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ABSTRACT

S 786 is one of the so-called Orthodoxorum charters, a group of documents which provide important evidence about the Anglo-Saxon chancery, the development of charters in the tenth century, and the history of Pershore Abbey and the tenth-century Benedictine reforms. The document has therefore received a great deal of attention over the past century or so, but this attention has been focussed on the surviving tenth-century single sheet, and so a second, significantly different version of the text has lain unnoticed. This second version is preserved in a copy made by John Joscelyn, Latin Secretary to Archbishop Matthew Parker. Among the material uniquely preserved in this copy are Old English charter bounds for Wyegate (GL), Cumbtune (Compton, GL?) and part of the bounds probably for Lydney (GL), as well as a reference to a grant by Bishop Werferth of Worcester. In this article both versions of the document are discussed and are published together for the first time, and a translation of the single sheet is provided. The history of the two versions is discussed in some detail, and the text of a twelfth-century letter which refers to the charter is also edited and translated.

The so-called Orthodoxorum charters have long played an important role in our understanding of the tenth-century Benedictine reforms. They form a group of six charters, all purportedly issued between 959 and 993, and all surviving in multiple copies.¹ They are usually considered as a group because they share many similarities in formulation, most notably the proems which are all very long, approximately the same, and in the same style of elaborate (and quite difficult) ‘hermeneutic’ or ‘poetic’ Latin.² They are interesting with respect to the tenth-century Reforms because they all claim rights for their monastic beneficiaries such as the right to elect their own abbot from within their own

---

¹ The charters are S 658 (Abingdon, dated 959), S 673 (Abingdon, dated 958 for 959), S 876 (Abingdon, dated 993), S 786 (Pershore, dated 972), S 788 (Worcester, dated 972), and S 812 (Romsey, datable 967 × 975). In references to Anglo-Saxon charters, S = P. H. Sawyer, Anglo-Saxon Charters: an Annotated List and Bibliography, R. Hist. Soc. Guides and Handbooks 8 (London, 1968), followed by the number of the document.

They are also important for the debate over the production of royal charters. And they are of further interest because their authenticity has been debated for over a century.

This latter debate is long and complex and can only be summarized briefly here. Two of the more recent protagonists are Simon Keynes and Susan Kelly; other important contributions include that by Eric John, and useful summary discussions have been published by both Charles Insley and John Hudson. In short, Simon Keynes (among others) has argued that only the latest of the group, S 876, is genuine and that the rest are forgeries, whereas Susan Kelly is one of several to argue that the earlier charters are genuine (with the exception of S 788, to which we shall return shortly). Both scholars have drawn on a long series of discussions which can be traced back nearly a century.

The purpose of this article is not to solve the question of authenticity, although that question will certainly be in the background. Instead, the focus of this discussion is on one of these charters: the one from Pershore. This document, S 786, is unusual even by Orthodoxorum standards. It survives in an apparently original single sheet, the text of which is mostly legible but with patches of relatively extensive wear. The text is unusually long: the surviving single sheet is one of the largest to survive from Anglo-Saxon England and still the scribe could not fit all the text on the face despite his small hand but had to continue onto the dorse as well. The charter purports to be a pancart, namely a single document confirming a very large number – presumably all – of the estates held by the abbey. This format of the pancart was relatively common on the Continent but very few survive from Anglo-Saxon England, and all of the ones from there which we do have are questionable in some way; the very format is therefore grounds for suspicion. Given all these difficulties, the purpose of this paper is to compile and reevaluate the evidence which can be

6 For a full bibliography, see The Electronic Sawyer Online Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Charters <www.esawyer.org.uk> (last accessed 21 May 2008) under the Sawyer numbers listed above, n. 1.
gleaned from close examination of all the surviving manuscripts of S 786. The hope is that such a compilation will allow a better understanding of the \textit{Orthodoxorum} charters in general and the Pershore one in particular. Indeed the importance of the manuscripts can readily be demonstrated as one of them, one which has long been known but apparently not closely examined, is not a copy of the surviving single-sheet charter as scholars have assumed but instead contains a significantly different version of the text, including three ‘new’ charter bounds which have not previously been studied. It is also of great importance for our understanding of Pershore Abbey, the transmission of documents, and the authenticity and larger context of the \textit{Orthodoxorum} charters in general.

\textbf{The Manuscripts}

Peter Sawyer’s \textit{Annotated List} gives five surviving copies of S 786, and this list is essentially unchanged in the \textit{Electronic Sawyer}.\textsuperscript{8} There is a sixth manuscript: a modern transcript of Sawyer’s MS 2 made before the original was damaged in the Cottonian fire; this copy is generally very accurate and thus provides some readings which have otherwise been lost. The six manuscripts are therefore as follows:

- **A** London, British Library, Cotton Augustus ii. 6 (s. x\textsuperscript{2})
- **T** London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. xiii, 163v–164r (s. xi\textsuperscript{2}; contains only the bounds of Acton Beauchamp)
- **V** London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius D. vii, 29r–30v (s. x\textsuperscript{vi})
- **D\textsuperscript{1}** Oxford, Bodleian Library, Dodsworth 10 (S.C. 4152), 66r–67r (s. xvii; direct descendant of A; no bounds or witnesses)
- **D\textsuperscript{2}** Oxford, Bodleian Library, Dodsworth 78 (S.C. 5019), 2r–3v (s. xvii; direct descendant of A; no bounds or witnesses)
- **R** Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson B. 445, unfoliated; the text is labelled as from fol. ‘B. 160’ of exemplar (s. xvii; direct copy of T)

These six manuscripts fall into three distinct textual groups, and these groups will now be discussed in further detail.

\textit{The ‘Single Sheet’ Version (AD\textsuperscript{1}D\textsuperscript{2})}

The earliest surviving copy of the document is Augustus ii. 6.\textsuperscript{9} This is a single sheet and is ostensibly original but, as noted above, its authenticity is by no means certain. It is unusually large: it is not perfectly square but measures

\textsuperscript{8} Sawyer, \textit{Anglo-Saxon Charters}, pp. 250–1; \textit{Electronic Sawyer}, no. 786.

\textsuperscript{9} For another discussion of this manuscript see S. D. Thompson, \textit{Anglo-Saxon Royal Diplomas: a Palaeography}, Publ. of the Manchester Centre for AS Stud. 6 (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 142–5. An edition of the text and translation of the Latin is given below, pp. 43–53 and 73–6.
Peter A. Stokes

approximately $635 \times 530–40$ mm, with a writing-frame of approximately $590 \times 495$ mm; it is written in fifty-six long lines on the face and has an additional seventeen lines on the dorse. The text is quite badly damaged in places, particularly along the horizontal folds, in the lower right-hand corner, and about two-thirds of the way up the right-hand side of the face. The parchment was repaired at some point after the charter was reproduced in the facsimile-edition of 1877. Unfortunately these repairs have obscured letters, so the facsimile is still a valuable witness.

