

## Chapter 7

### Supporting documents

The decisions involved in compiling this chapter were made over a period of several years, and I can hardly remember what my reasoning was in every single case. Over time, a stable solution seemed to emerge: there were no documents inside the line which I thought should be ejected, no documents outside the line which I thought should be admitted. One rule which I did decide to follow was not to print any of the documents which can be found in Bates's (1998) edition of the 'acta' (loosely defined) of Willelm I. I would cheerfully have broken this rule if any of the documents in question were directly connected with the survey of Kent; but in fact none of them are. The documents printed below are all significant, for one reason or another. It seems to me that they should all be studied closely by anyone interested in the survey of Kent, or more generally in the history of the county over the period 1066–1100. So I hope that the reader will find it helpful to have them assembled here.

#### Documents from Christ Church

Apart from the documents which were copied into manuscript C1 (above, pp. 36–7), the Christ Church archive has rather little to offer. The three disparate documents printed below tell us nothing about the survey itself; but they are all of considerable interest, each of them in its own way. Two of the manuscripts cited here, C5 and T1, can be found described elsewhere (Appendix I). In referring to T1, I distinguish between the two scribes who contributed to this manuscript. Scribe 1 did the bulk of the work; scribe 2 supplied the finishing touches.

#### 1

A formal record of the business transacted at a meeting of the shire court.

Fulchestan, de beneficio regis est. Ratebourc de archiepiscopatu est, et edzinus dedit goduino. Stepeberga de archiepiscopatu est, et ecclesia christi erat inde saisita quando rex mare transiuit, modo episcopus baiocensis habet. In tilemanestun quando rex mare transiuit erat ecclesia christi saisita de ducentis iugeribus terrae, et in fenglesham de centum iugeribus, et in elme de uiginti quinque iugeribus, et modo ea osbernus ab episcopo tenet. Totesham alnod child de monachis tenebat quando rex mare transiuit, et firmam inde reddebat, et modo episcopus habet. Torentun uiginti quinque iugera habet et ecclesia habebat quando rex mare transiuit, et modo episcopus habebat sed dimisit. Witriscesham ecclesia christi habebat quando rex

mare transiuit, et modo osbernus paisforere ab episcopo habet. Auueningesherst, et edruneland, et aduoluunden, ecclesia tenebat quando rex mare transiuit, et firmam inde habebat, et modo Robertus de romenel ab episcopo habet. Prestitun alnod child ab archiepiscopo tenebat quando rex mare transiuit, et firmam reddebat, et modo tuoldus ab episcopo habet. Godricus decanus dedit fratri suo quartam partem solingi quod pertinebat ad cliuam, et modo robertus uillelmus ab episcopo habet. Sunderhisc de archiepiscopatu est, et archiepiscopus dedit goduino, et episcopus modo habet. Langport et neuuenden de archiepiscopatu est, et archiepiscopus dedit goduino, et episcopus statim in placito cognouit esse de ecclesia. Saltoda de archiepiscopatu est, et archiepiscopus dedit goduino, et modo hugo de dono regis habet. Fecit archiepiscopus <sup>a</sup>Lanfranchus alios clamores super episcopum et super hugonem, sed in hundretis debent diffiniri. Pimpe et chintun, et uuestaldingis adalredus de archiepiscopo tenebat, et modo Richardus habet. Penesherst de archiepiscopatu est, et archiepiscopus tenebat quando rex mare transiuit, et censum et firmam inde habebat. Tertium denarium de comitatu archiepiscopus qui ante edzinum fuit habuit. Tempore edzini rex eduardus dedit goduino. Terras omnes que pertinent ad archiepiscopatum et ad abbatiam sancti Augustini, et terras comitis Goduini, testati sunt esse liberas ab omni consuetudine regia, <sup>b</sup>pre[ter illas antiqu]as uias que uadunt de ciuitate ad ciuitatem, et de mercato ad mercatum, et de portu maris ad alium portum. De illa calumnia quam episcopus Odo fecit de pratis archiepiscopi et sancti Augustini, iudicauerunt omnes quod <sup>c</sup>iniusticiam haberet, et prata utriusque ecclesie sicut cetera terra libera esse deberent. Terra Goduini damę ad ecclesiam sancti augustini pertinet, et quando rex mare transiuit ecclesia de terra illa seruicium habebat, et modo hugo de dono regis habet.

BL, Cotton Aug. ii. 36 (facsimile Douglas 1933), with endorsements (1) *Scriptum de terris quas antiquitus habuit cantuariensis ecclesia. Latine*, (2) *Quod archiepiscopus antiquitus habebat tertium denarium de comitatu cantie, et hoc iure ipsius esse debet*; T1, fo. 168r–v, with serial number C (scribe 1) and heading *Transcriptum cuiusdam scedule (ueteris) memorialis de maneriis quibusdam archiepiscopatus tempore Lanfranci* (scribe 2); Birch 1887, pp. 293–6; Douglas 1933, pp. 51–2

<sup>a</sup> partly in capitals, LanFRaNchVS <sup>b</sup> the original damaged by water and partly illegible; the missing words supplied from T1 <sup>c</sup> in iusticia birch, douglas

Date: soon after 1070. The only certain bounds are 1070 and 1082, the arrival of archbishop Lanfranc and the imprisonment of bishop Odo; but presumably Lanfranc would have acted as soon as he

© The British Library Board. Cotton Aug. ii. 36.

Figure 17. British Library, Cotton Aug. ii. 36. (The original measures 210 by 185 mm.)

could. There are some signs which seem to favour an early date. At the time when this text was written, ‘the archbishop’ still meant Stigand; if one meant ‘archbishop Lanfranc’, one had to say so. The legally significant date was ‘when the king crossed the sea’, not ‘the day when king Edward was alive and dead’.

This is the only document printed here which survives as an original. It consists of an oblong sheet of parchment (210 × 185 mm) with 25 lines of text written on one side of it. Below the last written line there seem to be two more ruled lines; the rest of the sheet is blank. The writing extends very nearly from edge to edge, with only the narrowest of margins. There are no corrections: this is obviously a fair copy, taken from an exemplar which was probably not so tidy. (Several sentences end with the clause ‘and now the bishop has it’ (or something similar to that). One sentence ends ‘and now the bishop had it but has handed it over’. In the exemplar, I imagine, *habet* had been altered to *habebat sed dimisit*.)

The scribe is a known individual (Webber 1995, p. 148). He wrote two other surviving documents, one of them a writ of bishop Odo for Christ Church (Bates 1998, p. 328); he also wrote a short inscription – which includes the words ‘I, Lanfranc’ – in a book donated to Christ Church by the archbishop.<sup>1</sup> The hand is not Lanfranc’s own;<sup>2</sup> but the man who wrote this inscription was, at least for part of his career, Lanfranc’s alter ego.<sup>3</sup>

Originally this document was longer than it is now – by how much it is impossible to say. Because the script is rather small, in proportion to the spacing of the lines, and (more particularly) because the descenders are quite short, it would be possible to make a horizontal cut, between any given line and the next, without touching the text, or almost so; and clearly that is what someone decided to do. In consequence the first surviving line is very close to the upper edge; and the tallest characters – the *F* in *Fulchestan*, the *R* and the *b* in *Ratebourc*, the abbreviation mark in *e’* for *est* – have all been sliced off at the top. Once the document had been cut in two, the upper part was discarded, and only the lower part was kept. It was folded up for safety (there are four horizontal creases and one vertical) and labelled for ease of reference.<sup>4</sup> In other words, it was now being treated as a formal document, fit to be preserved in the archive.

