

Chapter 3

Extracts from B-Ke made for Saint Augustine's

The register known as the 'White Book of Saint Augustine's' (National Archives, E 164/27) is a rather untidily written manuscript, measuring roughly 215 × 145 mm, which was approaching its final form in about 1320.¹ After the dissolution, it became one of a haphazard collection of cartularies which passed into the keeping of the exchequer official called the King's Remembrancer. It is known to have been there in the middle of the seventeenth century (above, p. 24).

The manuscript is mostly made up of quires of 12. There is a quire of 4 at the end (fos. 230–3), and there seems once to have been a matching quire of 4 at the beginning, though only the last leaf of it survives (fo. 1, numbered '4' by the hand which added the medieval foliation). Not counting these outermost quires, the manuscript consists of two booklets:

(1) documents relating to the abbey's endowment (fos. 2–192, sixteen quires, lacking one leaf at the end);

(2) annals till 1331 (fos. 194–228, three quires, lacking one leaf at the end).

Several scribes contributed, and their hands are rather hard to distinguish (or at least I find them so). As a first approximation, I suggest that it is possible to recognize the following stints:

2r1-27r9	scribe 1
27r10-48r16	scribe 2
48r16-58r14	scribe 3
58v1-97v21	scribe 4
98r1-103r13	scribe 3
103r13-17	scribe 5
103r17-110v4	scribe 4
110v5-7	scribe 5
110v7-91v11	scribe 4
191v12-2r10	–
194r1-223v10	scribe 3
223v10-7v20	–

As can be seen from this list, the bulk of the manuscript, from 48r onwards, was written by just two men, scribes 3

¹ There are also a 'Red Book' (BL Cotton Claudius D. x) and a 'Black Book' (BL Cotton Faustina A. i). How far these names are authentic I cannot say; I have not found them used in any of the manuscripts that I have seen.

and 4, and most of it was written by the latter.² Both were demonstrably at work in the 1320s. Scribe 3 was responsible for the annals: the last entry in his hand is the one for 1325.³ A different hand, which seems to occur only here, added a few more sentences to the annal for 1325 and continued as far as 1331; there is space for more entries after that, but none were ever supplied. As for scribe 4, the last and latest documents copied by him date from 1323–4; but there are some fairly pronounced changes of appearance in this final stretch of text (185r1, 189r9), and the preceding stretch (as far as 184v) may perhaps be slightly earlier – not earlier, however, than 1316–17. The two scribes were working together; at one point there was some misunderstanding between them and the same stretch of text was copied twice (58v1–8, by scribe 4; 58r15–22, an addition by scribe 3). From the inclusion of a series of form letters,⁴ it seems likely that the manuscript was intended to form a manual for the abbot; and the abbot at the time was Radulf de Burne (1310–1334). The scribes who created it were, I suppose, clerks employed in the abbot's household, not members of the monastic community.

It is clear enough that the manuscript was completed in the 1320s. Nevertheless, the first four quires (fos. 2–49) may perhaps be significantly earlier than that.⁵ There seem to me to be two hands represented here, though the general appearance of the script is similar for both. Neither hand reappears further on; as far as the contents are concerned, there is nothing later than the mid thirteenth century. From the look of the script, I suppose that it might be a generation earlier than that used in the rest of the book; but I would doubt whether it could be earlier than the end of the thirteenth century. Though I do not see how we can hope to arrive at any definite conclusion, I am inclined to think that the first four quires result from some earlier project, begun but left unfinished, which was taken up again and carried

² Only two short passages were contributed by scribe 5, who barely did enough to deserve a number. His writing is conspicuously bad; the sign for *et* is shaped like 2, not as usual like 7 or Z.

³ The change of hand on 223v was noted by Holtzmann (1930, p. 44).

⁴ Though most have been reduced to formulas – the person concerned is *A de B*, the church in question is *talis ecclesia* – there are some which retain a date; the latest of these is dated 5 April 1317 (183v–4r). (As I noted elsewhere (Flight 2000, p. 290), this is a letter of collation to the vicarage of Plumstead.)

⁵ Scribe 2 ends his stint at 48r in the middle of a sentence (*Hoc nimirum intuitu . . .*), a few lines into the text of a papal privilege dating from 1144 (Jaffé 1885–8, no. 8582). Scribe 3 began his first stint by copying the rest of this letter; but it would not have been hard for him to recognize which document this was, even if some length of time had elapsed.

through to completion in the time of abbot Radulf. Perhaps we might think of associating the original project with Radulf's predecessor, Thomas de Findone (1283–1310); but this is just a guess.

Whether the difference in date is significant or not, it will be convenient to make a distinction between the earlier and the later parts of the book. I refer to the initial section (fos. 2r–48r) as A4, to the rest of the book as A5. Since all the documents of any interest to us were copied either by scribe 1 or by scribe 4, in effect the sigla refer respectively to them.

Scribe 1 wrote what is, from our point of view, by far the most important stretch of text. (It fills the first two quires and overlaps into the third.) As a scribe he was competent enough; but he was not writing carefully, and it is often hard to be sure exactly what he meant. His minims are generally ambiguous: no distinction is made (that I can see) between *n* and *u*, or between *m* and *in* and *ui* – unless he remembers to accent the *i*, as he usually does. His *c* is the same as his *t*, and only the slightest hairline differentiates *e* from *c*. In English words the same sign that is used for *y* is used for *th* as well. In short, this scribe made some heavy demands on his readers – perhaps because he was hardly expecting to have any readers, other than himself. (In fairness perhaps it ought also to be said that his writing is easier to read than scribe 2's.)

Since this scribe was certainly at work before 1320, perhaps before 1310, it may be worth noting the fact that he seems to be more comfortable with arabic than roman numerals. Copying ancient documents like these, he understands that roman numerals are appropriate; but every so often, in an absent-minded moment, he writes an arabic numeral. Usually he notices his error at once and corrects it;⁶ occasionally he fails to see it.

The contents of this stretch of text can be summarized as follows.

(i) A list of charters and other documents (2r–8r), ranging in date from the seventh to the late twelfth century. Partly printed by Kelly (1995, pp. 189–94).⁷ The compiler of this list, presumably scribe 1 himself, seems to have been working from an collection of documents which were tied up in bundles of several items each, but otherwise not kept in order.⁸

⁶ In one place, for example, he writes a 3 and then changes it to *t*, so that he can replace the numeral with the word *tres* (19v18).

⁷ Though Kelly does not say so, the numbers that appear in the printed text are her contribution; neither these nor any other numbers appear in the manuscript itself.

⁸ This is the interpretation suggested by Kelly (1995, pp. xlvi–vii); I agree with it. Very briefly, the suggestion goes like this. If these hypothetical bundles had been numbered, and if the top of each bundle had been marked, the ordering of the documents would have been approximately the same as in a lost twelfth-century cartulary, partly reconstructable from two surviving copies (below, p. 218) – the reason being, either that the organization of the cartulary was dictated by that of the archive, or that the archive was reorganized, to make it match up with the cartulary. Because

(ii) A letter of pope Alexander III (8r–v = Jaffé 1885–8, no. 13120); extracts from two letters of pope Urbanus III (8v–9r = no. 15607, 9r = no. 15602).⁹

(iii) A narrative account of the negotiations involved in the settlement of a dispute between the monastery and archbishop Theobald in 1143–4 (9r–11v). This is a very strange piece of work, veering between forgery and fiction; but it drops all pretence at the end.¹⁰

(iv) A survey of the abbey's lands, *Noticia terrarum sancti Augustini in comitatu de Kent in quo lasto et in quo hundredo*, followed by various memoranda relating to its possessions in Milton hundred (11v–14r). The *Noticia* was apparently compiled in the time of abbot Hugo II (1126–51).¹¹ A note added by a fifteenth-century hand tells us that this copy was taken from the 'textus of Saint Adrian', *extrac-tum de textu sancti Adriani* (11v): that was the name which came to be used for the book which the monks considered to be their most important register.

(v) A further sequence of lists and memoranda (14r–17r), running parallel with an earlier manuscript, the one which I call A2 (below, p. 218). The first item to appear in both manuscripts is a list of the abbot's knights, the title of which, in A2 as well as in A4, refers back to article (iv), *Isti sunt milites feofati in suprascripta terra*; so it seems clear enough, not only that both manuscripts were copied from a common exemplar, but also that this was the same exemplar used for the preceding article by A4, i.e. the 'textus of Saint Adrian'.

(vi) *Excepta de compoto solingorum comitatus Cancie secundum cartam regis* (17r–25r). These are the excerpts from B-Ke, printed by Ballard (1920), and printed again below.

(vii) Charters of king Offa (25r–v = Kelly 1995, no. 15) and king Wictred (25v–6r = no. 10). The same two charters, in the same order, in the same shortened form, are also to be

the bundles were not numbered, the compiler of this list put them in a random order; because they were not marked on the top, he put some of them upside down. The upshot is that the ordering of the items is globally very different from the order in the cartulary but locally very close to it; and the correlation may be either positive or negative, depending on whether the compiler was starting from the top or the bottom of this particular bundle.

⁹ These two letters of Urbanus III were subsequently copied in full by scribe 4 (64v, 67v).

