in possession of this manor at the time; he was arguing that he should be. (DB puts Sandling in chapter 5, 'Land of the bishop of Bayeux', but accepts that the manor was held from the archbishop in the time of king Eadward.) Even if we knew for certain how this paragraph came to be moved, it might be unwise to assume that the same was true for other paragraphs.

4vc1) Farningham. Here both versions have the nonce-word *rubitoniensis*, which somebody thought (but nobody agreed) was a clever way to say 'of Rochester'. In C1 the word recurs at the start of segment 3.

4vc12) Graveney, Loose, Swarling, Hunton, Burston. In both versions, segment 2 ends with this string of seemingly redundant paragraphs. The holdings in question have all been described before, Loose and Hunton in segment 2, the others in segment 1. In detail, however, the facts reported here are sometimes rather different.

5ra11) The total given by C1 for segment 2 is 133.5 sulungs (Table 11). It is not quite as easy to see how this total was arrived at as it for segments 1 and 3. Two of the entries in C1's synopsis were later rubbed out and rewritten, but

Southfleet	6	
Stone	6	
Fawkham	2	
Longfield	1	
Bromley	6	
Wouldham	6	
West Malling	3	
Trottiscliffe	3	C1 and DB
Snodland	6	
Halling	6	
Frindsbury	10	
Cuxton	2.5	
Denton	2	
Borstal	2	
Stoke	5	
	66.5	

Table 12. Sum of TRE assessments for segment 3.

that does not cause us much trouble. From  $\alpha$  and DB, we can be sure what the original readings ought to have been: 20 (not 18) sulungs for Monkton (2rc4) and 6 (not 2.5) sulungs for Mersham (2rc17). More seriously, something had gone wrong near the end of the list: apparently the figure for Orpington (3 sulungs) was pushed up into the previous line, and the figure which ought to appear in that line dropped out (2rc31–2). To get the arithmetic right, it seems that we need to count 2.5 sulungs for Cliffe, as in C1 (4vb19). Making these corrections, and counting one sulung each for Almsland and Warehorne as in the synopsis, we arrive at the total reported by C1. For Cliffe, however, the figure reported by C4 and DB is 3.5 (not 2.5) sulungs: if that is right, as it presumably is, the total will come to 134.5 sulungs.

5ra16) Frindsbury. This paragraph is out of place in C1. Frindsbury belongs in Shamell hundred, with Halling, Cuxton and Denton, and that is where R1 puts it. Possibly this error reflects the existence of some lost version of segment 3 which began with Frindsbury (and the other Shamell hundred manors), not with Southfleet (and the other Axstone hundred manors), as in DB and R1.

5ra38) Stone. The current assessment is 3 sulungs in C1, 4 sulungs in R1 and DB. This discrepancy might be due to a scribal error in C1; but other numerical differences occur which cannot be explained away so easily.

Wherever there is some disagreement between C1 and R1, DB has the same TRE assessment as C1, the same current assessment as R1. In some sense, therefore, DB is textually intermediate between C1 and R1. But there are various ways in which that might have come about,<sup>58</sup> and I cannot decide what the best explanation might be.

5rb25) Trottiscliffe. The assessment of this manor was evidently the subject of some dispute. Neither C1 nor R1 uses the standard formula, *et in tempore E regis se defendebat pro .. sull', et nunc . . .*. C1 says only *et defendit se pro iiii*

<sup>58</sup> Not to leave it vague, there are four ways: C1 ← DB → R1, C1 ← DB ← R1, C1 → DB → R1, C1 → DB ← R1.

*sull'*, leaving it doubtful whether this is supposed to be the TRE figure or the current figure (the verb is ambiguous as to tense), or whether we are meant to assume that the figure has stayed the same. (The synopsis counts it as the TRE assessment.) R1 says something different, and says it both unambiguously and emphatically: this manor 'used to defend itself for one sulung, and it still does' (*defendebat se pro i solino, et adhuc facit*). (This is the voice of the bishop of Rochester's spokesman: he sounds somewhat annoyed.) DB's understanding of the facts is different again: 'TRE for three sulungs, now for one sulung' (5va41).