The scribe wrote the boundary-clauses in a smaller script than that of the main text, as was normal from about 940 onwards, but he used the same Insular letter-forms for both Old English and Latin; this practice of script was common up until about the start of Æthelred’s reign, after which charters were normally written in Anglo-Caroline for Latin and either Square minuscule or Vernacular minuscule for Old English. There is some influence of Caroline script in this scribe’s hand, however, and he did admit Caroline forms, though very infrequently: the phrase *coapostolo paulo dedicatum habetur monachis* in the middle of line 11 was written with three of the four occurrences of *a* and the first *d* all Caroline, as shown in Figure 1. Indeed, Caroline *d* and *a* are evident elsewhere in the document, although the round-backed ‘uncial’ *d* and single-compartment *a* are both much more common. Similarly, tall essentially Caroline *s* is found before *t*, but the round majuscule *s* was normally used elsewhere, although low Insular *s* was also used occasionally. Finally, the

---

10 Thompson has noted that this is one of the two largest single-sheet charters to survive from Anglo-Saxon England, the other being BL. Cotton Augustus ii. 38 (S 876), also from the Orthodoxorum group. My measurements of Augustus ii. 6 are rather different from hers, however, and agree with Susan Kelly’s. See Thompson, *Anglo-Saxon Royal Diplomas*, p. 20, and S. E. Kelly, ‘S 786’ (unpubl. material in preparation for her volume on the Midlands archives in the Anglo-Saxon Charters series). I thank Dr Kelly for generously providing me with a draft of her text well before publication.

11 As noted by Thompson, *Anglo-Saxon Royal Diplomas*, p. 145, no are rulings visible but, pace her, it is unlikely that the parchment was never ruled. Prickings are clearly visible on the left and occasionally on the right, and the scribe consistently maintained a very straight and horizontal baseline despite the extremely long lines of text, a feat that would require extraordinary skill if the sheet was not ruled. Much more likely is that the ruling was light and is no longer visible due to the poor condition of the parchment.


proportions are not obviously square in the way that one might expect for Square minuscule, and in particular the distinctive flat-topped a is entirely absent, the letter-form instead being more rounded and somewhat tear-drop shaped.\textsuperscript{16}

\begin{center}
Fig. 1 Variation in a, d and s in Augustus ii. 6
\end{center}

It is perhaps for these reasons that the script used to be dated to the eleventh century, but more recent palaeographers from T. A. M. Bishop onwards have tended to prefer the tenth century, and indeed the script seems not inconsistent with the claimed date of 972.\textsuperscript{17} In particular, as Dumville has shown, some Square minuscule which can be securely dated to the early 960s is unusually tall and narrow in its proportions and entirely lacks the flat-topped a, sometimes showing the Caroline form; it therefore has much in common with script of the early eleventh century.\textsuperscript{18} The hand of our single sheet is not so clearly tall and narrow as this form of Square minuscule, but it is written quite consistently

\textsuperscript{16} For the development of a at the end of the tenth century, see ibid., p. xxviii, and Stokes, ‘English Vernacular Script’, passim; for some other examples of tenth-century script showing non-Square a see Dumville, ‘English Square Minuscule: Mid-Century Phases’, pp. 151–6 and plate VI.


\textsuperscript{18} This script is Dumville’s Anglo-Saxon Square minuscule, Phase IV: see his ‘English Square Minuscule: Mid-Century Phases’, pp. 151–5. For the relationship between Phase IV Square minuscule, Anglo-Caroline, and the English Vernacular minuscule which emerged in the 990s, see especially Stokes, ‘English Vernacular Script’ I, 200–8, as well as D. N. Dumville, ‘Beowulf Come Lately: Some Notes on the Palaeography of the Nowell Codex’, A\textsuperscript{S}N\textsuperscript{SL} 225 (1988), 49–63, and Dumville, ‘Specimina’, pp. 8–9.
throughout, probably too consistently to be an eleventh-century imitation. Furthermore the forms of tall æ and e in ligature, as well as the mixture of round, tall and low s, are paralleled quite closely in some hands which were certainly or possibly written at Worcester Cathedral around the time of Oswald’s episcopacy, although those hands are otherwise quite different from this one. Unfortunately a full history of Anglo-Saxon Square minuscule is still to be written for the period from 960 until its demise in the early years of the eleventh century, and so dating a hand from this time at all closely is a perilous exercise. Nevertheless, the similarity in letter-forms and appearance with other single-sheet charters dated to the 960s is striking. A later date is still possible, but the short stints of Caroline script, as illustrated in Fig. 1, show none of the features which are characteristic of Anglo-Caroline minuscule from about the second quarter of the eleventh century. If this document is a forgery, then, it was surely written not long after the purported date, and the script suggests no more than thirty-five or perhaps forty years later at most.

The single sheet received a relatively large number of alterations. Some of these are minor changes in Old English orthography which seem to have been made by the original scribe and which do not seem particularly significant except to indicate that some care was taken in writing and correcting the document. Perhaps related are some erasures of the Latin text, most of which are short and of little obvious significance. However, one erasure is much longer


22 For this script, called Style IV Anglo-Caroline by Dumville, see his *English Caroline Script and Monastic History: Studies in Benedictinism, A.D. 950–1030*, Stud. in AS Hist. 6 (Woodbridge, 1993), pp. 128–31. Features characteristic of this style include the form of a and s, wedges on minims, and tapered ascenders, none of which are present in the script of Augustus ii. 6.

23 For a full account of these alterations, see the edition of the text below, pp. 43–52.
than the others: it comes immediately after the list of estates and covers the space of about 125–30 letters or just over half a line of the charter. Erasures cannot usually be dated with any confidence, but this may be an exception: the last letter of the word which precedes the erasure, libertatis, seems to have been added or freshened-up: indeed, it looks as if this letter was accidentally erased along with the following passage and then written in again. Interestingly, this s has the same round form which is found elsewhere throughout the document and which is common enough in the tenth century but dropped out of use fairly quickly in the eleventh. The letter may have been written by a later scribe in imitation of the main hand, but if so then it was done with some sensitivity and skill; an alternative and perhaps more likely possibility is that the erasure and ‘freshening up’ were by the original scribe.