I print the text from the original, checking it against the two previous editions (Birch 1887, Douglas 1933), and against the copy in manuscript T1, the existence of which was first noted by Du Boulay (1966). As well as making some adjustments to the text,

<sup>1</sup> *Hunc librum dato precio emptum ego LANFRANCVS archiepiscopus de beccensi cenobio in anglicam terram deferri feci et ecclesie Christi dedi. Siquis eum de iure prefatę ecclesie abstulerit, anathema sit* (Ker 1960, pl. 5).

<sup>2</sup> Lanfranc’s handwriting is represented by the subscription which he added to one version of the primacy agreement of 1072 (Bates 1998, pp. 309–10) – *Ego Lanfrancus dorobernensis archiepiscopus subscripsi* – and that is not the same as this. Here again, I am grateful to Tessa Webber for her advice.

<sup>3</sup> A monk of Le Bec named Gundulf is known to have been brought over to England and employed in Lanfranc’s household (until he was appointed to the bishopric of Rochester in 1077). Is it worth considering the possibility that this might be Gundulf’s hand?

<sup>4</sup> The first endorsement is the work of a twelfth-century scribe who seems to have been responsible for a thorough reorganization of the Christ Church archive. It would be useful to know the date of the latest documents which passed through his hands.

Du Boulay provided an English translation of it (1966, pp. 38–9); but I think that he misidentified some of the place-names. (Preston is certainly the place in Aylesford (DB-Ke-3rb41); Cliffe is presumably the manor of that name (4vb42).)

## 2

The report of an inquiry into the lands and other assets belonging to Newington church.

<sup>a</sup>Hee sunt consuetudines et terre que pertinent ad ecclesiam de <sup>b</sup>Niuuentune. Septem sulinges terre. Septem dennas in silua que uocatur ueald. Vna (1) piscacio in loco qui dicitur Bædinge. Viginti et octo pensas casei de Middeltune, et uiginti et octo (2) pensas casei de Scapeia <sup>c</sup>et de Binnen ea. Viginti quatuor libras denariorum, hoc est <sup>d</sup>gabulum de terra septem sulinge. Ecclesia sancte Sexburge in Scapeia debet predicte ecclesie unoquoque anno decem solidos. <sup>e</sup>Ecclesia quoque de Merandenne ad illam pertinet. Due <sup>f</sup>mansiones in Hrofecestr’ que reddunt ii solidos. Tres quoque (3) mansiones in ciuitate Cantuarie in occidentali parte Eastbrigge et ecclesia que <sup>g</sup>est ibi reddunt triginta denarios. Sex (4) carra de uuald. Homines quoque de uuald debent unam (5) domum estiualem <sup>h</sup>[facere] aut uiginti solidos dare. In eadem ecclesia sunt uiginti et octo partes. Octo partes sunt archiepiscopi et ecclesie Christi. Quatuor sancti Augustini. <sup>i</sup>Sedecim <sup>j</sup>partes sunt eorum qui seruiunt in eadem ecclesia. Brihtmundus tenuit partem archiepiscopi et dedit ei unoquoque anno octo libras. Leofsinus auunculus eiusdem Brihtmundi tenuit partem abbatis et dedit <sup>k</sup>ei iiii libras. In ecclesia quoque sancti Martini Doffris ecclesia Christi et archiepiscopus habet iiii partes. Et abbas duas.

(1) piscacio <sup>l</sup>quod dicitur anglice ‘uueer’ (2) pensas <sup>m</sup>quod anglice dicitur ‘uuægian’ (3) mansiones <sup>n</sup>idest ‘hagan’ (4) carra de uuald quod anglice dicitur ‘gaeluuænas’ (5) domum estiualem quod anglice dicitur ‘sumer hus’

T1, fos. 167v–8r, with serial number XCIX (scribe 1) and heading *Consuetudines de Newenton*’ (scribe 2); C5, fo. 28v, no heading (damaged by fire); Fleming 1997, pp. 151–2 (very inaccurate), from C5

<sup>a</sup> ( h )ee T1 (with cue for rubricator) : ( )e C5 <sup>b</sup> Nuuentune T1 : Niuentune C5 <sup>c</sup> a hairline added in T1 by scribe 2 suggests starting a new sentence here <sup>d</sup> gabulum T1 altered to gabulum by scribe 2 : gabla C5 <sup>e</sup> a small erasure before ecclesia T1 <sup>f</sup> mansiones in Hrofecestr’ T1 : etiam in Rofecestre mansiones C5 (perhaps misreading a transposition mark) <sup>g</sup> est ibi T1 : transp. C5 <sup>h</sup> facere my conjecture : om. T1, C5 <sup>i</sup> Sedecim T1 altered to Sexdecim by scribe 2 : xvi C5 <sup>j</sup> partes sunt T1 : om. C5 <sup>k</sup> ei T1 : om. C5 <sup>l</sup> quod dicitur T1 : que dicitur que dicitur C5 <sup>m</sup> gloss om. C5 <sup>n</sup> gloss om. C5

Date: 1070×86. Presumably after the arrival of archbishop Lanfranc, and probably not long after. Certainly earlier than 1086.

This is one of the documents which were copied into the lost cartulary, C3, and subsequently copied from there into these two surviving manuscripts, C5 and T1 (below, Appendix I). Without hesitation I print the text from T1, which though later than C5 is generally much more reliable; it is also in excellent condition, unlike

C5, which in places is illegible. (C5's variant readings are numerous but not of any interest; I cite only a few of them.) As it appears in T1, the text is the work of scribe 1, but several corrections were made to it by scribe 2. It was he who inserted the heading here; he also wrote the matching entry in the table of contents: *XCIX. Consuetudines et terre ecclesie de Newentun'* (fo. 148v).

Two features of the text are vaguely problematic. First, the punctuation is unsatisfactory – inadequate at the beginning, excessive towards the end. Seeing the problem, scribe 2 went through the underpunctuated section, adding vertical hairlines where he thought he saw a break in the sense. Though at one point I disagree with him (note *c*), on the whole it seems clear that he had caught the intended meaning, and I have followed his lead. Second, there are five explanatory remarks – glosses which give the English equivalent for some Latin word employed in a technical sense. Because some of these glosses are awkwardly placed (and because two of them are missing from C5), it seems doubtful whether they are properly part of the text; so I have thought it best to cut them out and place them at the end.

The contents of this document are paraphrased by Du Boulay (1966, pp. 176–7); I discuss them further in the commentary, in relation to DB's chapter 13 (14va3).

### 3

An obituary notice of Willelm I, who restored to the church of Canterbury almost all the lands which had been taken away from it, in Kent, Surrey, London, Middlesex, Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire, Suffolk and Essex.