¹⁰ There is a better copy in BL Cotton Claudius D. x, fos. 20r–1r, and part of the text – the part which manages to sound vaguely authentic – was printed from that manuscript by Brett and Brooke (1981, pp. 808–10). Two genuine documents are embedded in the narrative: a letter of Henric bishop of Winchester (Franklin 1993, no. 32, where the last sentence is part of the surrounding narrative, mistakenly printed as if it were part of this text) and a letter of pope Lucius II (Jaffé 1885–8, no. 8581). The entire narrative was incorporated into Sprott's chronicle; from there it was copied into Thorne's.

¹¹ Parts of it derive from B-Ke, by way of the excerpts copied separately into A4 (17r–25r); parts of it derive from chapter 7 of DB-Ke, by way of some meagre excerpts copied separately into A5 (143r–4v). Its date is fixed by a sentence near the end which mentions Robert de Ver, in connection with the payment of a mark of silver from Horton (13r): Robert de Ver (occ. 1127–51) was the third husband of Hugo de Montfort's daughter Adelina.

found in the manuscript I call A3 (fos. 105v–6r), in a stretch of text which seems to have been copied from a twelfth-century cartulary, perhaps contained in the ‘textus of Saint Adrian’ (below, p. 218). Apparently this stretch of A4 was copied from the same exemplar as A3.¹²

(viii) *De primatu super Eboracensem quam Cantuariensis ecclesia habere debet* (26r–7r), a copy of version 2 of the primacy agreement of 1072 (Bates 1998, no. 68), shortened towards the end.¹³

For the rest, the book does not contain much of any significance for us. Two stretches of text in A5, both written by scribe 4, are of some incidental interest. One is a sequence of documents (76v–87r) copied, so it seems, from a lost twelfth-century cartulary (the same source which I take to have been used for article (vii) above). The other is a series of excerpts from chapter 7 of DB-Ke (143r–4v).¹⁴

From here onwards I focus on article (vi), the text which carries the title *Excepta de compoto solingorum*,¹⁵ ‘Excerpts from the reckoning of sulungs’. I refer to it as xAug. It is possible (perhaps we may think it probable) that this text was copied from the same exemplar that had been used for articles (iv) and (v), the ‘textus of Saint Adrian’; but there is no way to prove it. A more significant conclusion can be proved – proved beyond doubt, I think. As the following paragraphs set out to show, this is the only surviving copy of the only known set of excerpts from the earliest version of the survey text for Kent.

There is, I take it, no need to argue that the source-text from which these excerpts were taken was some version of the survey text. Despite the abbreviation to which they have been subjected, despite the abbreviation which the corresponding entries in DB-Ke have also undergone, numerous passages can still be found which are manifestly in verbal agreement. This was demonstrated by Ballard (1920); I am not aware that anyone since then has ever thought of doubting it.

If that is agreed, the question becomes: which version of the survey text was it? The answer to that question is easily

¹² It is almost possible that A4 was copied from A3; but there are a few variants which, on that view, would have to be regarded as the result of some rather intelligent emendation on the part of the A4 scribe, and it is hard to think that he was paying that much attention.

¹³ This last article was not of any special interest to Saint Augustine’s; but I think that we are expected to read it from a prejudiced point of view, as proof that a simple-minded archbishop of York had let himself be bamboozled by an unscrupulous archbishop of Canterbury. The following item (28r–32r) – the first to be added by scribe 2 – is a piece of late twelfth-century pseudo-history which expressly sets out to show how a simple-minded abbot of Saint Augustine’s was bamboozled by the same unscrupulous archbishop.

¹⁴ The excerpts used by the compiler of the *Noticia terrarum* (above, note 11).

¹⁵ The first word has often been emended to *Excerpta*, but for that there is no necessity (Flight 2006, p. 123), and therefore no justification.

arrived at, because it can be shown that the source-text was organized cadastrally. That being true, it can only have been the B text.¹⁶

It is not instantly obvious that the source-text for xAug was organized in this way, because, in xAug itself, many of the cadastral headings have gone missing. Nevertheless, with the help of DB-Ke we can supply the omitted headings without much trouble; and as soon as we do that, the conclusion falls out straight away (Table 13).¹⁷ From our point of view, it is a great stroke of luck that the abbey owned some land in every lest. Thanks to that, we can state it to be true, for all seven lests, that the entries belonging to any one lest form a single block. A similar statement is true for the hundreds as well, with one small exception (21r11–12). For any hundred which comprises more than one entry, those entries also form a single block.

This pattern of evidence would prove nothing whatever if the entries were all contained in a single chapter of DB (derived from a single chapter of D, derived from a single C booklet). In that case we would expect them to be cadastrally organized, to the extent that the original order had been preserved, regardless of which version of the survey text they came from. But here again we profit from a stroke of luck, because the man who made these excerpts did not confine himself to the entries which eventually came to be included in DB-Ke’s chapter 7, the chapter describing the abbey’s own possessions. He interested himself in many other entries as well; and therefore we have the evidence which makes the proof complete.

Because these excerpts were made, because this copy survives, we are in a position to demonstrate the existence of B-Ke – to demonstrate, that is, that there did exist a version of the survey text for Kent which was organized cadastrally, lest by lest and hundred by hundred. The actual order is known for every lest, but only for 24 hundreds, not much more than a third of the total number. Even with that limitation, this is an important result.

In Kent, and in many other counties, the traces of a cadastral order inherited from the B text can be recognized in the organization of individual chapters, as they appear in DB. How distinctly these traces can be seen, how far the latent order can be reconstructed, varies from county to county. To put it crudely, the larger the number of chapters and the smaller the number of hundreds, the easier we can hope that it will be to piece together the ordering that existed in the B text.

In Kent the odds are against us: the number of chapters is rather small and the number of hundreds is uncommonly

¹⁶ Here I am applying the rule which I worked out in dealing with the excerpts made for the monks of Ely (Flight 2006, pp. 99–103). But the present case is very much simpler than that one, and the conclusion is much clearer.

¹⁷ There is only one doubtful point – where to mark the beginning of Eastry lest – and it cannot affect the conclusion.

Extracts from B-Ke made for Saint Augustine's

lest	hundred	B / xAug / A4	A4	DB-Ke	ch. 7
Sutton	Littleleigh	East Wickham	17r9–11	6va28	
		Plumstead	17r11–13	12ra3	1
Aylesford	Eyhorne	Leeds	17r13–19	7vb30	
		Lenham	17r20–4	12ra10	2
Milton	Milton	Milton	17r24–v14	2va46	
		Newington	17v14–21	14va3	
Wiwarleth	Faversham	Wilderton	17v24–18r1	12rb30	12
		Badlesmere	18r2–5	10rb11	
	Wye	Dernedale	18r5–7	12rb37	14
		Ashenfield	18r7–9	12rb34	13
	Felborough	Shillingheld	18r9–11	12va1	18
	Chart	Repton	18r11–14	12rb46	17
	Boughton	Selling	18r14–15	12rb39	15
	Calehill	Rooting	18r16–18	12rb43	16
	Longbridge	Kennington	18r18–21	12vb25	28
Borwar	Canterbury	city of Canterbury	18r22–19v6	2ra1	
		Longport	19v6–13	12ra22	4
		half sulung	19v13–15	12rb24	11
		Northgate	19v15–19	5ra9	
		Westgate	19v19–20r6	3va44	
		Nackington	20r6–8	9va6	
		Saint Martin	20r8–13	4ra10	
		32 mansurae	20r13–15	3ra3	
	Bridge	Bridge	20r15–17	12ra17	3
		Bekesbourne	20r17–19	9rb30	
	Downhamford	Wickhambreaux	20r19–v1	9rb43	
		Littlebourne	20v1–3	12ra30	5
		Garrington	20v3–7	12ra36	6
	Chislet	Chislet	20v7–11	12rb6	9
	Sturry	Sturry	20v11–12	12ra41	7
	Fordwich	town of Fordwich	20v13–20	12rb13	10
	Whitstable	Blean	20v21–3	14rb41	
		Swalecliffe	20v23–1r1	10ra1	
	Thanet	Minster	21r1–4	12ra48	8
Eastry	Preston	Elmstone	21r4–10	12vb5	24
	(three rods of land in Eastry hundred)		21r11–12	12vb13	25
		Preston	21r12–16	12va48	23
	Sandwich	town of Sandwich	21r16–v2	3ra7	
	Cornilo	Northbourne	21v2–13	12va5	19
		Little Mongeham	21v13–17	12va27	20
		Great Mongeham	21v22		
		Walmer	21v22		
		Ripple	21v23–2r2	—	
	Bewsborough	Sibertswold	22r3–5	12va38	21
			—	12va43	22
		town of Dover	22r6–v15	1ra4	
		prebends of Saint Martin's	22v15–4r10	1va11	
Limwar	Stowting	Bodsham	24r11–12	12vb17	26
		Elmsted and Horton	24r13–14	12vb20	27
	Blackbourne	?			
	?	Burmarsh	24r15–17	12vb33	29
	(customs of four eastern lests)		24r17–5r11	1rb1	
	(sac and soc in two western lests)		25r12–17	1va1	

Table 13. Extracts from B-Ke made for Saint Augustine's.

large. But here there are lests as well as hundreds, and the lests are few in number. For them at least the order is fairly easy to reconstruct. Though chopped and changed to some considerable extent, especially towards the end, the latent order is SAMBWEL – Sutton, Aylesford, Milton, Borwar, Wiwar, Eastry, Limwar. That is the same as the order in xAug, except for one dislocation: in xAug Borwar comes after Wiwar, but here it tends to come before it. This dislocation is interesting in itself, because it suggests that the B text consisted of some number of separate components which were, for some length of time, at risk of becoming transposed (above, p. 18).