One set of alterations seems to be quite different in character from the others. These are all found in the list of estates and hidages included in the grant. Several of the hidages have been altered, and these alterations do not seem to have been made by the main scribe: however, the hand looks Anglo-Saxon, insofar as one can tell from such a small sample, and so the changes were presumably made not long after the original document was written (although even a century later would be possible on palaeographical grounds, if not historical ones). In some cases, numbers were erased and different numbers were clearly written over the top. In other cases one cannot be certain of erasure but the spacing strongly suggests that this has happened. For example, the hidage for Stüre now reads as ten (‘x’), but there is a gap after the numeral which suggests that the number was once longer. Similarly, the document does not specify the total number of hides, but there is a space where the number may once have been, and the letter immediately preceding the space looks like it was partially erased along with the hidage. Another possibility is that the hidages were left blank and filled in later, but most of the numerals do seem clearly to have been entered by the main scribe at the time of writing and so later erasure is the most likely explanation.

Fig. 2 Examples of altered hidages in Augustus ii. 6

24 This gap is very clearly an erasure, as noted also by Kelly, ‘S 786’, pace Thompson, Anglo-Saxon Royal Diplomas, p. 143.
Finally, one other set of interventions is visible in the document. These are sporadic underlines and one large caret-shaped symbol in the proem, one vertical stroke in the list of estates and another after the end of the first boundary-clause, and perhaps also a red bracket before another boundary-clause which is now almost entirely lost due to damage in the parchment. These marks may well have been added at different times, but the underlines and the caret-symbol appear to be in similar or identical ink, and this ink is noticeably darker than that used elsewhere in this document. These underlines and their significance will be considered shortly. For now it needs only be said that the charter which now survives as Augustus ii. 6 received careful attention, both when it was first written and possibly for quite some time thereafter.

![Image](image-url)

**Fig. 3** Examples of underlines and the ‘caret’ symbol in Augustus ii. 6

Turning from this manuscript, there are two others which need also to be mentioned here. These are Dodsworth 10 and Dodsworth 78, manuscripts four and five in Sawyer’s handlist, both of which are now in the Bodleian Library in Oxford; the former is described in the summary catalogue as ‘a first draft of Dugdale and Dodsworth’s *Monasticon*, wherein practically the whole of its contents are incorporated’, and the latter as ‘notes from chartularies and monastic collections in the Cottonian Library’. Both copies descend from Augustus ii. 6 and both stop at the beginning of the vernacular bounds. Their relationship to Augustus ii. 6 is evident not only from the identical content but also because Dodsworth 78 begins with a sketch of the *Ae* which is found at the start of Augustus ii. 6, and both Dodsworth 10 and Dodsworth 78 contain notes referring explicitly to an exemplar in Cotton’s library. Furthermore, some illegible portions of the single sheet, including the long erased passage, are represented by dots in both copies. The copies are therefore of little use in establishing the text, particularly as Dodsworth 10 is extremely

---

26 See below, pp. 71–2.
27 F. Madan et al., *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*, 7 vols. (Oxford, 1895–1953) II, 872 (no. 4152) and 912 (no. 5019) respectively.
28 ‘Ex Carta Originali penes Thomas Cotton Baronettum’ (Dodsworth 10, 66r); ‘collecta . . . in bibliotheca Cottoniana mense Decembris 1639 per me Rogerum Dodsworth eboracensem’ (Dodsworth 78, i recto: the passage is part of the heading of a table of contents which includes the copy of S 786).
inaccurate, often containing *lectiones faciliores* which are ungrammatical or entirely nonsensical. Many of these errors can also be found in Dodsworth 78 but were subsequently corrected there, apparently by comparison with the original. These common errors suggest that the two copies were not made independently, and indeed one might assume that Dodsworth 10 was copied directly from Dodsworth 78. However, original and legible readings in Dodsworth 78 are left as lacunae in Dodsworth 10, a detail hard to explain if either one is a direct copy of the other. A case of eye-skip in Dodsworth 10 might seem to confirm copying from manuscript 78, as the skipped passage in the former (‘necon . . . coapostolorum Paulo’) corresponds exactly to a complete line of text in the latter. However, this same passage also fits exactly between two vertical folds in Augustus ii. 6 and so the copyist may have skipped from one fold to the next while he was copying, a mistake which is easy to understand in a large document with such long lines. Indeed examination of separate variants seems to demonstrate that both copies were made from an intermediate and that Dodsworth 78 was then checked against Augustus ii. 6 at a later date. A sample of these variants is listed in Table 1, below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Augustus ii. 6 (A)</th>
<th>Dodsworth 10 (D¹)</th>
<th>Dodsworth 78 (D²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>liminibus</em></td>
<td><em>luminibus</em></td>
<td><em>luminibus</em> (altered from <em>luminibus</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>dictu</em></td>
<td><em>die tu</em></td>
<td><em>dictu</em> (altered from <em>die tu</em> or perhaps <em>dic tu</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>præcluens</em></td>
<td><em>præcluens</em></td>
<td><em>præcluens</em> (altered from <em>præcluens</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>congregatio</em></td>
<td><em>congregatio</em></td>
<td><em>congregatio</em> (altered from <em>congregatio</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sacredum</em></td>
<td><em>...</em></td>
<td><em>...</em> (series of dots)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>abbatem</em></td>
<td><em>...</em></td>
<td>(series of dots) <em>iuste</em> (clear; not altered or inserted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>a rege uidelicet</em></td>
<td><em>aregeind the et</em></td>
<td><em>a rege nidiciet</em> (altered from <em>?tregeind the et</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAHE, HAM, SUTH, LONGAN</td>
<td>LEANE, NAA, SUTN, LONGAH</td>
<td>LEAHE, HAA, SUTH, LONGAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 on TRESHAM</td>
<td>LONTRESNAA</td>
<td>7 on TRESHAA (clear; not altered)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>neniam nec in theoria</em> (written across fold)</td>
<td><em>vrinam . . .</em> (series of dots) <em>eroba</em></td>
<td><em>neniam nec in theoria</em> (clear; not altered or inserted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>barrati</em></td>
<td><em>barrati . . .</em> (series of dots) <em>cum</em></td>
<td><em>barrati</em> <em>incendiis trusus cum</em> (last word altered from <em>?lugubris; incendiis unclear</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Saphyra ingiter</em></td>
<td><em>Saphyra ingiter</em> (series of dots)</td>
<td><em>Saphyra ingiter</em> <em>miserrimus cruciatur.</em> (clear; not altered or inserted)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Sample collation from AD¹D²