Obiit WILLELMUS rex anglorum. Hic reddidit ecclesie Christi omnes fere terras antiquis et modernis temporibus a iure ipsius ecclesie ablatas. Quarum terrarum nomina hec sunt. In cantia, Raculf, Sandwic, Rateburch, Wudetun, Monasterium de limminge cum terris et consuetudinibus ad ipsum monasterium pertinentibus, Saltwude cum burgo hethe ad saltwude pertinente, Langport, Niwendene, Rokinge, Detlinge, Prestentune non longe a fluuio medeweie sitam, Sunderherste, Earheth, Orpentun, Ainesford, Denintun, Stocke, Quattuor prebendas de niwentune, et preter hec omnia multas alias modicas terras tam in insulis quam extra insulas in cantia sitas. (Stocke uero et denentun LANFRANCUS archiepiscopus reddidit ecclesie Sancti ANDREE, quia de iure ipsius ecclesie antiquitus fuerunt.) In suthrege, Murtelac. Lundonię monasterium Sanctę MARIE cum terris et domibus quas Liuingus presbiter et uxor illius lundonię habuerunt. In mildelsexum, Hergam, Heisam. In buckingeham scire, Risbergam, Healtun. In oxenaford scire, Niwentun. In suthfolke, Frakenham. (Hanc uillam LANFRANCUS archiepiscopus reddidit ecclesie Sancti ANDREE, quia antiquitus ad ipsam ecclesiam pertinebat.) In eastsexum, Stistede, Stanbrigge. Hec omnia reddidit pro deo et pro salute anime sue gratis et sine ullo pretio.

Dart 1726, app. p. ii, from BL, Cotton Claudius C. vi, fo. 165v; Bandinel 1813, p. 109, from the same; Le Patourel 1948, pp. 24–6, from the same

Date: 1087. Presumably composed immediately after the king's death in September that year.

This document would not have existed in separate form (unless perhaps the author wrote out a draft of it on some spare piece of parchment); it would have been entered in the church's martyrology – the book where the monks recorded their benefactors' names – so that it could be read aloud each year, on the anniversary of the king's death. I reproduce the text as it was printed by Le Patourel, replacing & with *et* and adjusting the punctuation (but not the capitalization). Also I have bracketed two sentences which read like afterthoughts.

As far as Kent is concerned, the places listed (not all of them identified correctly by Le Patourel) are Reculver, Sandwich, Fleet (called Richborough) in Ash, Wootton, Lyminge, Saltwood and Hythe, Langport in Lydd, Newenden, Ruckinge, Detling, Preston in Aylesford, Sundridge, Crayford, part of Orpington, Eynsford, Denton and Stoke (these two restored by Lanfranc to the church of Rochester), and four prebends in Newington church.

## Documents from Saint Augustine's

The dissolution of Saint Augustine's abbey, in July 1538, appears to have resulted in the total destruction of its archive. In consequence, the only documents known to us are those which had been copied into the abbey's cartularies and registers, which (or some of which) had a happier fate. The textual relationships existing between these manuscripts are a tangle which no one has unravelled very far; in the comments which follow, I focus as narrowly as possible on the particular stretches of text which have some interest for us, and what I say should be regarded as tentative.

It is clear that the monks retained in their possession a remarkable collection of documents dating from the late eleventh century – from the time of abbots Scolland (1070–87) and Wido (1087–93), and from the scandalously long period, after Wido's death, when the abbey was left without an abbot (1093–1107). Of course they were careful to keep important documents, such as charters and writs of Willelm I,<sup>5</sup> Willelm II, or Odo bishop of Bayeux.<sup>6</sup> But documents of much less significance were also preserved – two small memoranda, for instance, relating to the compensation received by abbot Scolland for assets which vanished when a tract of land in Canterbury was seized as a site for the castle.<sup>7</sup> But it must not be forgotten that they exist only in the form of thirteenth-century and fourteenth-century copies, some of which may be several steps removed from the originals. Much more so than documents from Christ Church or Rochester, documents from Saint Augustine's have a fuzzy quality to them; and this is something which has to be allowed for in deciding how far to trust them.<sup>8</sup>

These are the manuscripts and stretches of text which come into question here.

<sup>5</sup> These were all edited by Bates (1998, nos. 80–4, 87–8).

<sup>6</sup> A writ and a charter of bishop Odo's were also edited by Bates (1998, pp. 351–3). (The charter has a line at the end of it added by the king.)

<sup>7</sup> They were printed by Urry (1967, p. 445), from manuscripts A2 and A4 (see below); I have not thought it necessary to print them again.

<sup>8</sup> This applies, not just to the documents printed here, but also to the abbey's pre-conquest (or ostensibly pre-conquest) charters, all of which – with the exception of the forged papal letters – were edited by Kelly (1995).

A2 = BL, Royal 1 B. xi, fos. 145v–7v, a collection of lists and memoranda relating to the abbey’s property, entered on five blank pages at the end of a mid twelfth-century copy of the Gospels (Warner and Gilson 1921, vol. 1, p. 12; Dodwell 1954, p. 34). A single stretch of text, written by an early thirteenth-century hand. The same documents, in very nearly the same sequence, turn up again in A4 (see below). Among them are the lists of parish churches which are printed in chapter 8 (where the reader will find some more detailed description of these two manuscripts); two of the other items are printed below (docs. 10–11).

A3 = BL, Cotton Julius D. ii, fos. 84–103, 114–33, 104–13 (five quires of 10 leaves each, the third bound after the fifth). Two stretches of text, the second beginning at 130v15. Both stretches were written by the same hand, that of a very competent scribe active in about 1230, but the second stretch (130v–3v + 104r–9v) is distinguished by the absence of rubrication, and by the fact that as far as 108r it runs parallel with a substretch of text in A5 (see below). Five items from A3 are printed below (docs. 4–8); all of them come from (what ought to be) the final quire.

A4 = National Archives, E 164/27, fos. 2r–48r. The rest of the book (see below) dates from about 1320, but this section may perhaps be somewhat earlier. Two stretches of text, distinguished by a change of hand at 27r10. The first stretch contains all the items of interest for us, most importantly the series of excerpts from the B-Ke text (chapter 3). Of the documents printed below, three appear in this manuscript. One which occurs in shortened form in A3 occurs at full length here (doc. 4). It is included in a substretch of text (2r–8r) which represents a partial calendar of the abbey’s archive, compiled (so it seems) from a boxful of documents tied up in bundles but otherwise not kept in order (above, p. 73). The two documents printed from A2 occur in A4 as well (docs. 10–11), included in a substretch of text (11v–17r) which from 14r onwards runs parallel with A2.<sup>9</sup>

A5 = National Archives, E 164/27, fos. 48r–191v, written by three collaborating scribes in about 1320. Four of the documents printed below occur in this manuscript, one of them only here (doc. 9). Two items (docs. 6–7) come from a substretch of text (76v–87r) which from 79v onwards runs parallel with A3. Within the specified bounds, both manuscripts seem to consist of excerpts from a mid twelfth-century cartulary.<sup>10</sup> The other two items (docs. 8–9) appear to have been copied from the originals; at least I can see no reason not to think so.

<sup>9</sup> A note added by a fifteenth-century hand against the beginning of this substretch tells us that it was ‘extracted from the textus of Saint Adrian’ (fo. 11v). That is the name which we find being used, from the late thirteenth century onwards, for what was regarded as the abbey’s most important register. There seems to be only one surviving manuscript which might perhaps be identified as a fragment of that register: I mean BL Cotton Vitellius A. ii, fos. 3–19.