As far as I can see, there is little hope of our reconstructing the order of the hundreds, beyond the partial sequence that is given by xAug. Some individual facts are clear enough and important enough to be worth noting. It seems fairly certain, for instance, that the survey of Wiwar lest began with Faversham hundred – which, after all, is rather what we might expect, Faversham being the only hundred where the king himself owned land, once Wye had been donated to the monks of Battle. Yet even in Wiwar, where xAug gives us a very good start, the indications that we get from DB are so inadequate, and so self-contradictory, that I doubt whether the hundred order can be worked out in full, in a way which would carry conviction.

Some significant features of the organization of the B text show up very clearly in xAug. The descriptions of all the towns that are represented here – Canterbury, Fordwich, Sandwich, Dover – are set into the cadastral frame. By the time that these passages turn up in DB, all but one have been extracted from that frame. The paragraphs relating to Dover and Canterbury (the latter heavily abridged) have come to be included in DB's preliminary section (1ra–b, 2ra); and DB's chapter 2 has a preliminary section of its own (3ra), which consists of one passage relating to Canterbury and the whole of the Sandwich paragraph. Only the Fordwich paragraph (12rb13) has not been moved. Similarly, the description of the prebends of the canons of Saint Martin's is inside the cadastral frame here, but in DB has been taken out of it (1va–b). In fact, there are only two passages in B/xAug which fall outside the frame. In DB the corresponding paragraphs are, again, included in the preliminary section (1rb, 1va); but here they come right at the end, forming a kind of appendix. From their placement in B, and from their content, I think we can conclude, with a fair degree of confidence, that these passages were added to the B text by the second team of commissioners.

How much time elapsed, after the completion of the B text, before these excerpts were taken from it is not easy to say. If xAug consisted of nothing but excerpts from B, its date would be impossible to fix. Whenever the excerpts were made – just after B had been completed, just before it ceased to exist, or somewhere in between – there would be no difference that we could hope to see. It is fortunate, therefore, from this point of view, that the text as we have it includes a number of interpolations, one of which, as Bal-

lard (1920) observed, seems to be approximately datable. The paragraphs relating to Northbourne and Little Mongeham (21v2–17) are followed by an added sentence (21v17–21) recounting the story of a successful law-suit which took place, as we happen to know, in May 1110;¹⁸ and the gist of it is that 'abbot Hugo' had proved his case 'in the court of king Henric'. As far as the dating is concerned, the significance of this sentence lies not so much in what it says as in what it fails to say. Anyone writing after 1154, after the accession of a second king of the same name, would (very probably) have thought it necessary to call this king 'Henric I'.¹⁹ So the interpolation is likely to be earlier than 1154. Anyone writing after 1126, when this abbot was succeeded by a second abbot of the same name, would (probably) have thought it necessary to call him 'Hugo I' – especially so because either Hugo could have fought a case in the court of Henric I, and because the second Hugo would still have been alive (or just recently dead) at the time when this sentence was written. So the interpolation is likely to be earlier than 1126. This argument is thin, to be sure, but I am inclined to trust it. If it is indeed safe to conclude that additions were being made to xAug in the time of abbot Hugo I (1107–26), it will follow that the excerpts themselves are at least as early as that. Essentially this was all said by Ballard (1920, p. xii), and I do not see that there is anything much to add.²⁰

The rest is a matter of judgment. It seems quite likely to me that the excerpts were made at the instigation of abbot Hugo, soon after his arrival in 1107. Before that, for a period of fourteen years, the abbacy had been left vacant – deliberately and scandalously left vacant, so that the abbey's income (minus whatever was thought sufficient for the monks' subsistence) could be diverted into the hands of the king.²¹ We know for a fact that the new abbot was quick to exert himself in recovering control over the abbey's possessions, and xAug might have been needed for that purpose. In order for that to be true, we should have to be willing to think that the B text was still in existence, and still thought important enough to be worth making excerpts from,²² more than twenty years after the completion of the survey. I have no trouble believing that myself; but anyone who finds it incredible is free to imagine an earlier date for xAug. It is possible that the excerpts were made in the time of abbot Wido (1089–93); it is even possible that they

¹⁸ The resulting writ is Johnson and Cronne 1956, no. 944.

¹⁹ Just as Willelm I is called *Willelmus primus* in two other interpolated passages (17v11, 17v24).

²⁰ But it is a point worth noting that extracts from xAug were incorporated into a composite text (above, note 11) which seems to date from the time of abbot Hugo II (1126–51).

²¹ Later vacancies show up in the exchequer rolls. In 1173, after the abbot-elect had been deposed, the king took the abbey into his hands and put it out to farm for 180 pounds a year, pending the election of a new abbot (GREx 1174:1–2, 1175:221, 1176:209). The next time around, the monks were willing to pay huge sums to get custody of the abbey for themselves (GREx 1212:15).

²² Why the excerpts were taken from B, rather than from D or DB, is not a question which I would want to ask. How could we hope to answer it?

were made in the time of abbot Scotland, the abbot in office at the time of the survey (he died in September 1087). Perhaps the reader can discover some way of deciding between these possibilities; for my part, I cannot.

If, from one point of view, we have to be glad that the text has been interpolated, from another point of view we have to regret the fact. Some of the passages inserted in the text are easy enough to recognize. Some are obviously anachronistic: a passage mentioning *rex Willelmus primus*, or *abbas Hugo*, or *rex Henricus* cannot have come from B-Ke. (There is also one sentence (21v7) which cannot have been added until the mid thirteenth century.) Some are so blatantly partisan that they must have been written by somebody at Saint Augustine's. The problem is that there may be other interpolations which are less self-evident than these. We value this text, among other reasons, because it contains much factual information derived from B-Ke which is not to be found in DB; but we have no means of making a sharp distinction between what came from B and what was added later. If we choose to disregard that problem, we take a risk. Though the danger does not seem serious to me, I would not wish to let the reader think that there is no danger at all.

The text is not in good shape. There are numerous mistakes, numerous places where something has obviously gone missing. (Conversely a small unwanted word has crept in here and there.) Some of these errors may have been inherited from the exemplar; but many of them are visibly the fault of the scribe who made this copy. Besides, it had better be repeated that in some respects his writing is hard to read.²³ Slips of the pen occur frequently. Sometimes the scribe stumbles over a word – *canonicus*, for example, trips him up three times (22r8, 22v16, 23v21) – and his attempts at correction tend rather to make things worse. As a general rule, I let the scribe have the benefit of any doubt; and this means, in the last resort, that I print what I think he was intending to write, even if he did not quite succeed in writing it.

Given that the text is so defective,²⁴ I have taken some liberties with it that I would never think of taking with a text that survived in the original, or in an accurate copy. By and large I retain the spelling used in the manuscript. Though I tolerate the *p* in words like *dampnum*, *calumpnia*, I draw the line at some late medieval spellings (such as *yems* for *hiems*) which would look painfully incongruous. All changes involving more than one letter are noted; the rest are too trivial to mention. The punctuation and capital

letters are largely my contribution, and the scribe is not answerable for them. Errors so slight that they hardly affect the sense (such as *in mare* for *in mari*) are left uncorrected; more serious mistakes are treated in one of two ways. If the sense can be restored by changing a few letters, or by adding or omitting one small word, I make the emendation; otherwise I insert an ellipsis. The uncorrected readings are given in the notes at the end, in case anyone should want to look at them.

Those passages which seem to me to be interpolations (many of them were seen in the same light by Ballard) are printed in grey type.²⁵ It is conceivable that some of these interpolations were made by the compiler of xAug himself: I do not mean to say that they are all significantly later than the main text, only that they are (in my opinion) unlikely to have been copied from B-Ke. In the manuscript these passages are not differentiated in any way; but the reader will find it helpful, I hope, to have them discreetly marked off.

Not just here but throughout the book, there is some marginal annotation by later hands; but the additions made alongside xAug are not of any interest (except as proof that this particular text was still being looked at from time to time). Like Ballard, I have made it my policy to print everything that was written by the main scribe, nothing that was not.

²³ To cite just one example, the name which ought to be *Ansfridus* seems to me to be spelt *Aufridus*, like *Gaufridus*; but Ballard preferred to read it as *Anfridus*, and I cannot say with confidence that he was wrong.

²⁴ The second-hand excerpts included in the *Noticia terrarum* (above, note 11) were so much reworked that it would only complicate the issue to cite them here. Of the emendations which I have made, just one – 17r17 *cambiam* – reflects a reading found in the *Noticia*.

²⁵ I have also used grey type for two words (17v5, 19v6) which seem sure to be corrupt, but which I do not see how to emend.

B-Ke/xAug/A4-17r

Excepta de compoto solingorum comitatus Cancie secundum cartam regis, uidelicet ea que ad eccl'iam sc'i Augustini pertinent, et est in regis domesday.