29 A pencilled note on Dodsworth 10, 66r, has an O with a circle around it followed by ‘fol. 2’, a clear reference to the copy in Dodsworth 78; for these shelfmarks of letters within shapes see J. Hunter, *Three Catalogues: Describing the Contents of the Red Book of the Exchequer, of the Dodsworth Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, and of the Manuscripts in the Library of the Honourable Society of Lincoln’s Inn* (London, 1838), pp. 76–82. Madan also noted that Dodsworth 10 was transcribed out of other Dodsworth manuscripts including number 78 but did not specify which parts were copied from which manuscripts; he cites as evidence a list on folio 6v of Dodsworth 10, but that list does not specifically mention Pershore. See Madan, *Summary Catalogue II*, 872 (no. 4152).
The second manuscript given in Peter Sawyer’s *Annotated List* is ‘Hemming’s Cartulary’ which was compiled towards the end of the eleventh century at Worcester. This manuscript does not contain a copy of S 786, however: instead it contains the boundary-clause for just one of the estates in our document, namely that of Acton Beauchamp, an estate which was claimed by Pershore, Worcester, and also Evesham in the eleventh century. The compiler may have had a full copy of S 786 but selected only one boundary clause for inclusion, but this seems unlikely. Furthermore, the boundary-points are the same in all three versions but the phrasing of each version is different from the others, and it is hard to imagine why the phrasing would have been altered so significantly while the text was being copied. On balance, it seems more likely that the copy in ‘Hemming’s Cartulary’ was drawn from a different exemplar than that of either Augustus ii. 6 or the transcript discussed below. The cartulary was damaged in the Cottonian fire, and material towards the front and back of the volume (including the bounds of Acton Beauchamp) can be difficult to read. However, a copy of the entire manuscript was made before the fire and is now preserved at Oxford; it is listed as R above. A note on the first flyleaf of the copy states that it was made for one Richard Graves of Mickleton and was used by Hearne in his edition of the cartulary. Several of the boundary-clauses in this copy have been recently collated against the original by the author of the present paper, and the transcript has generally proven to be very accurate and a useful witness for readings that are now lost.

**The ‘Transcript’ Version (V)**

This leaves Vitellius D. vii, a paper manuscript written in the sixteenth century which was burnt during the fire at Ashburnham House in 1731. The manuscript was made by John Joscelyn, Latin secretary to Matthew Parker, and is generally referred to as ‘Joscelyn’s notebook’ as it contains his transcripts of

---


32 This has also been suggested by Kelly, ‘S 786’. For the texts see the bounds of Acton Beauchamp below, pp. 47, 54–5, and 57.

33 For these collations, see LangScape: the Language of Landscape; Reading the Anglo-Saxon Countryside <www.langscape.org.uk> version 0.9 (last accessed 15 October 2008), boundaries for S 80, S 104, S 121, S 174, S 180, S 201, S 217, S 401 and S 1335.
charters, chronicles, and other historical and Anglo-Saxon texts. As a result of the fire the leaves are burnt all around the edges, usually with loss on all four sides, and comparison with descriptions in catalogues made before the fire reveals the loss of material at the start of the manuscript and the jumbled order of the leaves which remain. A few letters are lost at the edges of every page, and several lines are gone from the tops and bottoms. The pages are not ruled and the density of the writing varies significantly, but the leaves containing S 786 have between about forty-five and fifty-five long lines surviving on each page, with the remnants of several more lines visible at the bottoms of the pages. The text begins on a recto with the right-hand margin still visible, but the left-hand margin and the first few letters of each line are burnt away; similarly the right-hand edge of the text is lost on the following verso, and so on. The very end of the text has been burnt away but Wanley recorded a note which is now lost: ‘Habui ab Matthaeo Archiepiscopo Cant. et exhibita fuit per Parcivelum Creswel nomine Abbatis et Conventus de Parshoyer 15 Sept. an. 1537.’ This seems to indicate that Joscelyn’s exemplar was at Pershore shortly before the abbey was dissolved in 1539 and that the original then came into the possession of Matthew Parker. The exemplar was not Augustus ii. 6, however, as Joscelyn transcribed a text significantly different to that of the surviving single sheet. The Latin proem is more or less identical, but the list of estates


36 This difference was noticed by Gale who has printed the texts in Augustus ii. 6 and Vitellius D. vii. However, she has provided no discussion, noting simply that Joscelyn’s exemplar no longer survives. See Gale, ‘John Joscelyn’s Notebook’, pp. 194–5 and her Appendix II.
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is quite different, and three boundary-clauses, one very incomplete, are also included which are not known from anywhere else.  

The Texts

All six witnesses were fully collated when preparing this edition; however, as noted above, the Dodsworth transcripts are direct copies of the surviving single sheet and so are omitted from the apparatus here except where they provide evidence for otherwise lost or uncertain readings. Augustus ii. 6, Vitellius D. vii, and Tiberius A. xiii have all suffered fairly extensive damage and thus portions of each are now illegible or burnt away, but in many cases these readings can be restored with some confidence. The photograph of Augustus ii. 6 which was printed by the British Museum in their series of facsimiles clearly shows a number of readings which have since been covered by repairs; these are provided in the text without comment, as are readings which have been recovered by examination and enhancement of a high-quality digital photograph of the single sheet. Similarly, if one or two letters are lost from the burnt edges of the pages in Vitellius D. vii, and if the reading is otherwise consistent with the remaining copies, then these losses are not noted. Alterations are generally noted, however, and the distinction is made between material which has been crossed out, represented here in strikethrough, and erased, represented here by a note in the apparatus.

The vernacular boundary-clauses present additional problems to the Latin text. First, the charter bounds are only preserved in the Augustus and Vitellius manuscripts, so the Dodsworth copies are of no use in establishing lost readings. Second, although very many of the boundary-points are the same in the two versions, nevertheless the phrasing is significantly different, as often is the spelling. These differences are important and should be recorded but they are also too numerous and complex to include in an apparatus. For this reason the largely vernacular portion of Vitellius D. vii from list of estates through to the end of the boundary-clauses are not collated against that of Augustus ii. 6 but are printed separately afterwards. Where the two versions are printed separately, lost readings are supplied in square brackets where this can be done with some confidence, thus: ‘re[con]struction’. If lost text can be postulated by comparison with the other version but without any further evidence to support it then this text is again printed in square brackets but is also italicized to emphasize its more speculative nature, thus: [tentative reconstruction]. Ellipses ‘...’ indicate lost text which cannot be reconstructed, and angled brackets <> indicate supplied readings for which there is no space in the manuscript.