<sup>10</sup> Because there are only two copies – not three, as in the case of the Christ Church cartulary (Appendix I) – the evidence is ambiguous by definition, and the exemplar cannot be adequately reconstructed. Of the items occurring in both copies, the latest are two charters of Henric I (Johnson and Cronne 1956, nos. 1283, 873); of those occurring only in A5, the latest is a charter of Stephan (Cronne and Davis 1968, no. 163); of those occurring only in A3, the latest are a batch of documents dating from the period 1175–8, when the abbot-elect was working hard to repair the damage done by his predecessor – and, at the same time, trying to avoid being humiliated by the archbishop. This last batch looks as if it may have been inserted subsequently (in the same way that a batch of documents was copied onto the blank pages at the end of manuscript C1); my guess would be that the cartulary was originally compiled in the time of abbot Hugo II (1126–51). It may have been, or may have become, another component of the textus of Saint Adrian (see previous note).

Most of the following documents are referred to by the abbey’s earliest chronicler, Thomas Sprott, who was at work towards the end of the thirteenth century, perhaps even a little later. Except for the first few paragraphs (Dugdale 1655, p. 23 = Bandinel 1813, p. 126), Sprott’s chronicle has not been published in its original form; but large portions of the text – including all the passages of interest for us – were translated into English by Stevens (1722, pp. 303–22).

#### 4

A list of the pieces of land stolen from Saint Augustine since 1066.

Iste sunt terrule quas ab antiquo tempore et in diebus Eadwordi regis sanctus Augustinus habuit, set sibi potestas diuitum eas contradicentibus fratribus abstulit. Unum iugum quod uocatur Suanetum sibi Hugo de mundford iniuste usurpauit, et xxx agros quos Godwine punter linde east bricce tenebat, et unum iugum de Hortune, et Ængestsele quod Wlfric pullehare de sancto Augustino tenebat, et terram Ælfsi tumbe sune, de qua sanctus Augustinus solebat habere seruitia. <sup>a</sup>[Willelmus de arces habet dimidium aratrum atte Broke quod Siric habuit. Ricardus de tonnebrigge habet illud de Bearmlince. Robertus de somerie habet Sourtherst et Herreferynge, duoden’ l agros Aelfgidgetone. Rاندulfus de columbeal et terram que uocatur Smethetune. De Acrisc dimidium aratrum habet Rاندulfus frater Godefridi de eo. xxv agros tenet Petrus de Aelgidgetune. xxv agros tenet Rاندulfus de corbespyn de Yatenholte. Et Reginaldus de albedone tenet quatuor agros de Hemstede. Et Osbernus tenet Betlesangre. Et comes Cancie possidet Scellynge.]

A3, fo. 108r, incomplete, with space for heading but none supplied; A4, fo. 2v, no heading; Kelly 1995, pp. cx–xi, from A4 (as far as *quod Siric habuit*)

<sup>a</sup> et c’ A3, omitting the rest

Date: 1070×82. Presumably later than abbot Scolland’s arrival in 1070; earlier than bishop Odo’s fall from power.

The text is not in good shape. There are places where both scribes seem to be copying sequences of characters without understanding what they mean (and the A3 scribe gives up the struggle halfway through). I am in the same quandary: I can more or less read what the manuscripts say, but there are places where the sense of it escapes me. Despite that, most of the text is comprehensible, and I am sure that it deserves to be published in full. I print it from A3, as far as A3 goes; the rest is from A4 (which, as the reader should bear in mind, is rather carelessly written).<sup>11</sup>

<sup>11</sup> This is the closest that I would be willing to come to a translation: ‘These are pieces of land which Saint Augustine used to own in ancient times, and in the time of king Eadward; but the power of rich men has taken them away from him, despite the brothers’ protests. Hugo de Montfort has unjustly usurped for himself a yoke which is called Swanton, and 30 acres of Eastbridge which Godwine ... used to hold, and a yoke of the Horton, and Hinxhill which Wulfric ... used to hold from Saint Augustine, and the land of Ælfsi ... from which Saint Augustine used to get services. Willelm de Arcis owns a half ploughland at Brook which Siric used to own. Ricard de Tonebrige owns ... Barming. Robert de Someri owns ... two dens (?), 50 acres (of) ‘Ælvetune’ ... Rاندulf de Columbels ... the land which is called ‘Smedetune’. Godefrid’s brother Rاندulf has

This seems to be an aide-mémoire drawn up for abbot Scolland's benefit, at a time when he was trying to recover Saint Augustine's lost property. Since it is clear from doc. 1 that some of the abbot's grievances were discussed at Penenden in 1072, we may be tempted to suppose that the present document was drawn up at about that time; but the evidence does not seem adequate to justify this conclusion. (It should be noted, by the way, that the manor of Badlesmere, to which the abbot advanced a claim in 1086 (DB-Ke-10rb15, 12vb37), is not mentioned here.)

## 5

An agreement between abbot Scotland and Hugo son of Fulbert. Hugo gets possession of two sulungs at Sibertswold, on condition that he pays the abbot 20 shillings each year on the feast of Saint Andrew and gives tithes of all his proceeds from the domain. He is to keep the land properly stocked and manage it well. After his death, it is to revert to Saint Augustine, in whose cemetery he has chosen to be buried.

Conuentio inter Scollandum abbatem et monachos sancti Augustini cum Hugone filio Fulberti. Accepit ipse Hugo terram duorum solingiorum Suibertesweald, ea conditione, quod dabit ipse per singulos annos xx solidos in festo sancti Andree abbati et fratribus, et dabit decimam omnium rerum suarum que in eadem terra fuerint, scilicet messium, ouium, lane, porcorum, animalium, caseorum et ceterorum que ipse in dominio habuerit. Francigene quicumque de terra illa quicumque ab eo tenuerint eandem prescriptam conuentionem quam et ipse custodient. Angli uero ibidem degentes consuetam annonam reddent, usque dum legitime ab omnibus Angligenis decima reddatur, et ipsi eam tunc daturi. Terram uero istam debet ipse Hugo bene uestire et domibus et animalibus et bene agricolari. Et si contigerit sibi obitus, habeat totam terram cum uestitura in dominium sanctus Augustinus, in cuius cimiterio delegit sibi sepulturam, et omnium propriarum rerum donationem. Ipse autem seruiet abbati et fratribus fideliter sicut miles eorum. Consuetudines tamen quas hactenus reddidit terra illa regi in operibus castellorum uel quod dicunt scot uel aliarum rerum reddet. Nomina testium, Hildegarus decanus, <sup>a</sup>. . . . .

A3, fo. 104v, with space for heading but none supplied; summarized A4, fo. 3v

<sup>a</sup> et c' A3, *omitting the rest*

Date: 1070×9. Probably not much later than 1070. Presumably of the same date as doc. 6, which is earlier than doc. 7, which is fairly sure to be earlier than doc. 8, which is dated 1079.

Unlike archbishop Lanfranc (who arrived in England just a few months later than him), abbot Scolland liked to get his business dealings recorded in writing, and docs. 5–7 are a consequence of that. He has had to negotiate agreements with three of bishop Odo's men: Hugo son of Fulbert, Wadard, Ansfrid Masleclerc. All three (so we may assume) had put themselves into possession

from him a half ploughland of Acrise. Petrus holds 25 acres of 'Ælvetune'. Ra(d)ulf de Curbespine holds 25 acres of 'Wlatenholt'. Reginald de (V)albadon holds 4 acres of 'Hemstede'. Osbern holds Betteshanger. The earl of Kent is in possession of Stelling.<sup>7</sup>

of land which properly belonged to Saint Augustine, and the abbot had to make the best terms with them that he could. The resulting agreements were probably all drawn up in duplicate, though there is nothing in the wording to indicate that. This agreement with Hugo was apparently the only one which included a list of witnesses; unfortunately the A3 scribe cut the list short (as he usually did) and the first name alone is preserved. I have no idea who Hildegar the dean may have been.