Plumstede quod tenuit Brixi cild, tempore regis Edwardi se defendit pro ii solin' et uno iugo, modo tenet illud abbas de sc'o August' de feodo ep'i baiocensis, 10
 et est apreciatum x lib', sed tamen reddit xii *lib'. Alia pars de Plumstede quam tenuit Serag, tempore regis Edwardi se defendit pro ii solin' et uno iugo, et est appreciatum xii li', sed tamen reddit xiiii li'. Ledes tenuit comes Lifwinus de rege Edwardo, et defendit se pro tribus solin', et modo defendit se pro ii solin'. Et Etheloldus tenebat illud de ep'o baiocensi, sed nunc habet rex Will's illud in manu sua, et est apreciatum xx lib', sed tamen reddit xxv lib'. De isto manerio habet abbas sc'i Augustini dimid' solinum propter *cambiam de parco de Wicham, et reddebat tempore regis Edwardi x sol'. Item de eodem manerio *tenet comes Robertus de Eu iiii dennas siluarum in Suthsexa, que *appreciate sunt xx sol'.
 Lenham manerium est de cibo monachorum sc'i Augustini, tempore regis Edwardi se defendit pro v solin' et dimid', et est apreciatum xxviii li'. Et in supradicto manerio . . . quod uocatur Bromfeld. Ibi habet adhuc sc's Augustinus dimidium iugum terre quod iacet ad istud manerium, et est apreciatum v sol'. Middeltune manerium

B-Ke/xAug/A4-17v

est de dominio regis, et defendit se tempore regis Edwardi pro quater viginti solin', et est apreciatum illo tempore cc li', et quando Hamo dapifer illud recepit, tunc se defendebat pro lxxii solin' unum iugum minus, et est apreciatum cc li' xx li' minus. Ex hiis quater uiginti solinis tenet Hugo de Port viii sol' et unum iugum de ep'o baiocensi, qui omnes consuetudines reddebant in isto manerio, hec *ergo tenuit Edwardus. Et adhuc ex lxxii solin' supradictis unum iugum minus dantur xi libre et x sol' in Newentone de gablo, et xxviii pense caseorum, et de istis predictis lxxii solin' unum iugum minus sunt ix solini qui reddunt in Newentone socam et saccam et gablum et omnes consuetudines extra *aueriam.
 Ex hiis solin' habet sc's Augustinus partem suam que fuit diracionata in hundredo de Middeltone et in comitatu Kancie tempore regis Will'i primi. 10
 Tamen Hamo qui nunc tenet Middelton regi sepcies uiginti libras cum incensione *et pensa et xv lib' et vi s' *ii d' minus reddit cum numero, et xii lib' quas uicecomes habet ad suum opus. Newentune manerium tenuit Suidgar de regina Eaditha, tempore regis Edwardi se defendit pro vii solin' et dim', et modo tenet illud Albertus, et est apreciatum xxxvii lib'.
 Et hoc quod archiep's habet est apreciatum vi li', et quod ep's baiocensis habet ualet lx solid', et Godefridus habet unum iugum terre de ep'o baiocensi et ualet x solid', et Adam filius Huberti habet tantum silue *quod ualet xl den'.
 Et due mansiones sunt in Roucestre quas ep's baiocens' tenuit, que reddunt huic manerio duos solid'. De isto manerio diracionauit sc's Augustinus et abbas Scotlandus viii prebendas et eccl'iam cum omnibus terris et consuetudinibus ad illas pertinentibus tempore regis Will'i primi. Wilrintun manerium est de cibo monachorum sc'i Aug', 20

B-Ke/xAug/A4-18r

tempore regis Edwardi defendit se pro uno solino, et est apreciatum iiii li'. Badlesmere manerium tenuit Godrich wisce de rege Edwardo, et defendit se pro uno solino, et modo tenet illud Aufridus de ep'o *baiocensi, et est apreciatum iiii libras. Hoc idem manerium reclamant monachi sc'i Augustini per cartam et sigillum regis Edwardi. *Dernedale manerium sc'i Augustini 5

tempore regis Edwardi *defendit se pro dim' solin', et modo tenet illud Adam de abb'e ad gablum, et ualet xx sol'. *Echemersfelde manerium sc'i Augustini tempore regis Edwardi defendit se pro uno solino, modo tenet illud Ascetillus marescallus de abb'e, et ualet xl solid'. Schellingehelde *manerium sc'i Augustini tempore regis Edwardi se defendit pro dimid' solin', et modo tenet illud Auufredus masculus clericus de abb'e, et ualet xxx sol'. Rapetune manerium sc'i Augustini tempore regis Edwardi se defendit pro uno solino, et modo tenet illud Ansierus de abb'e, et abbas dedit sibi adhuc tres uillanos cum ii iug' terre, et est apreciatum iiii li' et v s'. Sellinge manerium sc'i Augustini tempore regis Edwardi se defendebat pro vii solin', et ualet xv li'. Rotinge manerium sc'i Augustini tempore regis Edwardi se defendebat pro dimidio iug', et modo tenet illud quidam uillanus de abb'e, et est apreciatum xl solid'. Keningtune ... sc'i Augustini tempore regis Edwardi se defendebat pro iiii solin', et cum hiis solin' habet adhuc sc's Augustinus unum iugum in dominio quod nunquam scotauit, et est apreciatum inter totum x li', sed tamen habet abbas quinquaginta solid' plus. Hic incipit Burewarelest. *De ciuitate Canterburia ... rex Edwardus in d'nio li burgens' qui reddebant iii lib' et xvii solid' et v d' de gablo. Et in eadem ciuitate fuerunt cc et xii homines

B-Ke/xAug/A4-18v

de quibus rex *habebat sacam et socam, et tria molendina que reddebant regi xlii s' de gablo, et viii agri prati unde pascebantur equi regis, euntes et redeuntes, et mille ag' minute silue unde homines patrie et burgenses ciuitatis reddebant preposito regis xx solid', et teloneus panis reddebat xx solid'. Et si extranei mercatores ueniebant in ciuitate et accipiebant hospicium in terra sc'e trinitatis uel sc'i Augustini, tunc habebant ... sui prepositi. Sed fuit *quidam prepositus nomine Brimannus qui per totam terram ciuitatis accepit omnes consuetudines et teloneum iniuste, de quo fecerunt monachi clamorem regi Will'o, qui precepit ut inde fuisset ... ante ep'm baiocens' et ante Hugonem de Mundfort et comitem Ow et Ricardum filium *Gisleberti, qui eum iurare fecerunt ut de hac re uerum diceret, quibus post iusiurandum dixit quod *uero toloneum habebat acceptum per totam ciuitatem, sed iniuste de terra sc'e trinitatis uel sc'i Augustini. De molendinis uero que sunt infra muros ciuitatis, si ex utrisque partibus aque ambe ripe sunt unius senioris, tunc exclusam et molendinum potest mutare quo ... uoluerit, ita tamen ut alterius ... molendino non noceat, et de rota molendini in spacio duarum *perticarum potest deliberare *uiam in antea uel retro propter emendacionem molendini, et ut dictum est alterius senioris molendino non noceat. Et si ex una parte aque est ripa unius senioris, et alterius ex altera, tunc non potest ... ulla *edificacio uel mutacio exclude sine licencia illius cuius est altera pars ripe, et ex spacio duarum *perticarum in antea est aqua in dominio regis. Et si panis aut *ceruisia esset facta alio modo quam constitutum est in antiquo tempore, uolebant inde *monachi habere forisfacturam, sed Brimannus supradictus prepositus accepit hanc forisfacturam sicut *tho-

B-Ke/xAug/A4-19r

loneum. Et omnes *uie ciuitatis que habent duas portas, hoc est introitum et exitum, ille sunt de consuetudine regis. Et si aliquis facit forisfacturam aliquam ... unam leucam et in spacio trium perticarum et trium pedum, illam habebunt prepositi regis de ciuitate. Et si aliquis in hoc supradicto spacio fossam fecerit uel sudem miserit uel callem regis *cinxerit sine licencia prepositi regis, quocumque ierit ille qui hoc fecerit secuturus erit, donec rex habeat

inde forisfacturam suam. Regina E et Alnoth cild et *Osbern bigga et Sired de Chileham, isti habuerunt in ciuitate consuetudines suas de suis hominibus. Tholoneus panis reddebat lx s'. Et quando Haimo recepit ministerium huius ciuitatis erant omnes consuetudines regis sicut prius, sed modo sunt xxxii burgenses minus propter escambium castelli, qui reddebant regi xl s' et ii d'. Ex hiis habet modo archiep's vii, et abbas sc'i August' xiiii, et xi sunt perditii infra fossatum castelli. Et adhuc sunt cc et xii liberi homines de quibus habet rex sacam et socam. Sutores et drapararii reddunt xxx s' et portarius v s'. Molendinum lxxv s'. Tholoneus panis reddit viii sol' plus solito. Et de minutis debitis x s'. In tempore regis Edwardi est appreciatum ministerium li li', et quando Haimo recepit similiter, sed tamen qui nunc tenet reddit xxx li' cum incensione et pensa. Extra portam ciuitatis in *calle regis erant due domus, una foris et alia intus, de quibus monachi sc'e trinitatis unam destruxerunt et aliam prohibuerunt ne *fuisset facta, que reddebant regi xvi d' de gablo. Et in alio loco tantum terre que reddebat iii d'. Item demonstrant burgenses *ciuitatis xlv mansiones terre unde habebant liii s' de gablo tempore regis Edwardi, et ipse rex habebat *inde sacam et socam. Hec omnia nunc *tenent Ranulfus de Columbeles et Vitalis de Cantebire de *feodo ep'i baiocensis,