38 See below, pp. 57–65.  39 See above, p. 34.
Latin ę in Joscelyn’s transcript is silently normalized to e, as is j to i and v to u, but ę is preserved when used in Old English. In the portion of text which is common to the Augustus and Vitellius manuscripts, the Latin orthography of the single sheet is followed and minor variations in the transcript are not noted; these differences include ecclesia, ecclesiasticus, decussatim, prob, Saphira, Britannie and once dipinxi in Vitellius for aeclesia, aeclesiasticus, decusatim, pro, Saphyra, Brittanie and depinxi in Augustus. Similarly the practice of the single sheet in the use of æ, ę, and e is followed throughout the (Latin) portions printed in common, and variations in the transcript are not noted. Old English wynn (ƿ) has been normalized to w in all texts, and all abbreviations in both Old English and Latin have been silently expanded except for the Tironian nota (起重) when used in the vernacular; this last abbreviation has been preserved because the scribe of Augustus ii. 6 used both ond and and as well as the nota and so no consistent expansion can be provided. Crossed thorn (ƿ) is silently expanded to þæt in the Augustus text and ðæt in the Vitellius text in order to preserve the respective orthographies. No attempt is made to reproduce the punctuation or word-division of either manuscript.40

BL Cotton Augustus ii. 6

40 Many of the texts have also been translated and more fully edited by D. Hooke, Worcestershire Anglo-Saxon Charter-Bounds, Stud. in Anglo-Saxon History 2 (Woodbridge, 1990), pp. 177–230 (no. 29) and D. Hooke, Warwickshire Anglo-Saxon Charter Bounds, Studies in Anglo-Saxon History 10 (Woodbridge, 1999), pp. 67–71 (no. 8). A full edition and discussion by Susan Kelly is also forthcoming as part of the British Academy series on Anglo-Saxon Charters, a draft of which is Kelly, ‘S 786’. At the time of writing the LangScape database contained information about the bounds in S 786 but the semi-diplomatic transcripts were not yet available for display or word searches. See ‘Archives’ in LangScape (under the ‘Resources’ submenu; last accessed 15 October 2008).
famina stupenda cecinisse uidetur carmina, cui æclesia tota catholica consona uocablem proclamat: 'Beata es uirgo Maria que credidisti, perficientur in te que dicta sunt tibi a Domino.' Mirum dictu incarnatur urbum et incorporatur, scilicet illud de quo evangelista supereminentis uniuersorum altitudine sensuum inquit: 'In principio erat urbum et urbum erat apud Deum et Deus erat urbum,' et reliqua. Qua uidelicet sumpta de uirgine incarnatione antiquæ uirginis facinus demitur et cunctis mulieribus nitidis praeluens taumatibus decus irrogatur. Intacta igitur redolente Christi divinitate passaque ipsius humanitate libertas addictis clementer contigit seruulis.

Hinc ego Eadgar altithrono amminiculante Anglorum ceterarumque gentium in circuitu triuatiem persistentium basileus, ut huius libertatis altithroni moderatoris clementia mereat optinere consortium, coenobio loco celebri qui ab huius prosapie solicolis Perscoran nobili nuncupatur uocabulo situm, genetricique domini nostri semper uirgni Marie, necnon beato Petro apostolorum principi eiusque coapostolo Paulo, dedicat habetur, monachis regulariter degentibus monasticæ aeternæ sanctiones. Inde igitur priuilegii concedo libertatem, quatenus post decessum Foldbrihti abbatis egregii eius temporibus hæc libertatis restitutio concessa est quem sibi uniuersa præfati coenobii congregatio apto elegerit consilio secundum regularia beati Benedicti institutæ abbatem et iustæ ex codem fratrum cuneo eligens constituat

Huius priuilegii libertas deinceps usu perpetuo a cunctis teneatur catholicis, nec extraneorum quispiam tyrannica fretus contumacia inw predicto monasterio ius arreptiens exercet potestatis, sed eiusdem coenobii collegium perpetuum. Qua uidelicet providentia Christi sufragante concessa est quem sibi præfati coenobii congregatio, cum ejusdem seriebus, congrue beati Benedicti institutæ abbatem et iustæ ex codem fratrum cuneo elegens constitutæ

Huius priuilegii libertas deinceps usum perpetuum a cunctis teneatur catholicis, nec extraneorum quispiam tyrannica fretus contumacia inw predicto monasterio ius arreptiens exercet potestatis, sed eiusdem coenobii collegium perpetuum. Qua uidelicet providentia Christi sufragante concessa est quem sibi præfati coenobii congregatio, cum ejusdem seriebus, congrue beati Benedicti institutæ abbatem et iustæ ex codem fratrum cuneo elegens constitutæ.
Tempore siquidem quo rura quae domino deuoto concessi animo iniuste a sancta Dei æclesia ablata fuerant, perfidi quique nouas sibi hereditarias cartas usurpantes ediderunt sed in patris et filii et spiritus sancti nomine precipimus ut catholicorum nemo easdem recipiat, sed a cunctis repudiaret fidelibus in anathemate deputentur ueteri iugiter uigente priuilegio.

Si quis uero tam epilempticus phylargiriæ seductus amentia (quod non optamus) hanc nostræ munificentæ dapsilitatem ausu temerario infringere temptauerit, sit ipse ueteri iugiter uigente priuilegio.

Dis sindon þa lond gemœra þæra tun londa þe into perscoran belimpað.

[Pershore Estates] Ærest of piri forda on þa dic, andlang dic on þa pyrigan, of þære pyrigan on pone mapuldre, of þam mapuldre on eap mana wylman, [of þære wyllan] to þam h[æwe, be] þære h[æwe to þam bænincges byrig, of b]ænincges byrig to weall ge[ate], of we[alh ge]te to mæ[r] cnolle, of mæ[r] cnolle on lind hoh, of lind ho on clottes more, of clottes more on mær p[ul], ondlong pulles on afene, of afene on caldan wyllan, of caldan wyllan on wyrð hlinc, of wyrð hlinc on hor þyt, [of] hor pyþte o[þ]n culfan mere, of þæm mere on hag[an weg, of hagan weg on b]roc [h]rycg, of broc hryge on þa caldan dic, of d[þære dic] on swyne, of swyn[e] on reod dic, of þære dic on weorces inimico liberatus est. Et cum Iuda Christi proditore sinistra in parte poris et sanguinis Iesu Christi filii Dei, per quem totus terrarum orbis ab antiquo humano generis inimico liberatus est. Et cum Iuda Christi proditore sinistra in parte deputatus, ni prius hic digna penituerit quod contra sanctam Dei æclesiam rebellis agere pressumpsit, nec in uita hac practica ueniam nec in theoria requiem apostata obtineat ullam, sed æternis barathri incendiis trusus cum Anania et Saphyra iugiter miserrimus crucierut, g3 h3

Ærest of piri forda on þa dic, of ærest of piri forda on þa dic, andlang dic on piddes meres weg, of þæm dic on swyne, of swyn[e] on reod dic, of þære dic on weorces onlyncges byrig, of b]ænincges byrig to weall ge[ate], of we[alh ge]te to mæ[r] cnolle, of mæ[r] cnolle on lind hoh, of lind ho on clottes more, of clottes more on mær p[ul], ondlong polyng pulles on afene, of afene on caldan wyllan, of caldan wyllan on wyrð hlinc, of wyrð hlinc on hor þyt, [of] hor pyþte o[þ]n culfan mere, of þæm mere on hag[an weg, of hagan weg on b]roc [h]rycg, of broc hryge on þa caldan dic, of d[þære dic] on swyne, of swyn[e] on reod dic, of þære dic on weorces inimico liberatus est. Et cum Iuda Christi proditore sinistra in parte poris et sanguinis Iesu Christi filii Dei, per quem totus terrarum orbis ab antiquo humano generis inimico liberatus est. Et cum Iuda Christi proditore sinistra in parte deputatus, ni prius hic digna penituerit quod contra sanctam Dei æclesiam rebellis agere pressumpsit, nec in uita hac practica ueniam nec in theoria requiem apostata obtineat ullam, sed æternis barathri incendiis trusus cum Anania et Saphyra iugiter miserrimus crucierut, g3 h3