Two matters referred to incidentally here are, I think, of some larger significance. First, we find it being taken for granted that pieces of these manors are likely to be given to foreign immigrants, *Francigene*. (Perhaps this has already happened; the abbot would not admit that gifts made previously were valid.) Such immigrants, it seems, were numerous enough to be found just about everywhere; and those who are known to us by name were probably not more than a small proportion of the total number. Second, while these immigrants are expected to pay tithes, the English do not do the same. They pay something; there is some custom which they recognize; but they do not pay tithes in any sense of the word which abbot Scolland understands. Though he disapproves of it, he does not have the authority himself to overturn this custom. Nevertheless, he is expecting that some change will be made – and that means, I suppose, that archbishop Lanfranc was known to be considering the matter.

The first two agreements (docs. 5–6) are framed in identical terms – from which we may infer that Hugo and Wadard had formed a united front against the abbot. In return for an acknowledgment that it was Saint Augustine's, each of them was allowed to keep the land that was in his possession, for his lifetime, at a modest rent. After his death, it would become part of Saint Augustine's domain. No doubt there was some expectation that the lease would be renewed in favour of the man's heir; but the abbot did not commit himself to that.

Sibertswold, the manor in question here, was back in the abbot's hands by 1086 (DB-Ke-12va38). Fulbert de Dovre – Hugo's heir, presumably his son – was not in possession of it. But there are signs that Fulbert had only quite recently come into his inheritance, and perhaps he had not yet had time to come to terms with the abbot. That is doubtful; but Sibertswold did certainly belong to Fulbert's descendants.

## 6

An agreement between abbot Scotland and Wadard the knight. Wadard gets possession of five sulungs around Northbourne, on condition that he pays the abbot 30 shillings each year at Whitsun and gives tithes of all his proceeds from the domain. He is to keep the land properly stocked and manage it well. After his death, it is to revert to Saint Augustine, in whose cemetery he has chosen to be buried.

Conuentio inter Scollandum abbatem et monachos sancti Augustini cum Wadardo milite. Accepit ipse Wadardus terram quinque solingiorum circa Norburnam uillam, ea conditione, quod dabit ipse per singulos annos xxx solidos in pentecosten <sup>a</sup>abbati, et dabit decimam omnium rerum suarum que in eadem terra <sup>b</sup>fuerint, scilicet messium, ouium, lane, porcorum, animalium, caseorum et ceterorum que ipse in <sup>c</sup>dominio habuerit. Francigene <sup>d</sup>quicumque de

terra illa <sup>e</sup>quicquam ab eo tenuerint, <sup>f</sup> . . . . . Angli uero ibidem degentes consuetam annonam <sup>g</sup>reddent, usque dum legitime ab omnibus Angligenis decima reddatur, et ipsi eam tunc daturi. Terram uero istam debet ipse Wadardus bene uestire et domibus et animalibus et bene agricolari. Et si contigerit sibi obitus, habeat totam terram cum <sup>h</sup>uestitura in dominium sanctus Augustinus, in cuius cimiterio delegit <sup>i</sup>sibi sepulturam, et omnium propriarum rerum donationem. Ipse autem seruiet abbati et fratribus fideliter sicut miles eorum. Consuetudines tamen quas <sup>j</sup>hactenus reddidit terra illa regi in operibus castellorum uel quod dicunt scot uel aliarum rerum reddet.

A3, fo. 107v, with space for heading but none supplied; A5, fo. 85r, with heading *De terra Wardardi militis circa Northbourne*; summarized A4, fo. 2r

<sup>a</sup> abbati et fratribus *doc. 5*      <sup>b</sup> fiunt A5      <sup>c</sup> domo A3  
<sup>d</sup> quecunque A5      <sup>e</sup> quicunque A5      <sup>f</sup> eandem prescriptam conuentionem quam et ipse custodient *doc. 5 : om. A3, A5*  
<sup>g</sup> reddent *doc. 5 : redent A3 : reddant A5*      <sup>h</sup> uestura A5  
<sup>i</sup> om. A5      <sup>j</sup> actenus A3

Date: 1070×9. Earlier than doc. 7, which is fairly sure to be earlier than doc. 8.

It is a textual point worth noting that both copies omit the second half of the sentence which begins with *Francigene*. (The A5 scribe tried to knock some sense into what was left by changing two of the words; he did not succeed.) Otherwise the wording is identical, mutatis mutandis, with that of the abbot's agreement with Hugo son of Fulbert (doc. 5). In DB we find Wadard listed as the abbot's tenant for part of Northbourne (12va14) and part of Little Mongeham (12va35); the fact that he pays the abbot 30 shillings is mentioned twice.

## 7

An agreement between abbot Scotland and Ansfrid Masleclerc. Ansfrid gets possession of two named lands, on condition that he does service to Saint Augustine's and pays the customs which the land ought to pay; he is also to pay tithes, on the same terms as Wadard. In addition, he agrees to give tithes from five places which he holds from the bishop (of Bayeux); the bishop's assent to this is noted.

Hec <sup>a</sup>conuentio est inter abbatem Scollandum et Ansfridum qui dicitur Masleclerc. Accepit ipse terram que dicitur Riple et terram de Aluatuna a supradicto abbate, ea conditione, ut seruiat inde sancto Augustino et abbati et fratribus et reddat consuetudines quas terra reddere debet. Reddat autem decimam frugum suarum rerum, sicut reddit Wadardus. De quinque etiam suis uillis, id est Hortun, Lega, Ernoltuna, Sceldrisham, Oslacestune, quas possidet <sup>b</sup>ab episcopo, ipso annuente, similiter <sup>c</sup>dat decimam tam frugum quam omnium animalium suorum et ceterarum rerum sancto Augustino, preter <sup>d</sup>gabulum et forisfacturas. Si qui Franci fuerint in istis terris, decimam dabunt. Angli uero secundum suum morem faciant, donec melius fit.

A3, fos. 107v–8r, with space for heading but none supplied; A5,

fo. 85r–v, with heading *De terra de Ripple et Aluetuna*; summarized A4, fo. 2r

<sup>a</sup> est conuencio A5      <sup>b</sup> de A5      <sup>c</sup> dat A3, A5 (*read det or dabit*)      <sup>d</sup> ga A5 (*at end of line*)

Date: 1070×9. It refers back to the abbot's agreement with Wadard (doc. 6); from the fact that Wadard and Ansfrid are named as witnesses in the next document, it appears that they had both come to terms with the abbot before 1079.

The place-names here are uncommonly problematic. Ripple was described in B-Ke (xAug has a shortened version of that paragraph) but dropped out of the text, somewhere along the line between B and DB. *Aluatuna* is *Æluetone* in DB (12vb5), but can only be loosely identified on the ground. As for the five manors held by Ansfrid from the bishop of Bayeux (called simply 'the bishop'), only the first is straightforward: this is Horton in Chartham (10va25). *Ernoltuna* and *Sceldrisham* are recorded as Ansfrid's property in DB (10rb1, 10ra46) but have not been adequately identified. *Lega* and *Oslacestune* are puzzles which I cannot solve.