B-Ke / xAug / A4-19v

sed illi non cognoscunt nisi de xxvi. Adhuc tenet idem Ranulfus v agros terre cum una eccl'ia que pertinent ad monasterium sc'i Augustini. Item dicunt burgenses quod idem Ranulfus tenet quater uiginti agros de alodiis eorum, et ipse dicit se eos tenere de ep'o baioc'. Adhuc idem Ranulfus tenet xxxiiii agros terre quos burgenses semper habuerunt in gilda eorum de donis *omnium regum. Langeport manerium sc'i August' est i solin' in d'nio, et iacet in hundredo de Cantebir', et semper fuit et est quietum, ibique fuerunt burgenses lxx qui reddebant de gablo iiiii li' et x s'. Et uillani et bordarii qui manent extra ciuitatem reddunt vii li' et x s' et viii d' de gablo et unum sextarium mellis. Et quatuor molendini qui reddunt xxix sol' et iiiii d'. Et in alio hundredo est unum iugum terre quod subiacet huic solino et ualet iiiii sol'. Hoc manerium totum appreciatum est xxxv li'. Adhuc habet sc's Augustin' extra ciuitatem in dominio dimidium solin' et iiiii agros terre, et est de elemosina monachorum, et est appreciatum iiiii lib' et ii s' et unum sextar' farine. In hundredo de Cantebiria habet archiep's unum manerium Norgate, et est de cibo monachorum sc'e trinitatis, tempore regis Edwardi se defendit pro uno solino, cui nunc subiacent c burgenses *tres minus qui reddunt ix lib' et vi d' de gablo, et est appreciatum xvii li'. Item habet archiep's unum *manerium in dominio nomine Stursete, tempore regis Edwardi se defendit pro vii solin', et sunt ibi xxv burgenses qui reddunt x sol' de gablo, et est appreciatum dominium archiep'i xl li'. Ex hiis vii sol' habet Godefridus dapifer unum solinum de archiep'o et est appreciatum

B-Ke / xAug / A4-20r

c solid', similiter et Vitalis tenet unum iugum terre et est appreciatum *xxx s', sed et Hamo tenet dimidium solinum liberaliter ... et est apreciatum xxx sol'. Alboldus uero tenet inde unum iugum terre et est appreciatum xxx s'. *(
) Adhuc eciam tenet Elwardus liberaliter tria iuga terre in Natindune que dant altari sc'e trinitatis xii sol' et sunt apreciata xl sol'. Natingdune tenet Hamo dapifer de ep'o baiocensi, tempore regis Edwardi se defendit pro dimidio solino, et est appreciatum iii li'. ... Hoc dimidium solinum clamant burgenses ciuitatis sicut aliam supradictam terram. Ad

Sc'm Martinum habet archiep's in d'nio unum solinum et iacet in viii sol' de Stursete et ualet d'nium vii li'. De isto solino habet Radulfus camerarius medietatem in *feodo de archiep'o et ualet iiii li'. Infra muros ciuitatis sunt . . . burgenses qui reddunt huic manerio viii solid' et iii den' de gablo. Adhuc sunt xxxii mansure et unum molendinum que tenent clerici ciuitatis ad gildam, ibique manent xii burgenses qui reddunt eis xxxv sol', et molendinum reddit v sol'. In hundredo de Brugges Burn' manerium sc'i Augustini tempore regis Edwardi se defendit pro uno solino, et est appreciatum c sol'. Aliud manerium Burnes tenuit *Liuinges de rege Edwardo et defendit se pro ii solin', et modo tenet illud *baiocens' ep's in dominio, et est appreciatum xii li', sed reddit xviii li'. Wicham manerium tenuit Elured bigge de rege Edwardo, et defendit se *pro iiii sol', et modo tenet illud ep's baiocens' in d'nio, et est appreciatum xxx li'. Huic manerio subiacet dimidium . . . quod est liberum, et tenuit illud Siredus de Eluredo bigge, et modo tenet illud Godefridus filius Rogeri mala terra

B-Ke/xAug/A4-20v

de ep'o baiocensi. Littelbourne manerium est de d'nico allodio sc'i August', et pro septem solin' se defendit, et est appreciatum xxxii li'. De isto manerio habet ep's baiocens' in suo parco tantum quod est *appreciatum iii li'. Et pro hac terra dedit idem ep's aliam terram nomine Garwynton' sc'o August' et fratribus propter escambium terre parci sui, et modo tenet eam Randulfus de Sc'o Wandrigesilo de abb'e, et defendit *se pro dimid' solin' et pro xlii agris terre, et est appreciatum iiii li'. In hundredo *de Blengate Chistelet manerium sc'i August' tempore regis Edwardi se defendit pro xii solin', de hiis solin' sunt sex ad Margate, et est . . . illud manerium inter totum *lxxviii li'. De isto manerio *habent iiii milites tantum quod est appreciatum xii li', et adhuc sunt in isto manerio tres arpenne uinee sine precio. Stureye manerium sc'i August' se defendit pro v solin' quietis, et est appreciatum lvi li'. Ad Fordwik habet sc's Augustinus unum paruun burgum qui tempore regis Edwardi se defendebat pro uno iugo, et ipse rex Edwardus dedit sc'o August' duas partes huius burgi, et terciam partem dedit postea ep's baioc' qui erat comes Kancie ex concessione regis Will'i. Adhuc *subiacent huic burgo xxxiii agri terre, et erant in isto burgo tempore regis Edwardi c mansure terre iiii minus, et modo sunt lxxiii, et est appreciatum inter totum xi li'. Ibiq'ue habet archiep's vii mansuras terre que in mari debent seruire cum aliis burgensibus, sed archiep's modo eis aufert inde seruicium. In hundredo *de witstaple Blean tenuit Normannus de rege Edwardo, et defendit se pro uno solino, et modo tenet illud Hamo de rege Will'o, et est appreciatum vi *li'. Swalcliue tenuit Edwardus snoch de rege Edwardo, et defendit se pro dimid' solin', et modo tenet illud

B-Ke/xAug/A4-21r

Vitalis de ep'o baioc', et est appreciatum xxx s'. In hundredo de Thanet Thanet terra sc'e Mildrethe est manerium sc'i August', regis Edwardi tempore se defendit pro xlvi solin', et est appreciatum c li'. De isto manerio habent tres milites tantum quod est appreciatum ix li'. Elfgethetun manerium dedit Godehose sc'o Augustino et reddebat inde per annum xxv d' super altare sc'i August', tempore regis Edwardi defendit se pro dimid' solino et uno iugo et xx agris terre, modo tenet illud Aufridus masculus clericus de abb'e. Item tenet idem Aufridus dimidium solin' in eodem manerio et reddit sc'o August' per annum c d', et ualet inter totum lx s'.

In hundredo de Estrie habet sc's August' tria iuga terre, et ualent xx sol'. Prestune manerium sc'i Aug' est in se ipso *hundred, et pertinet ad cameram monachorum sc'i Augustini, tempore regis Edwardi se defendit pro v solinis. Ex hiis solin' habet Vitalis unum solinum et dimid' iugum in *feodo de abb'e, et est appreciatum d'nium abb'is xiiii li' et hoc quod tenet Vitalis c sol'. Sandwich burgum sc'e trinitatis est de uestura monachorum, et est hundred in se ipso, et reddit regi seruicium in mare sicut illi de Doura, et homines illius uille, antequam eis rex dedisset suas consuetudines, reddebant xv li'. Et quando archiep's recuperauit, reddebant xl li' et xl mil' de allecibus, . . . modo uero debent reddere lxx li' et alleces sicut *prius. Tempore regis Edwardi erant ibi ccc et vii mansure, modo sunt lxxvi plus. In isto burgo habet sc's August' unum agrum, et ibi sunt xxx mansure que reddunt monachis iiii mil' de allecibus uel x s',

B-Ke/xAug/A4-21v

et regi faciunt seruicium in mare *sicut alii. In isto agro habet eciam sc's August' unam eccl'iam. In hundredo de Cornilo Norbourne manerium sc'i Augustini tempore regis Edwardi defendit se pro xxx solinis. De hiis solinis habet Odelardus dapifer unum solinum, Gilbertus habet ii solin' xxv agros minus, Wadardus tres solinos lx agros minus, Marcherus . . . Letardi dimid' solin', Ranulfus . . . de Walbadun unum iugum et reddit unum denar'. Hec est terra quam tenet Simon de Holte. Item Odelardus unum solinum de Bawesfeld, Odelinus unum solinum. Et est apreciatum dominium quater uiginti libras, et hoc quod Odelardus habet inde c solid', et quod Gilbertus vi li', et quod Wadardus ix li', et quod Marcherus viii s', et quod Osbernus xxv solid', et quod Acardus xx s', et quod Ranulfus de Columbeles iiii s' et ii d', et quod alius Ranulfus l d', et quod Odelinus iiii li'. Moningham manerium sc'i Augustini tempore regis Edwardi se defendit pro ii solin' et *dimidio, de isto manerio tenuit Wadardus totam terram uillanorum que *semper fuit et esse debet de propria firma monachorum, et modo est appreciatum hoc quod monachi habent xvi li', et quod Wadardus tenuit x li'. Totam istam terram et illam de Northbourn' diracionauit abbas Hugo in curia regis Henr' cum *concessu eiusdem regis, presentibus multis optimatibus, ep'is, abbatibus, comitibus, uicecomitibus, aliisque quamplurimis, eamque cum sigillo regio confirmatam sc'o Augustino hereditario iure restituit. Estmoningham. Walemere. Ripple manerium tenuit Wlmerus de abb'e sc'i August' tempore regis Edwardi, et defendit se pro uno solino et dimid', et modo tenet