[Wihtlafestun (North Piddle), Abberton, Naunton and Ælflædetun (Flyford Flavell)] Þis sind þara feower tuna lond gemœra wihtlafes tun 7 eadbriht[il]neg tun 7 niwan tun 7 ælflæde tun. Ærest of pidelan on þa caldan dic, of þære dic 7lang fura on
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thea to winter burnan, of winter burnan on hina gmæran on þone ealdan weg, of þamæg hege on tittan dune 7 of tittan dune on byligan fen, of byligan fenne on wixena broc, ondlang broces on pidelan, 7lang pidelan þæt eft on wihlfæs gemæra.

[Flyford (Dormston?)] Þis sind þa lond ge<max>ra⁵ into fle[ferð. Æ]res[t] of þam ealdan slede on [w]nter burnan, of þære burnan on þane swyn hege, 7lang heges on comeres mæduan, of þam mæduan on hodes æc, of þære æc 7lang heges to þæm wege, 7lang wesges on winter burnan, 7lang burnan on hereferðes maduan, þonan in þæt sic, of þam sice in þæne cumb, of þam cumbe on þa ealdan dic, 7lang dice in pidelan, 7lang pidelan to bradan hamme, a butan bradan hamm[e]ft in pidelan, 7lang pidelan eft to þæm slæpe.

[Martin] Hussingtree Þis sind þa lond gemæra to husan treo. Ærest of þære stræt 7lang dic to bradan 7lang burnan on³ seale weorpæn, ondlang seale weorpæn to col forda, of col forda 7lang þære mielan dic on æl broc, 7lang broces on ðecorner³ mor, of þam more 7lang dic on føower gemæra, of þæm gemæran to þorn lehe, of þorn lehe 7lang eft on þa stræt.

[Longdon] Þis sind þæs londes gemæra into langan dune. Ærest of sæfern on wiferðes mæduan hege, of þam hege³ on þone hricg, of þam hricg on þone wulf hagan midne of þam wulf hagan to þam ðrym gemæran, of þæm ðrym gemæran to pis bræce, of pis bræce to tidbrihteg hamme, of þan hamme on pyrt broc, 7lang broces to pyræan heale, of þartan healle to halgan geate, of hagan geate to twy forde, of twy fyrdre to luft beec, of luft bece betwæceon dune, of þære dune on hwitan³ cumb, of þam cumbe on swyn geat, of swyn geate 7lang æce þæt on hæð hricg, of hæð ríce on sæt ríce, of sæt ríce on æc mor, of sæc more on æl, of ælc on orices pul, of orices pulle ef⁵ on sæfern.

[Chaceley, Eldersfield, Staunton, and Wynburh Edisce] Þis sindan þa lond gemæra into ceatewes leahe 7 to yldres³ felda 7 to stan tune 7 to wynburhe edisce. Ærest of an burnan to cum bran wæorde, of cumbran weorþæ to þære mæran æc, of ðæreme³ æc to stan hlincan, of stan hlincan³ to reade burnan, of reade burnan to healære³ mere, of healære mere to þære æc, of þære æc to hagan leahe, of þære leahe on sæcæ bræce, of sæcæ bræce to þan hean dore, of ðærome³ þan dore to brydæ bræce, 7lang bþroces þæt in glencingæ, 7lang glencingæ þæt in ledene, 7lang ledene to mær bræce, of mær bræce to brycæ geleagan, of brycæ geleagan on bradan ford on glencingæ, 7lang glencingæ to blæcan mores ford, of blæcan mores ford to þan halgan geate, of þan halgan geate to risc heale, of hrisc heale to þam hæl, of þam hæl a be wuda to þam æsceæ, of þam æsce to þære æceæ, of þære æceæ to bradan leahe, of bradan leahe to feles gæfeæ, of feles gæfeæ to cram pulæ to þam mær hege, of ðæmæg hege on s[æ]fern, of sæfern eft on an burnan.

[Powick] Þis sindon þa lond gemæra into poinec wican. Ærest up of sæfern on beornwoldes sætan, of beornwoldes sætan on hagan geate, of hagan geate on sæcæ lares stræd, of sæcæ lares stræd on troh hræcæ, of troh hræcæ on telesæ mor, of þæmæ [more] on baldæ hraegæ, of baldæ hraegæ on flotæ hraegæ, of flotæ hraegæa⁴⁴ on þa smæðan æcæ, of ðæreme æcæ on lindælæ hraegæ, of lind hraegææ on abban dunes wican, of abban dunes wican æn baldæ geate, of baldæ geate on cust leahe, of cust leahe æn eadwoldægæ geate middeæræ æn eadwoldægæ leahe æn steapanææ æn steapanææ æn ðæmæg æn greatan lindan,
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of ðære lindan on cardan stigew, of ðære[ç] stigew in wearman dene to hrood broc geate, of ðam geate on wæðe burunan, ðlang wæðe burunan ðæt wiðutan ðone snæd hege ðæt to scir hylt geate, of scir hylt geate on codran ford, ondlang codran on [cfr]om[a] ðæt to ðære cældan stræt, ondlong ðære stræt to maw pul, ðlang pulles on temedel, ðlang temedan eft in [sæfern].

[Leigh] Ð[is sind]\[b] ð[a] land gemæra into beornðodes leahe. Ærest of cadvoldincæ leahe an æcer, of ðam æcere on mer helge, ðlong mer[æ] heges on sceancpan[æ] h[yl], of [scean]pan hylle on wæðe burunan, of ðære burnan on g[undel]ng rycg, of ðam rycge on codran, of codran to syl beame, of syl beame to crome, of crome to hwitan wyllan, of ðære wyllan to hagan geate, of hagan geate to ðære greatæ æc, of ðære æc on ða sand seaes, of ðam seaæn in temedal, of temedel on ða lyttan becas ðahan [on grindles bece], of grindles bece swa ðæt gemære ligð in tem[eda]n, of temedan onbutdan elders ege ðæt eft in temedan, andlang temedan ðæt eft in maw pul.