## 8

The record of a donation made by Herbert son of Ivo, with the assent of his lord, bishop Odo, earl of Kent, in return for his being made a brother of abbot Scotland and the brothers of Saint Augustine's. His donation consists of the tithes from five of his manors, the names of which are given; tithes of all tithable goods are to be paid to Saint Augustine, or one hundred shillings in cash each year, if that is what the abbot decides.

Anno dominice incarnationis millesimo septuagesimo nono, regnante glorioso rege Anglorum Willelmo et Odone Baiocarum pontifice Cantie comitatum tenente, domino quoque <sup>a</sup>abbate Scollando sancti Augustini monasterium regente, Herbertus Iuonis filius petiit a <sup>b</sup>supradicto abbate et fratribus loci quatinus illorum efficeretur frater, eumque suis precibus die ac nocte domino commendarent. Quod iam dictus abbas una cum fratribus benignissime annuit. Pro qua re isdem Herbertus, concedente Odone pontifice Cantie comite domino suo, dedit sancto Augustino et domino abbati Scollando et fratribus decimas quinque mansionum, quarum nomina subter <sup>c</sup>annectimus, ut <sup>d</sup>posterorum nostrorum memoriis commendentur. Est ergo una harum ad Cliue, altera ad Æuella, tertia uero ad Ospringes, quarta ad Hergedesham, quinta ad <sup>e</sup>[Wildene]. De his quinque mansionibus totam plenam decimam omnium rerum de quibus recte datur decima sancto dedit Augustino, uel per singulos annos centum nummorum solidos. Istud in arbitrio et uoluntate iam dicti abbatis constituit. Huius igitur donationis nomina testium qui affuerunt hic annotamus, scilicet Reginaldus, Wadardus, <sup>f</sup>[Ansfridus masleclerc, Odilardus dapifer abbas, Gaufridus filii Gauslini, et preter hos affuit omnis sepepredicti abbatis familia.]

A3, fo. 108r, with space for a heading but none supplied; A5, fos. 148v–9r, with heading *Donacio decimarum Herberti sancto Augustino*; summarized A4, fo. 2r

<sup>a</sup> om. A5    <sup>b</sup> iam dicto A5    <sup>c</sup> anectimus A3 : anneximus A5  
<sup>d</sup> posteriorum A3    <sup>e</sup> Wildene A5 : Langedune A3 (Langedone  
A4, Langetune doc. 10)    <sup>f</sup> et c' A3, omitting the rest

Date: explicitly 1079, when Willelm was king of the English, Odo bishop of Bayeux was earl of Kent, and Scolland was abbot of Saint Augustine's.

This seems to be a genuine donation, inspired by nothing beyond the declared motive – a wish to be remembered in the monks' prayers. The manors in question are Solton in West Cliffe (DB-Ke-11ra38), (Temple) Ewell (11ra26), Ospringe (10ra34), Harrietsham (7vb13), and apparently Wilden in Bedfordshire (DB-Bd-209vb). (At some later stage, the monks seem to have decided that the fifth manor was (part of) (East or West) Langdon; but I do not see how that could be right.) By 1086, all of these places had passed into the possession of Herbert's nephew Hugo; DB-Bd makes it clear that Hugo holds from his uncle, who holds from the bishop of Bayeux, and no doubt the same was true for the manors in Kent, though DB-Ke does not say so. The tithes (and the optional 1200 pence) were all lost, soon after 1088, when the lands from which they were supposed to come were given to Willelm Pevrel (doc. 10).

## 9

A writ of Willelm II (Davis 1913, no. 351) addressed to Haimo the steward, ordering him to see to it that the abbot of Saint Augustine's continues to receive the tithes which were being paid on the day when the king's father was alive and dead, regardless of to whom the king has given the land from which the tithes arise; also to see to it that the abbot is put back into possession of the land of which Anschitil has dispossessed him.

Willelmus rex <sup>a</sup>Angl(orum) H(aimoni) dap(ifero) salutem. Fac ut abbas sancti Augustini habeat omnes decimas quas sanctus Augustinus habebat ea die qua pater meus fuit uiuus et mortuus, cuicumque ego postea dederim terras de quibus decime exeunt, et quicquid sibi ablatum est fac sibi reddi cum iusticia. Et de terra de qua Anschitillus dissaisiuit eum postquam ipse recepit abbaciam fac eum resaisiri, et michi et sibi fac inde iusticiam, si iniuria facta est. T(este) R(oberto) can(cellario).

A5, fo. 148r–v, with heading *Willelmus i de decimis beati Augustini*; Davis 1913, p. 133

<sup>a</sup> Anglie A5

Date: 1088×93. Later than the redistribution which followed from the rebellion of 1088. The unnamed abbot has to be Wido, who died in 1093.

The next document gives some indication of the tithes which were in contention. As to the dispute with Anschitil (de Ros), it seems that the land causing trouble was East Wickham – i.e. the half of Plumstead held by the previous abbot from the bishop of Bayeux (DB-Ke-6va28). A mid twelfth-century list of Saint Augustine's's lands complains that 'the other part of Plumstead ... has now unjustly been taken away from him' (A4, fo. 11v); but some compromise was eventually worked out, with the result that Anschitil's descendants are found holding East Wickham at fee-farm from the abbot and convent.

## 10

A list of the tithes donated to Saint Augustine by Herbert son of Ivo and others which are no longer being paid.

Herebertus filius iuonis dedit decimas de v maneriis suis, Osprenge scilicet et Cliue et Welle et Hergetesham et Langetune, et assederat erga abbatem per c sol'. Sed postquam Willelmus peuerel habuit honorem abstulit totum <sup>a</sup>santo. Willelmus de albeneio aufert S' Augustino decimas iii maneriorum, scilicet <sup>b</sup>(Con(l)tune) Cnoltune et Ringeltune et Tikenherste, quas dedit Apeloldus S' Augustino cum concessu regis Willelmi et episcopi baiocensis. Et Rogerius de maineres aufert decimam de Eswelle quam dedit similiter Aðeloldus eodem concessu. Decima paisforie de Boclande et de Doura, iste et alie quamplures decime iniuste detinentur.

A2, fo. 147v, no heading; A4, fos. 15v–16r, no heading

<sup>a</sup> sic A2    <sup>b</sup> Contune corrected and then cancelled instantly A2

Date: probably c. 1090, but possibly somewhat later.

Herbert's donation is recorded by doc. 8, Adelold's by a charter of bishop Odo (Bates 1998, p. 353). Willelm Pevrel and Willelm de Albigni were among the men rewarded with grants of land in Kent after 1088. Presumably the same was true for Roger de Maineres, but this memorandum is (to my knowledge) the only trace of his existence.

## 11

An early twelfth-century list of the abbey's lands.