B-Ke/xAug/A4-22r

illud Aufridus masculus clericus de abb'e Scotlando, et reddit per annum sc'o Augustino c d' et sc'o Martino c d', et est appreciatum totum manerium *viii li'. Hundredum de Cornilo est de Estrileast. In hundredo de Beauuesberga Siberdeswelde manerium sc'i August' est de uestitu monachorum, tempore regis Edwardi se defendit pro ii solin', et est appreciatum viii li'. Estrielest. Doura est burgum regis, tempore regis Edwardi reddebat prepositus de Doura xviii li', ex quibus rex habebat xii li' et comes Godwynus vi li', et contra hoc habebant *canonici de sc'o Martino aliam medietatem. Et quando rex dedit burgensibus illorum sacram et socam, tunc burgenses econtra dederunt regi xx naues *semel in anno per xv dies ad custodiendum mare. Et in unaquaque nauis xxi homo. Et quando legati regis ueniebant illuc, dabant tres d' in *hieme pro equo *transfretando, et in estate

dabant ii d'. Et burgenses inueniebant eis stirmannum et unum
 alium hominem, si uero plus necesse fuisset de pecunia eorum *conducebatur.
 Et a festiuitate sc'i Michaelis usque ad festiuitatem sc'i Andree *erat 15
 triwa regis in illa uilla. Si uero aliquis in hoc termino fecisset aliquam
 forfacturam, . . . uicecomitis communiter accipiebant illam. Et omnes
 burgenses qui ibi manebant non dabant tholoneum in tota Anglia.
 Et hii sunt qui tenent mansuras terre in Doura ex quibus rex
 habet suas consuetudines perditas. Robertus de Romenal habet duas man- 20
 suras, Radulfus de Curbaspina iii, Will's filius Theoldi et
 *Robertus niger vi, . . . Will's filius Ogeri . . . Hugo de Mundfort i,
 Durandus i, Rog' de Oistresham i, Wadardus vii, Gosfridus

B-Ke / xAug / A4-22v

filius Modberti i, Hunfridus loripes i de qua medietas est forfacta
 regi. Will's filius Gauufridi habet unam gidhallam quam burgenses
 habent perditam, hec erat elemosina regis et ibi sunt tres domus. Item
 Rog' de Oistresham habet unam domum factam in aqua et in terra regis sine
 licencia alicuius hominis, unde iste habet gablum et rex nichil. Omnes isti 5
 reuocant ep'm baioc' ad guarant et datorem. Ranulfus de Columbeles
 habet xv agros terre de quodam uthlago, de qua rex habet dimidium
 gablum et medietatem terre, sicut omnes dicunt. Sed et Herbertus filius
 *Iuonis fecit unum molendinum in introitu portus, ubi confringuntur na-
 ues omnes per conturbacionem fluctuum maris. Et Hugo *nepos 10
 Herberti dicit quod ep's baioc' hoc concessit *fieri auunculo suo, sed econtra dicunt
 burgenses hoc esse regi dampnum et suis. Nunc autem apreciata
 est firma huius burgi xl li'. Sed tamen qui tenet reddit liiii li',
 uiginti et quatuor libre dantur regi de xx d' in ora, cum incen-
 sione et pensa, et xxx libre dantur ep'o baioc' cum numero. De preben- 15
 dis *canonicorum sc'i Martini de Doura. In least de Estrie sunt
 duo hundreda, scilicet Beauuesberga et Cornila, in quibus iacent xxi
 solin', et in lasto de Limwarlest iacent iii solini, unus ex hiis ia-
 cet in hundredo de Strete, et alius in hundredo de Brichholt,
 et tercius in hundredo de Blakebourne. Tempore regis E erant 20
 omnes prebende communes et ualebant lxi li', et quando ep's baiocens'
 uenit, diuisit eas inter canonicos eccl'ie ut sibi placuit. Ra-
 dulfus de Sc'o Samsone habet in Cherletune unum solinum terre

B-Ke / xAug / A4-23r

de prebenda sc'i Martini, istam tenuit Lifwynus tempore regis Edwardi
 et ualebat c sol', et est de hundredo de Beauuesberga, et ualet modo iii
 li' et x sol'. Item in eadem Cerletune habet Will's filius Ogerii unum
 solinum de prebenda quam Siredus tenuit tempore regis Edwardi, et
 ualebat tunc xii li' et modo vi *li'. Adhuc habet ipse Will's extra prebendam 5
 unam eccl'iam in burgo de Doura que reddit xii s', sed canonici
 *calumpniantur eam. In hundredo de Beauuesberge habet *Alfwinus
 in Bokelande unum solinum de prebenda quam ipsemet tenuit tempore regis E,
 et ualebat tunc c s' et modo iiii li'. In eodem hundredo habet Wlricus
 in Gusistune unum iugum terre de prebenda quam tenuit Alricus tempore 10
 regis E, adhuc habet xxv agros terre qui iacent in hundredo de
 Cornilo, et ualet inter totum xx s'. Siredus de Sc'a Margareta
 tenet in hundredo de Beausberge unum solinum de prebenda quam
 pater suus tenuit tempore regis E, et ualet c s'. In hundredo de Beau-
 uesberge habet Radulfus canonicus unum solinum ad Sc'am Mar- 15

garetam de prebenda quam tenuit Aluricus de rege E, et ualebat tunc
iiii li' et modo iii li' et x s' et ii d'. In hundredo de Beauuesberge
tenet Alericus de prebenda unum solinum terre apud Sc'am Mar-
garetam, et ualet lx s'. In eodem hundredo habet Robertus niger
apud Sc'am Margaretam unum solinum terre de prebenda quam
Smet capellanus tenuit de rege E, et ualet lx s'. Item in eodem
hundredo habet Walt's de Cambremer ad Sc'am Margare-
tam unum solinum terre de prebenda quam tenuit Swytgar de

B-Ke/xAug/A4-23v

rege E, et ualebat tunc iii li' et x sol', et modo ualet lx s'. In hundredo de
Beauuesberge et Cornila habet Rob' trublet unum solinum de prebenda quam te-
nuerunt duo homines Suithgar et Goldstan tempore regis E, et ualet lx s'.
In hundredo de Beauuesberge tenet Edwynus canonicus dimid' solinum
et xxv agros ad Sc'am Margaretam et quater uiginti agros in hundredo
de Cornila de prebenda quam ipsemet tenuit tempore regis E, et ualebat tunc xii
li' et modo lx s'. De prebenda istius accepit ep's baioc' viii agros terre et de-
dit Alano, qui et ipse dedit Vlrico. In hundredo de Beauuesberge habet
Will's pictauiensis dimid' solinum et xii agros et dimid' ad Siberdeswelde
et in hundredo de Cornila dimid' solinum et xi agros et dimid', et ualebat
tempore regis E iiii li' et modo lx s'. In hundredo de Cornila habet archiep's
cant' unum solinum terre de prebenda sc'i Martini, et ualet vi li' *et x s'.
In eodem hundredo iacent l agri terre quos ep's baioc' dedit Ascetillo
archidiacono cant', et ualent xx s'. Item in hundredo de Beauuesberge
dedit ep's baiocensis Ascetillo archidiacono l agros terre, et ualent
xxx s'. In hundredo de Cornila tenet Athelolldus iii iuga terre
ad Dale de prebenda quam ipse habuit tempore regis E, et ualent iii li'. In hun-
dredo de *Beauuesberge et Cornila habet sc's Augustinus unum solinum terre *de
prebenda ad Dale et Guthistun, tempore regis E *ualebat xl s' et modo xxx s'. In hun-
dredo de Cornila habet Will's filius Theoldi dimid' solinum et dimid' iugum
ad Dale de prebenda quam tenuit Diryngus *canonicus tempore regis Edwardi,
et ualet lx s'. In hundredo de Beauuesberge habet Nigellus unum iugum
terre ad Sc'am Margaretam ... tempore regis Edwardi et ualebat *tunc *xxv s' et modo

B-Ke/xAug/A4-24r

xx *s'. In hundredo de Beauuesberge habet Sigar unum iugum et dimidium
ad Siberdeswelde de prebenda ... tempore regis E, et ualebat *tunc xxx s' et modo xxv s'.
In eodem hundredo habet Will's Godefridi filius unum solinum terre ad *()
Feruengela de prebenda quam tenuit Siredus tempore regis Edwardi, et ualebat
tunc vi li' et modo iiii li'. Item in eodem hundredo habet Baldewynus unum so-
linum terre ad Hucham de prebenda quam frater eius tenuit tempore regis Edwardi,
et ualebat tunc c solid' et modo iiii li'. In hundredo de Beauuesberge habet
Godricus latimarius unum solinum terre in Bokelande de prebenda quam Wl-
wynus siluagijs presbiter tenuit tempore regis E, et ualebat tunc viii li' et modo
vi li'. Finis de prebendis sc'i Martini de Doura.
In hundredo de Stutingen tenet Godefridus de abb'e sc'i Aug' unum ma-
nerium *Bodesham, et defendit se tempore regis E pro i solino, et ualet iiii li'.
In eodem hundredo habet sc's August' unum manerium Elmestede et Hortune,
et defendit se tempore regis E pro ii solinis et uno iugo, et *ualet viii li'.
In hundredo de Blakebourne ... habet sc's Augustinus unum manerium Bure-
waremarais, tempore regis E se defendit pro ii solin' et iii iug' terre, et ualet
xxx li'. In hoc concordant homines de quatuor lestis, scilicet de Bureware-
least et de Estrieleast et de Wiwarelest et de Limwarelest. Si aliquis homo

fecerit sepem uel fossatum unde stringatur callis regis, uel foueam
in illo calle fecerit, uel palum fixerit, aut arborem stantem infra callem inciderit, 20
uel si arborem stantem extra callem cedendo intra ceciderit et postea ramum uel fron-
dem aut ipsam arborem sine licencia portauerit, pro unaquaque harum *forfactorum
soluet regi c solid', et licet abierit inde domum non calumpniatus nec