[Acton (Beauchamp)] Ðis sind ða lond gemæra into ac tune. Ærest on horsa broc, of horsa broc in heafoc rycg, of heafoc rycge on bilincæ broc, of byling broc in at leahe geat, of at leahe geate in ða hlydan, of ðære hlydan in bycæra fald, of bycæra [fal]de on sand ford, of sand forda in scotta ðæð, of scottan wæðe in gyslan ford, of gyslan forda on sord burnan, of sand burnan on scead wællan, of scead wellan in lam sæpanæ, of lam sæðan in ledene, of ledene in lin leahe, of lin leahe in saltera weg, of saltera wege in hean ofer, of hean ofre in suð broc, of suð broc in wesæt broc, of west broc in cleg wyllan, of cleg wyllan in ædelstanes graf, of ædelstanes grae on hengestes healh, of h[æn]gestes heale eft in horsa broc.

[South Stoke] Ðis sind ða para vii land gemæra into suð stocæ. Ærest of møeddæne westewoardæne on beacuc hyl ðlang dene on badan pyt, of ðam pytte on æsc wyllan broc, ðlang broces on afene, ðlang afene on broc hardes fordæ, of ðam] fordæ on swyn burnan, of swyn burnan on funtæn burnan, of funtæn burnan on bremer leah, of bremer lea ðlang dene on stan leah, of stan lea on seonecan dene, ðlang dene on chan feldæ geat þonne on gate wyllan, of gate wyllan on cynæges crundlu, of cynæges crundlan ðlang dene on risc mere, of risc mere on æsc [de]ne, of æsc dene on hord dene, of hord dene on þone holan weg on luhine wudu on fælæ leahe, of fælæ leahe on æðelan wyllan, of ðæm wyllan adune on streæamæ, ðlang streæumes up on hyrde wyllan, of hyrde wyllan on cynæinga cruselul, of cynæinga cruselulæ on rycg weg, ðlang weges on þone stapol, of ðam stapolæ on ða hlydan, of ðære hlydan up andlang streæumes, of ðæm streæumeþæ be heafdan þæt on mihan lea esteæwærdæne on þone garan up ðlang weges, of þam wege be heafdan þæt eft on mød beorh.

[Dyrham] Ðis sind ða land gemæ[æ]ra intæ deor hamme. Ærest of sulæn fordæ on loddrælæn wellæan, þonon on byd yncel bi abban graue to b[ry]de wyllan, þæt swa on eccæn treo, þonon on micæn mæduæ þæt on byd, þonne on hy geredæ æceræ 7 swa bi clop æcere ufa on sulig cumb, þonon on mus beorh þæt swa to æðerædæ wellæan, þonne on cleg wegæ be ciææ stede þæt swa bi sadol hongæranþæ on færn beorh[æ] . . . . .]æwæ on gemær broc þæt eft on sulæn broc.

[Beoley] + Ðis sind þa land gemææra into beo leahe. Ærest of beo leahe on cundyne æceræ, of cundyne æceræ on færn healææ, of færn healææ on burh leahe, of burh leahe on geææs ofer, of geææs ofer on stan geat, of stan geate on wulferæs wyllan, of
Pære wyllan on deawes broc, of Þæm broce on mapoldren [geat], of Þæm geate on beard[æ]cgf ford, of bearding forda eft on beo leah.

[Yardley] Þis sind Þa land gemæra into gyrd lea. Āerest of gyrd lea on colle, of colle on màr dic, of màr dice on blacan mearc, of blacan mearc on Þ[p]o[n]e hæð garan on dagarding weg, of dagarding wege on ac wyllan, of ac wyllan on bradan apoldr[e, o]f ðære apoldre on màres ðorn, of ðan ðorne on smalan broc, of smalan broce on cinc tunes brocek4, of Þæm broce on dyrmn ford, of dyrmn for[da] on brom halas of brom halan on hwitan leah, of hwitan leah cn on leommanincg weg ðonan on colle, of colle on meos mor, of meos more on ciondan, of ciondan on spel broc ðonan on bulan wyllan, of bul[an] wyllan on Þa langan ðe, of ðære langan ðe [on] mundes dene, of mund[æ]s dene on colle, of colle eft on gyrdid4 leah.

[Aldermanster] Þis sind Þa land gemæra Þæs londes Þe lympëmnd to sture, Þæt is ðonne, æt ærestan denuelincg hommes ende scyt on sture, þonne scyt se dic [Þæt hit] cymd foran to byrman scyfte, þonne Þonan 7lang Þære caldan stræte Þæt hit cymd on màr bro[e], 7lang màr broces Þæt hit cymd to langan dun[es e]ndc Þonon Þæt hit cymd to Þo[s] hilvan, þonne of Þos hilvan to sealt mere, of sealt mere on fægel mere, of fægel mere on steapan hlic, of steapan hlicne on bara broc, of bara broce ymb wydan cumb, of widan cum[be to h]æ æt hit cym, hit cym to po[s] hliwan, Þonne Þonon to cealc se[a] in on stan hlinces ende, Þonon on r[æ]m beorgas, Þonne Þonan to ceale scabæn, of ceale se[aæ]lan to tildegnes triowan, Þonan to meox b[œ]hym, Þonan to pehtun[æ]s triowan, fram pehtunes triowan to pıoles clifan, þæt 7langæ4 pıoles clıifes middeweardes to cıp hıyrste, þonne of cıp hıyrst on Þa dic Þe lıgø on sture.

[Broadway] Þis sind Þa land gemæra to brada[ṇ wege]. [Āerest] of màr cumbe4 on pes broc, þonon on Þa heafda æt west mæduwan, of west medwan on Þa heaf[da] Þæt on Þistel me[e, of Þæm me[r]e 7lang slædes on pincan dene, of p[incan dene] Þæt up on beornæ4 dune ufe[w]e[ar]de þonon on Þone stapol, of Þæm stapol of[e[r] þone caldan feld þæt on fægel hlaw, of Þæm [hlawe] on egsan mor, of ðan mor[e] up andlang dune Þæt [on] bæddes wellan, of bæddes wellan on brer hlaw, of Þæm hlawe on norð ham onbutan norð ham 7lang Þære caldan dic Þæt on sand broc, of sand broce on bord rīdīg, of bord rīdīg on hor pyttes rīpīg, of hor pytte 7lang fura Þæt on cadan mynster þonon on Þa ece Þæt on Þa sealt stræt, 7lang stræt on Þa caldan dic æt nanes mannes lande, of ðære dic on[ti] vi[ll] wyllan, of [se]fæn[ø] wyllan on ṭristlinga dene, of ṭristlinga dene ufebeweard Þæt on Þa caldan dic æt wad beorhe, 7lang dic eft o<n>4 màr cumbe.