5rb29) Snodland. C1 says that the assessment was and still is 6 sulungs; R1 says that it was and still is 3 sulungs. Both use the standard formula: only the numeral differs.

5rb48) Denton. The TRE assessment is 2 sulungs in C1, 1 sulung in R1 (*pro i solino*).

5rc45) For segment 3, the total reported by C1 is 66.5 sulungs (Table 12). The arithmetic is straightforward – but some of the items would have been disputed in Rochester.

The archbishop's response to the commissioners' questionnaire

Concordance				C4	C1	R1	DB-Ke	
						9	Leaveland	4rb43
						19	East Lenham	4va2
		<b>segment 1</b>		9	28		East Farleigh	4vb31
70rb3	2va3	Stursete	3va44, 4ra10	17	43		East Peckham	4vb9
—	48	mansurae in Fordwich	12rb22	28	4vb9		Meopham	4vb25
26	52	Wingham	3vb35	34	19		Cliffe	4vb42
35	2vb13	Bishopsbourne	3vb10	38	26		Orpington	4rb17, 4vb2
38	19	Petham	3va33		44		Sandling	7ra17
70va4	30	Aldington	4ra3	72va8	4vc1		Farningham	4rb2
14	46	Lyminge	4ra32	13	12		Graveney (Boughton under Blean)	
24	2vc11	Reculver	3va12	17	21		Loose (East Farleigh)	
27	17	Northwood	3va20	20	29		Swarling (Petham)	
35	32	Boughton under Blean	3vb16, 4rb46	23	35		Hunton (East Farleigh)	
70vb5		Leaveland	4rb43	27	43		Burston (Maidstone)	
10	51	Teynham	4va7					
18		East Lenham	4va2				<b>segment 3</b>	
22	3ra10	Charing	3vb23		5ra16		Frindsbury	5vb14
29	23	Pluckley	3vb29		27	209r5	Southfleet	5va2
34	33	Gillingham	3va2		38	11	Stone	5va9
71ra1	46	Maidstone	3rb36		47	15	Fawkham	5va17
9	3rb6	Northfleet	3rb12		53	17	Longfield	5va22
15	17	Bexley	3ra43		5rb6	21	Bromley	5va25
19	25	Crayford	3ra49		14	209v2	Wouldham	5va31
24	35	Brasted	4rb23		19	4	West Malling	5va36
29	44	Otford	3ra26		25	6	Trottisccliffe	5va41
35	3rc2	Sundridge	3ra36		29	8	Snodland	5va46
71rb3	16	Wrotham	3rb20		37	12	Halling	5vb10
11	30	East Malling	3rb36			15	Frindsbury	5vb14
15		Sandling	7ra17		42	20	Cuxton	5vb1
20	39	Darenth	3ra19		48	23	Denton	5vb6
24	48	Eynsford	4rb9		5rc2	210r3	Borstal	5vb19
28	3va3	Ulcombe	4rb30		17	13	Stoke	5vb28
31		Newenden	4ra43					
36		Saltwood	4va17					
71va3		Langport	4va30					
10	10	prebends in Newington	14va22					
12	—	prebend in Dover	1vb11					
		<b>segment 2</b>						
22	3vb3	Northwood	5ra9					
27	15	Eastry	4va10, 5rb8					
71vb2	48	Sandwich	3ra7, 5rb47					
9	3vc12	Monkton	4vb47					
13	20	Adisham	5rb18					
20	41	Ickham	5ra3					
25	52	Seasalter	5ra15					
29	4ra7	Chartham	5ra26					
32	14	Godmersham	5ra32					
36	22	Great Chart	5ra37					
40	29	Little Chart	5ra42					
72ra6	41	Appledore	5rb33					
11	51	Westwell	5rb1					
15	4rb7	Hollingbourne	4vb19					
20	18	Boughton Monchelsea	4rb37					
26	28	Mersham	3vb47					
32	39	almsland	5rb43					
35	45	Warehorne	5rb28					
37	51	Brook	5rb38					
	4rc5	Langport	4va30					
	20	Newenden	4ra43					
72rb1	31	Westenhanger	4va25					
	40	Saltwood	4va17					
5	4va1	Preston	5ra21					