B-Ke / xAug / A4-24v

diuadiatus, tamen sequetur illum prepositus regis ubicumque fuerit, et regi c
s' emendabit. De grithbreche uero, si quis eam fecerit et calump-
niatus aut diuadiatus in calle *fuerit, viii li' regi emendabit.
Sin autem, quietus erit erga regem, non erga dominum cuius homo fuerit. Item con-
cordant hoc, quod rex habet has supradictas forfacturas super omnes allo- 5
darios tocius *comitatus de Kent et super ipsorum homines, excepta terra
sc'e trinitatis et sc'i Augustini et sc'i Martini, et excepta terra Godri-
ci de Burnes et Godrici Karlessune et Alnothchild et Osbern bigge
et Sired de Chileham et Turgis et Norman et Atsur, super eos habet rex
tantummodo forfacturam de capitibus eorum. Et quando moritur allodarius, rex 10
habet releuamen de terris suis qui *habebant suam sacam et socam.
Et de aliis terris, scilicet Oslaces . . . Bocland et tercium Bocland, Herst, unum
iugum de Ore et unum iugum Hertei, Scheldrisham, *Machehauue,
Ernulwyntun, Oslacintun, Piria, altera Piria, Thruliga, Osp-
ringes, Hortune, de hiis terris habet rex has forfacturas, ham- 15
socne, grithbriche, forestal. Et de adulterio tantummodo hominem per totum
Kent et archiep's mulierem, excepta *terra sc'e trinitatis et sc'i Augustini
et sc'i Martini, de quibus rex nichil habet. Et de latrone qui iudicatur
ad mortem habet rex medietatem peccunie sue. Et de huthlago qui
uthlagatus fuerit, qui postea illum recipit sine licencia, rex habet inde for- 20
facturam. Et de terris *supranominatis, scilicet Alnothchild, Sired de Chile-
ham, Godrich de Burnes eorumque similia, habet rex . . . diebus custo-

B-Ke / xAug / A4-25r

diam apud Canterb' et apud Sandwich si ibi fuerit cum corredio suo.
Et si non *habuerint regis corredium, sine forfactura recedent. Et si submo-
niti fuerint ad schiram, *ibunt usque Pinnendone . . . longius, et si non
uenerint, rex habebit de istis *forfactoris c s', excepta grithbreche que viii
lib' emendatur, et de callibus sicut superius. Item in Limwarelest in 5
Brissegueia habet rex hanc consuetudinem, scilicet duas carectas et duas
sticcas anguillarum pro uno inwardo. Et in terra Sophis habet xii d'
pro uno inwardo, et de uno iugo in Northbroche xii d' aut unum *in-
wardum, . . . hee terre iacent in Wy, et hee terre custodiebant re-
gem apud Canterbiriam uel apud Sandwich per tres dies si rex illuc ue- 10
nisset, et si aliquis inde forfecisset de custodia, regi emendasset per c s'.
In leasto de Suttune et in least de Agelesford habuerunt isti sacam
et socam, Brixichild, *Athellod de Helteham, . . . Athsur de Liesenes,
Alfwyn horn, Wrnold lewite, Ordunge de Hortune, Osbern de
Chilesfeld, Leuenoth de Suttune, Edward de Terstane, Wlstan 15
et Lieuric *de Otringebire, Oswald de Northtune, Edgeth de Eselholte,
Elred de Eldynge.

Notes

17r11 lib'] *missing* 17r17 cambiam] camiam 17r18 tenet comes Robertus] tenescome Roberto 17r19 appreciate] appreciata 17v5 ergo] *seems corrupt* 17v9 aueriam] auiam 17v13 et pensa] expensa 17v13 ii] et ii 17v19 quod] que 18r3 baiocensi] baiocense 18r5 Dervedale] *with l altered from n* 18r5 defendit] et defendit 18r7 Echemersfelde] Echemesrsfelde 18r9 manerium] est manerium 18r22 De] *with D written large* 18v1 habebat] habelat 18v6 quidam] quidem 18v10 Gisleberti] Giseiberti 18v11 uero] uerum 18v16 perticarum] particularum 18v17 uiam in antea] vi animantes 18v20 edificacio] edificio 18v21 perticarum] particularum 18v22 ceruisia] seruicia 18v23 monachi habere] mo'ihre 18v24 tholoneum] ptholoneum 19r1 uie] *with e inserted* 19r5 cinxerit] cinxerit 19r7 Osbern] Osbernn *with the first n dotted out* 19r18 calle] calde 19r20 fuisset] fusset 19r22 ciuitatis] cuitatis 19r23 inde] in 19r24 tenent] tenet 19r24 feodo] feudo 19v6 omnium] *seems corrupt* 19v18 tres] *with t written over a 3* 19v19 manerium] manium 20r1 xxx] 30 xxx *with 30 dotted out* 20r3–4] Sed et hamo tenet / dimidium solinum *dotted out* 20r11 feodo] feudo 20r17 Liuinges] Liinges 20r18 baiocens'] baiocenc' 20r20 pro iiii sol'] per 4 sol' 20v3 appreciatum] *blundered* 20v6 se] *missing* 20v7 de] de de 20v9 lxxviii] *with l inserted* 20v10 habent] habet 20v16 subiacent] subiacet 20v21 de witstaple] dwitstaple 20v23 li'] *missing* 21r12 hundred] hundredo 21r15 feodo] feudo 21r21 prius] *blundered* 21v1 sicut] si 21v14 dimidio] dimidii 21v15 semper fuit] superfuit 21v18 concessu] concensu 22r2 viii] 8 22r8 canonici] *blundered* 22r10 semel] simul 22r12 hieme] yeme 22r12 transfretando] tranfretando 22r14 conducebatur] conducebantur 22r15 erat] erit 22r22 Robertus] Roberter 22v9 luonis] luonis 22v10 nepos] nopos 22v11 fieri] *missing* 22v16 canonicorum] *blundered* 23r5 li'] *missing* 23r7 calumpniantur] calumpniant 23r7 Alfwinus] Asfwinus 23v12 et] *missing* 23v18 Beauuesberge] Beauuesberige 23v18 de] *missing* 23v19 ualebat] ualet 23v21 canonicus] *blundered* 23v23 tunc] *missing* 23v23 xxv] *with v inserted* 24r1 s'] *missing* 24r2 tunc] *missing* 24r3] Feuer *cancelled* 24r12 Bodesham] de Bodesham 24r14 ualet] ualent 24r22 forfacturarum] forfactura 24v3 fuerit] fecerit 24v6 comitatus] coiuitatis *with o inserted* 24v11 habebant] habebat 24v17 terra] *missing* 24v21 supranominatis] super nominatis 25r2 habuerint] huerint 25r3 ibunt] ibunt ibi 25r4 forfacturis] forfactis 25r8–9 inwardum] in / in wardum 25r13 Athellod] Athellodlod 25r16 de] *missing*

Comments

17r7–8) 'Excerpts from the reckoning of sulungs of the county of Kent according to the king's record, namely those which belong to the church of Saint Augustine.' But this title understates the scope of the text; and the word 'sulung', which seems to be *solingum* here (the pronouns 'those which' are neuter), is *solinus* in the main text. Probably, therefore, the title was not added till later – perhaps when xAug was copied into the 'textus of Saint Adrian', if we think that it was so copied. The phrases *compotus solingorum* and *carta regis* are notable in any event: they show that the B text of the survey could be thought of (could, when the title was added, still be thought of) as a *carta* containing a *compotus* – a *compotus solingorum* for Kent, a *compotus hidarum* for the other southern counties.

17r8) *et est in regis domesday*. Apparently a garbled gloss on *secundum cartam regis*, inserted by someone who thought (mistakenly) that these excerpts came from DB. I suppose that it ought to read *id est in domesday regis*. At the end of the title the words *W. conquestoris* were added by a different hand. (Ballard omitted them, no doubt because he saw that they were not by the main scribe; I omit them for the same reason.) This is the hand of a fifteenth-century annotator whose marginal comments occur throughout the book. There are places where he has something useful to tell us – he reports that one stretch of text came from the 'textus of Saint Adrian' (11v); he supplies some words omitted from a charter of Henric I (82r); he identifies the source of the excerpts from DB-Ke, *Extracta de domesday R. W. conquestoris* (143r) – but here he has nothing to say that we cannot see for ourselves.

17v2) *et est apreciatum illo tempore*. The verb has to be read as a past tense, 'and was appraised at that time'. Possibly *est* should be emended to *erat*; but I refrain from making this change because the usage is repeated below (19r16).

17v5) Possibly *hec ergo* ought to be *hec omnia*, as at 19r23. But *omnia*, however it is written, is not easily misread as *ergo*.

17v6) *Edwardus* should be *Oswardus*, but I refrain from making the correction (because, for all we know, the error may go back to the original).

18r15) The word 'defended', usually *defendit*, is *defendebat* in this and the next two paragraphs.