Breuis recapitulatio.  
De S' Mildreda xlviii solini.  
Ad Meregat vi solini.  
Ad Cistelet vi solini et i iugum.  
Ad Sturaie v solini cum Swalecliue.  
Ad Langeport i solin' et <sup>a</sup>(ii) iuga silicet Iuentune et Lichesore.  
Ad Norburne et Muningeham et Bewesfeld, Riple, Langedune, Scoueldune, Ælfuettune, Smethetun' cum aliis omnibus menbris xxxvi suling.  
Ad Prestune v soling et xv acres cum terra Haimonis filii uitalis.  
Ad Litleburne vii solin.  
Ad Leanham v soling' et dimid' et i iugum.  
Ad Sellinges vi suling'.  
Ad Kenetune et Wiuelesberege iiii soling' et iii<sup>a</sup> iuga.  
Ad Suiberteswald ii soling.  
Ad Wilrintune i soling.  
Ad Brege i suling.  
Ad Dene dimid' soling.  
De terra demesune iii<sup>a</sup> iuga, inter marasc et superiorem terram.  
Ad Repetune i suling'.  
Lizeline de Snaue dimid' suling.  
Ad Sceldingelde dim' soling'.

Ad Gildinge i solin.  
 Ad Bodesham i soling.  
 Ad Æsmeresfeld i soling.  
 Ad Plumstede ii soling et i iugum.  
 Ad Dervedane dim' soling.  
 Ad Marasc ii soling et iii<sup>a</sup> iuga et unus miles scilicet  
 Robertus de S' leodogario tenet dim' iug'.  
 Ad Forwiz i iugum.  
 De terra Wolnod tretun i iug' et dim'.  
 Ad Sturtune et Rotinge i iugum et dim'.  
 De terra <sup>b</sup>(Colring) Colgrin i iugum.  
 Willelmus de Rapintune tenet iii uirgas in hundred de  
 Æstrie.

A2, fo. 147ra–b, with heading *Solini de abbacia*; A4, fos. 16v–17r, with title replaced by heading *Breuis recapitulacio solinorum*

<sup>a</sup> ii on erasure A2      <sup>b</sup> Colring cancelled instantly A2

Date: not earlier than c. 1090, not later than c. 1130.

The dating depends on the comment attached to the entry for Preston, 'including the land of Haimo son of Vitalis' (which one could easily regard as an afterthought, if one were inclined to complicate the issue). The Vitalis who held part of Preston in 1086 (DB-Ke-12vb1) was the same man who occurs elsewhere as a tenant both of the archbishop and of the bishop of Bayeux. He was dead by 1108; his son Haimo was dead by 1137.

Loosely speaking, this list is a generation later than 1086; I print it because it appears to have some independent value. As far as I can see, there is nothing in the arrangement or wording of the entries which connects this list with the records of the survey. The title 'A short recapitulation' suggests that it was originally compiled from, and placed at the end of, a survey of the abbey's manors – possibly a new survey commissioned by abbot Hugo (1107–26).<sup>12</sup>

## Documents from Rochester

We have the monks of Rochester to thank for preserving two important documents: a version of the Rochester section of text *α* (chapter 2), and a list of the parish churches existing in the diocese of Rochester (chapter 8). For the rest, there are only four documents which I take to be worth printing here, and they are only rather distantly relevant. Two of them (docs. 12 and 15) tell us something about the disruption caused by the creation of the lowy of Tonbridge; the others (docs. 13–14) relate to a donation made by the bishop of Bayeux, while he had possession of Chatham, which after 1088 was declared to be illicit.

Four manuscripts are cited here, the last two of them only incidentally. These are they:

R1 = Strood, Medway Archives, DRc / R1, fos. 119–235 (c. 1120);

R2 = BL, Cotton Domitian x, fos. 92–211 (early thirteenth century);

R3 = BL, Cotton Vespasian A. xxii (early thirteenth century);

<sup>12</sup> The record of this private survey, if there was such a thing, might also be the source for some of the components in the *Noticia terrarum* (above, p. 73) which are not derived from either B-Ke or DB-Ke.

R4 = Strood, DRc / R2, fos. 9–52, 'Custumale Roffense' (mid thirteenth century).

All four are described in Flight (1997a); as far as R1 is concerned, the pertinent facts have already been repeated once (above, pp. 39–40), and I refrain from repeating them again.

## 12

An agreement between bishop Gundulf and Gislebert son of Ricard, made in the presence of archbishop Lanfranc, concerning the lands in the lowy of Tonbridge which belong to the church of Rochester.

Hęc est conuentio que facta est Cantuarię in presentia domni archiepiscopi Lanfranci atque eo precipiente scripta, inter Gundulfum episcopum et Gislebertum de tunebrige. Iudicio ipsius domni archiepiscopi debet Gislebertus unoquoque anno dare I solidos domno episcopo Gundulfo pro terra sancti Andreę quam ipse Gislebertus habet, quoad usque dabit ei tantum de alia terra sua unde habeat per singulos annos I solidos uel ualens. Testante eodem archiepiscopo Lanfranco, et episcopo Willelmo de Dunhelma, et abbate Gisleberto Westmonasterii, et abbate Paulo sancti Albani, et Haimone uicecomite de Cantorberia, et Bertranno de uirduno, et maxima parte de familia ipsius domni archiepiscopi.

R1, fo. 175r, with heading *De conuentione inter Gundulfum et Gislebertum*; printed most recently by Brett and Gribbin 2004, p. 11

Date: 1086×8. At the time of the survey, Gislebert's father was still in possession, and the issue referred to here was unresolved. The bishop of Durham was exiled in 1088, not returning to England till after Lanfranc was dead.

This is a temporary settlement of a dispute echoed in several paragraphs of DB-Ke; it arose from the fact that the lowy of Tonbridge had swallowed up outlying portions of some of the bishop's manors. A final settlement, involving some chicanery on Gislebert's part, was arrived at some years later (doc. 15).

## 13

A writ of Willelm II (Davis 1913, no. 355) addressed to Haimo the sheriff and his officers of Hoo, concerning the land belonging to the reeveship of Chatham which was given to the monks of Rochester by the bishop of Bayeux (1088×94)

Willelmus rex Anglorum, Haimoni uicecomiti et omnibus ministris suis de Hou, salutem. Sciatis me concessisse monachis sancti Andreę roffensis ecclesię terram illam que pertinet ad preposituram de Ceteham, et quam ipsi monachi infra ortum suum habent inclusam, ea conuentione quod ipsi monachi pro anima patris mei ducentas missas cantare debent, et episcopus Gundulfus pro illa terra debet dare de alia terra sua que ualeat quantum ipsa ualebat tempore quo episcopus baiocensis concessit eam eisdem monachis.

Testibus, Walchelino episcopo, et Rodberto cancellario, et Rannulfo capellano, apud Bricestoc.

R1, fo. 211v, with space for a heading but none supplied; R2, fo. 183r, with heading *De terra ubi uinea est*;<sup>13</sup> Thorpe 1769, p. 209, from R2

Date: 1088×94. Later than ‘the battle of Rochester’ (doc. 14). The chancellor is Robert Bloet, who was made bishop of Lincoln in 1094. Probably 1089×93, while the archbishopric was vacant.

This writ, combined with the consequential writ of bishop Gundulf (doc. 14), gives us a glimpse of some of the adjustments which followed from the fall of Odo bishop of Bayeux. The manor of Hoo, which had belonged to the bishop by right of the earldom of Kent, was back in the king’s hands now; and the sheriff had sent in some of his officers to manage it. (From doc. 14 we discover their names, and the fact that they were answerable to the sheriff; here the word *uis* is ambiguous.) Hoo was their base, but their sphere of operations included the city of Rochester (which had also belonged to bishop Odo by right of the earldom) and the manor of Chatham.