18r22–19v6) This whole stretch of text was first put into print by Larking (1869, pp. 34*–5*). Much of the information given here is missing from DB, probably because the DB scribe did not think it worth reproducing, but it does have some points of interest. Perhaps the most valuable fact is one which emerges incidentally: we discover that the city of Canterbury was already divided into districts – later on there were six of them, usually called wards (Somner 1640, p. 96) – each of which had its own *senior*, 'elder' or 'alderman'. Some of the mills inside the city were located upstream from somebody else's mill, or on the boundary between one ward and the next, and dissension could arise when the mill or its sluice needed to be repaired.

18v11–12) *quod uerum toloneum habebat acceptum*, 'that he had indeed taken the toll'. The use of an auxiliary verb to form a perfect tense marks the B text as being written in a relatively relaxed style. It is common in colloquial Latin (and in French); but the DB scribe prefers some more dignified expression. (Here he might have said *acceperat*; but in fact he went a notch higher still and used the infinitive *accepisse* (2ra46).) Other instances occur below: *habet suas consuetudines perditas* (22r19–20, *perdidit* in DB), *quam burgenses habent perditam* (22v2–3), *habet unam domum factam* (22v4, *fecit* in DB).

18v17) The manuscript has *vi animantes*, which makes no sense at all; I emend this to *uiam in antea*, 'a roadway at the front'. The expression *in antea* is a colloquialism which the scribe seems not to grasp (but he gets it right four lines later). It means 'in front, towards the front'; it can also mean 'forward in time', as in *ab hac die in antea*, 'from this day forward' (pseudo-Lanfranc, ed. Knowles rev. Brooke 2002, p. 162).

19r5) For *cinxerit* the manuscript has *cinxnerit*, quite distinctly so written. This is one of several places where the scribe seems to offer us a choice of readings. Here, for example, he allows us to read the word as either *cinxerit* or *cincerit*. Similarly *feodo* (19r24, 20r11, 21r15) can be read as either *feodo* or *feudo*, *Osbenrn* (19r7) as either *Osben* or *Osbern*. Sometimes the scribe makes his own choice (as he does with *Osbenrn*, putting a dot under the first *n* to cancel it); sometimes he leaves the choice to us. I take it that the exemplar displayed some corrections, and that the A4 scribe, not wanting to ignore them but doubting whether they had authority, kept his options open by packing the alternative reading into the word.

19r16) As at 17v2, *est appreciatum* has to be a past tense: 'in the time of king Edward was appraised'.

19v6) I cannot think that *omnium regum* is right. Perhaps *omnium* is the mangled remains of a word like [*pri*]orum. Or perhaps the phrase is a mutilated fragment of something like *de elemosina regis Edwardi et omnium regum antecessorum suorum* (DB-Ht-142ra).

20r3–4) Distracted by the recurrence of the phrase *et est appreciatum xxx sol'*, the scribe lost his place and started copying the previous sentence again, *Sed et hamo tenet dimidium solinum*. Having got that far, he noticed his mistake and cancelled what he had written.

20r9) *et iacet in viii sol' de Stursete*. Probably the numeral ought to be *vii*, as at 19v21 (and as in DB-3va44). A scribe who writes *sol'* for 'sulung' is inviting his readers to confuse this word with 'shilling'. The A4 scribe falls into that trap himself (20r20).

20r20) The manuscript has *per 4 sol'*, which would seem to mean 'by four shillings'. (This '4' is one of the arabic numerals which the scribe did not suppress.) But of course it ought to be *pro iiii solin'*, 'for four sulungs'.

20v7) *In hundredo de de Blengate*. The text seems to have been tampered with here (which perhaps explains why *de* is

written twice). As far as we can gather, Blengate hundred did not exist at the time of the survey: the manor of Chislet was in Chislet hundred (DB-Ke-12ra6).

21r11) *In hundredo de Estrie habet sanctus Augustinus tria iuga terre*. 'Three yokes' should be three rods, as is clear from DB, and from an independent list of the abbey's lands (below, doc. 11). This paragraph is the only one which does not fit quite correctly into the cadastral frame (Table 13), and there is obviously something peculiar about it. In A4 the scribe makes a point of starting this entry on a new line, even though this means that almost the whole of the preceding line is left blank. In DB the corresponding paragraph (12vb13) reads like an afterthought. I think we can be sure that this entry was added to the B text by the second team of commissioners, but not properly integrated into it.

21v7) 'This is the land which Simon de Holte holds.' An interpolation dating from the mid thirteenth century: it seems to be the latest ingredient of all, not just in the text of xAug, but in the whole stretch of text written by scribe 1. Simon de Holte (occ. 1236–58) acquired his lands by marrying the daughter of Stephan de Denintone.

21v18) It is one of the A4 scribe's foibles that he tends to confuse *concessus* and *consensus*. Here he writes *cum consensu*, which I take to mean *cum concessu* (as in doc. 10, p. 221); but *concessu* or *per concessum* would sound better.

21v22) 'East' (i.e. Great) Mongeham and Walmer are represented only by their names. Apparently the B text had nothing to say about these places – except perhaps that Great Mongeham was appraised with Adisham, and that Walmer was appraised with Folkestone.

21v23) This paragraph relating to Ripple has no counterpart in DB. We would expect to find the manor listed there between Little Mongeham and Sibertswold, at 12va37–8: I discuss the case in the commentary at that point (below, p. 187).

22r5) Here or near here, there ought to be an entry for the manor called *Wlatenholt* (DB-12va43). Perhaps the entry was overlooked by the compiler of xAug; perhaps it was omitted accidentally, by somebody copying xAug.

22r17) There is something wrong with this sentence. I take it that a word such as *ministri* has been omitted before *uicecomitis*; so the meaning will be that the sheriff's officers take receipt of the money. From here onwards, the spelling *forfactura* is preferred to *forisfactura*. That is a change for the worse; but eight new asterisks would be needed to countermand it, and I am not willing to pay so high a price.

22v14–15) The formula *cum incensione et pensa* seems to have been borrowed from some other paragraph (17v12–13 or 19r17–18) and inserted here as a gloss on 'twenty pence to the ora'. But the meaning was not quite the same. The 'twenty pence' formula meant a surcharge of 25 per cent. The 'fire and weight' formula, if it were taken literally, would imply that a sample of the money was refined and tested for weight (as was supposed to be the practice in the twelfth-century exchequer). Conventionally, however,

it seems to have meant a surcharge of 30 per cent: to discharge a debt of 50 pounds, one had to pay 65 pounds (DB-Sx-16rb).

22v15–4r10) The description of the prebends belonging to the canons of Saint Martin's agrees very closely in substance (not in wording) with the corresponding section of DB (1va–b). Some information given in xAug is missing from DB, presumably because it was omitted by the DB scribe; some information given in DB is missing from xAug, presumably because it was omitted by xAug's compiler. Those passages in DB which I take to have resulted from some supplementary investigation – the added paragraph at the foot of column 1vb, the assorted memoranda in column 2rb – are not represented in xAug. They were, it seems, not properly part of the B text.

24r8–9) This man (Ballard misread the name) is the same Wulwy – known as 'the wild one' – who is mentioned in DB in connection with some land at Atterton claimed by the canons of Saint Martin's from Hugo de Montfort (13ra37).

24r15–16 'In the hundred of Blackbourne Saint Augustine has a manor (called) Burmarsh.' That is what the manuscript says, but I do not see how it can be right. Burmarsh, later, was in Worth hundred, a long way from Blackbourne hundred. It is not inconceivable that the situation was different in the late eleventh century; but I think it would be rash to entertain that thought, given that our copy of xAug is far from perfectly reliable. It seems safer to suppose that something has gone wrong with the text.

Concordance

DB-Ke		B / xAug
1ra4	town of Dover	22r6
1rb1	customs of eastern lests	24r17
1va1	sac and soc in western lests	25r12
11	prebends of Saint Martin's	22v15
2ra1	city of Canterbury	18r22
2va46	Milton	17r24
3ra3	32 mansurae in Canterbury	20r13
7	town of Sandwich	21r16
3va44	Westgate	19v19
4ra10	Saint Martin	20r8
5ra9	Northgate	19v15
6va28	East Wickham	17r9
7vb30	Leeds	17r13
9rb30	Bekesbourne	20r17
43	Wickhambreaux	20r19
9va6	Nackington	20r6
10ra1	Swalecliffe	20v23
10rb11	Badlesmere	18r2
12ra3	Plumstead (chapter 7 begins)	17r11
10	Lenham	17r20
17	Bridge	20r15
22	Longport	19v6
30	Littlebourne	20v1
36	Garrington	20v3
41	Sturry	20v11
48	Minster	21r1
12rb6	Chislet	20v7
13	town of Fordwich	20v13
24	half sulung next to Canterbury	19v13
30	Wilderton	17v24
34	Ashenfield	18r7
37	Dernedale	18r5
39	Selling	18r14
43	Rooting	18r16
46	Repton	18r11
12va1	Shillingheld	18r9
5	Northbourne	21v2
27	Little Mongeham	21v13
38	Sibertswold	22r3
43	<i>Wlatenholt</i>	—
48	Preston	21r12
12vb5	Elmstone	21r4
13	three rods of land in Eastry hundred	21r11
17	Bodsham	24r11
20	Elmsted and Horton	24r13
25	Kennington	18r18
33	Burmarsh (chapter 7 ends)	24r15
14rb41	Blean	20v21
14va3	Newington	17v14