On the evidence of this writ, I think it has to be inferred that Chatham too, at the time, was regarded as one of the manors appropriated to the earldom of Kent. It had not been given to the bishop of Bayeux outright: it had been given to him in trust – and now it turned out that he broken that trust by giving away some of its assets. The particular case that we hear about (there may have been others) concerns a piece of land which Odo had given to the church of Rochester, ‘for the monks to make their garden there’ (doc. 14).<sup>14</sup> But this land, as the king was now informed, was one of the perquisites which went with the reeveship of Chatham, and ought not to have been given away. The king was magnanimous enough not to insist on the land being given back; instead he demanded a piece of land of equal value, by way of compensation. He also expected the monks to sing two hundred masses for his father’s soul. (Some time later, Chatham was given – given outright – to Haimo the sheriff, and its value was deducted from the value of the earldom. That had happened before any record of ‘the farm of the land of the bishop of Bayeux’ found its way into the surviving exchequer rolls (Flight 1998).)

## 14

A writ of Gundulf bishop of Rochester addressed to sheriff Haimo and the barons of Kent, concerning three acres of the land of

<sup>13</sup> There is also a copy in the charter roll for 1275 (*Calendar of Charter Rolls*, vol. 2, p. 194)

<sup>14</sup> The location of the piece of land given by bishop Odo remains uncertain. From doc. 14 we learn that it consisted of three acres, ‘next to the wall (of the city) on the outside’. By 1088 it had been surrounded with a wall of its own. The rubric in R2 identifies this land as ‘the land where the vineyard is’: that made sense in about 1220, but does not convey any definite meaning to us. Just a few years later, in 1225, a new ditch was dug around the city; and in consequence of that, very probably, a new site would have had to be found for the vineyard. (To the south of the southernmost wall around the cathedral precinct, there is a public garden called ‘The Vines’. Until someone convinces me otherwise – the earliest occurrence of the name known to me dates from 1759 (*Archaeologia Cantiana*, 15 (1883), 123) – I shall go on assuming that it was invented by some local antiquary in the eighteenth century.)

Borstal which he has given to the king in exchange for the three acres given to the church and monks by Odo bishop of Bayeux.

Gundulfus rofensium gratia dei episopus, Haimoni uicecomiti et omnibus baronibus regis de Cænt francigenis et anglis, salutem et benedictionem dei et suam quantum potest. Volo uos omnes scire me iam quietum esse aduersus regem de illa cambitione terrę quam ei promisi post uuæram Rofę, pro illis tribus acris quos Odo baiocensis episcopus dedit ecclesię sancti Andree et monachis nostris ad faciendum ibi ortum suum iuxta murum deforis uersus australem partem ciuitatis forinsecus, qui iam inclusi sunt muro circumquaque. Et illos tres acros terrę quos pro illis tribus dedi regi in cambitionem liberaui iam ministris uicecomitis, Rodberto scilicet de sc’o amando, et Rodberto latimier, et Ælfuino <sup>a</sup>fratre eius preposito de Cetham, et Grentoni de Rouecestra, de nostra dominica terra de Burchestealla, presentibus testibus istis, Ansgoto de rouecestra, Gosfrido talebot, Goisfrido de ros, <sup>b</sup>Radulfo pincerna Adę, Rodulfo clerico, et aliis multis de nostra familia et de ciuibus eiusdem uillę.

R1, fos. 211v–12r, with space for a heading but none supplied; R2, fo. 183r–v, with heading *De eadem* (i.e. *De terra ubi uinea est*); Thorpe 1769, p. 526, from R2

<sup>a</sup> sic R1, R2      <sup>b</sup> Radulfo with l corrected R1

Date: 1088×94 or a little later. Presumably not more than slightly later than doc. 13; at any rate earlier than 1100.

There are some interesting names here. Robert Latimier (his surname distinctly so spelt) is still active, though here he appears as one of sheriff Haimo’s officers.<sup>15</sup> He has a brother, Ælfrin, who is reeve of Chatham; Grento is reeve of Rochester (R1, fo. 189v). Among the witnesses, Goisfrid Talebot is one of the new men rewarded for their support in 1088, and Radulf the butler is a tenant of Adam son of Hubert’s.

## 15

A writ of Gislebert son of Ricard addressed to sheriff Rannulf and the barons of Surrey, concerning the land given by his man Othin to the church of Saint Andrew of Rochester.

Gilebertus filius Ricardi, Rannulfo uicecomiti et omnibus baronibus francigenis et anglis de comitatu de Suthereia, salutem. Sciatis quod ego dedi ecclesie sancti Andree de Rouecestra terram Othini hominis mei de Bullocchesfelda, pro cambitione illius terre quam habeo de eodem sancto infra leugam meam de Tunebrige, liberam et quietam ab omni consuetudine que ad me pertinet. Et hanc donationem meam facio cum filio eiusdem Othini ad faciendum <sup>a</sup>[eum] monachum ibi, pro anima patris mei et matris mee, et pro salute anime mee. Et isti sunt testes, Anselmus archiepiscopus <sup>b</sup>. . . . .

<sup>15</sup> Robert died during Anselm’s lifetime, i.e. before 1109 (R1, fo. 183r). His widow had some complicated dealings with the monks of Rochester (R1, fos. 200v–1r).

R2, fo. 140r, with heading *De terra de Bullocchesfeld'*.

<sup>a</sup> eum om. R2      <sup>b</sup> et c' R2, omitting the rest

Date: probably 1093×7. Anselm was in England at the time, and Gislebert would have wanted to get this matter settled as soon as he could. Other possible dates are 1100×3 and 1107×9.

There also exists an inflated version of this document (supposed original, Strood, DRc/T373; R2, fo. 139r–v; Thorpe 1769, p. 590, from R2). It seems sure to be a forgery (though I cannot say that I have looked at it very closely), but the witness list – which includes the name of Godefrid prior of Winchester (1082–1107) – may possibly be genuine.

In hard fact, this is a donation by Othin, payment for his son's admission as a monk. To make this donation he needs his lord's assent – but Gislebert, instead of just assenting, represents it as his own donation, and as a fulfilment of the promise that he had made (doc. 12).<sup>16</sup> (He glosses over the fact that the donation is worth less than 50 shillings.) Nothing further is known of Othin's son. A rent of 480 pence from *Bullocsfelde* is said to have been earmarked for the monks' clothing by bishop Gundulf (R1, fo. 196r); it is listed c. 1220 among the chamberer's rents (R3, fos. 101v, 102r; R4, fos. 51r, 52r, from R3; Thorpe 1788, p. 27 from R4).<sup>17</sup>

<sup>16</sup> A man called Odin, presumably the same, occurs in Surrey as a tenant of Gislebert's father at the time of the survey: he held 2.5 hides belonging to the manor of Bletchingley TQ 3250 (DB-Sy-34va). (His name is *Odmus* in the printed text, but the Phillimore edition assumes that it ought to be *Odinus* – and rightly so, as this document would seem to prove.)

<sup>17</sup> I have not identified 'Bullocksfield', but apparently it was somewhere in the parish of Bletchingley (R3, fo. 102v).