4 Anno dominicae incarnationis decece lxxii4 scripta est huius munificentiae singrapha his testibus4 consentientibus quorum inferius nomina secundum uniuscuiusque dignitatem urbiusque ordinis decusatem domino disposente caraxantur:

Ego Eadgar Britannic Anglorum monarchus hoc taumate donum agie crucis roborau.
Ego Dunstan Dorobernensis æclesie archiepiscopus eiusdem regis4 benioulentiam confirmau.
Ego Oswold Eboracensis basilicæ primas huic regali dono adsensum prebui.
Ego Æðelwold Wintoniensis presul edis canonica subscriptione manu propria depinxi.
Ego Ælfstan Lundoniensis cathedre pontifex signum sanctæ crucis latus impressi.
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Ego Alfwold Scireburnensis cathedre antistes hoc intrepidus donum corroboraui.
Ego Brihtelm plebi Dei famulus huius regis dapsilitati letabundus aplausi.
Ego Alfwold legis Dei catascopus testudinem agie crucis iussu regis impressi.

Ego Ælfstan Rofensis sedis archimandrita tau[maj] z crucis agie hilaris imposui.
Ego Eadelm commissarum plebium speculator hoc eulogium gaudens firmaui.
Ego Wynsige Dei allubescente gratia spiritualis ouilis opilio hanc largitionem consolidaui.
Ego Aðulf domino codrus amminiculante hoc donum tropheo sancte crucis confirmau.
Ego Ælfryð præfati regis conlaterana hoc sintahma cum sigillo sancte crucis subscripsi.

Ego Ælfric abbas subscripsi.
Ego Æscwig abbas conscripsi.
Ego Osgar abbas dictau.
Ego Ægelgar abbas impressi.
Ego Cyneweard abbasi depinxi.
Ego Foldbriht abbas descripsi.
Ego Æleah abbasiconfirmau.
Ego Sideman abbas corroboraui.
Ego Osweard abbas consensi.
Ego Brihteah abbas impressi.
Ego Godwine abbas consensi.
Ego Brihtnoð abbas assensi.
Ego Germanus abbas firmaui.

Ego Ælfere dux.
Ego Ælweard minister.
Ego Wulfstan minister.
Ego Ælfsige minister.
Ego Ælweard minister.
Ego Wulfstan minister.
Prefata\textsuperscript{v} quoque [. . . ] trium iugerorum quantitas et duo predia, in famosa urbe quae ab accolis dicitur Wygorneceastre accidunt, quae sub eiusdem condicione libertatis perpetuiter in nomine domini nostri Iesu Christi haberi precipio.

\textbf{[Endorsement]} \textsuperscript{v}\textsuperscript{5}[XP] DIS [IS SE FREOLSE] 7 †ARA LANDA BOC [DE] EADG[AR] CINING GEUDE INTO PERSCORAN SWA HIS YLDRAN HIT ÆR GESETTAN GODE TO LOFE 7 SANCTA MARIAN\textsuperscript{v}\textsuperscript{5}

\begin{itemize}
\item Fundacio Abbathiae de Persor per Regem Edgarum Ex Carta Originali penes Thomas Cotton Baronettum heading in D\textsuperscript{1} Edgari carta originalis de Abbatia de Persor heading in D\textsuperscript{2} . . . 7 see Benedicte . . . heading (mostly lost to fire) in V
\item + Au\textsuperscript{o} om. V D\textsuperscript{1}
\item ut\textsuperscript{c} perhaps two letters lost at start of line V
\item microcosmum\textsuperscript{d} microcosmum A
\item formauerat\textsuperscript{e} formauerat [formaerat V]
\item amoenitatis\textsuperscript{f} c inserted A
\item decentissime\textsuperscript{g} ss underlined in pencil A
\item alogia\textsuperscript{h} aogie V
\item profetis\textsuperscript{i} prophetis V 6–8 letters erased after profetis A
\item infrustrans\textsuperscript{j} altered from ?o V
\item supernis\textsuperscript{k} supernus V
\item quæ\textsuperscript{l} que V
\item Perscoram\textsuperscript{m} Perscoram V c inserted A
\item priuilegii\textsuperscript{n} altered from priuilegium V
\item Foldbrihti\textsuperscript{o} Foldbrihti V
\item quem sibi uniuersa\textsuperscript{p} illegible A written as que . . . universa D\textsuperscript{1}D\textsuperscript{2}
\item apto . . . abbatem\textsuperscript{q} illegible A written as a series of dots D\textsuperscript{1}
\item secundum . . . abbatem\textsuperscript{r} written as a series of dots D\textsuperscript{2}
\item eligens constitutae\textsuperscript{s} eligens c lost to fire V
\end{itemize}
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deinceps usu perpetuo) usu perp lost to fire deinceps written twice V

catholicus) lic lost to fold A

extraneorum . . . tyrannica) neorium quisiam ty lost to fire V

in) illegible A

monasterio ius arripiens exerceat) lost to fire V very unclear A

coenobii . . . libertatis) lost to fire V

noster) nostri D1

priuilegio . . . concessi sunt) lost to fire but passage seems to be followed by Tempore siquidem clause (see note a2 and pp. 60–1, Table 2) V large ^ added in black ink after sunt A

Id est) collation against V ends here; for text of V see below, pp. 53–7.

Brihtulfing tum) inserted, l on erasure A

probably on erasure A

possibly on erasure A

numeral erased A

on erasure A

g unclear; looks like c in A but clearly g in D1D2

on erasure A

in illegible in A but clear in D1D2

followed by illegible note in right-hand margin? A

on erasure A

Flæferth) l inserted A

om. D1 cl (but very unclear) D2

h probably inserted (parchment damaged so unclear) A

perhaps altered A

Suthstoce) S underlined A

Hilleahe) second l inserted A

Dydimertune) second e perhaps on erasure A

very faint; perhaps partially erased or written in different ink A

on erasure A

on erasure A

unusual form; probably altered from x A

probable erasure after which was part of numeral A

Cumtune) first v unclear but fairly certain; perhaps o A

Usiguuennan) g unclear and perhaps c A Wicwennan D1 Uuicuuennan D2

vertical line added after numeral A

underlined A

Approximately 125–130 letters erased A

precipimus ut catholicorum nemo . . . priuilegio) comes immediately before list of estates; first half of sentence (tempore siquidem . . . precipimus) lost to fire: see above, note a2 and below, pp. 57–8, 60–1, Table 2. V priuilegio underlined in brown ink A

arte) illegible in A but clear in V, om. (rows of dots) in D1D2

jugiter) text ends here (with line of dots) D1

crucietur) underlined; remainder of line blank, perhaps erased A

Si quis . . . crucietur) comes after bounds (see below, pp. 57–8, 60–1, Table 2) V

dic) text ends here D2

ænineges) c inserted A

ondlong) d inserted A

ðorn) ðor A

Δam) Δam inserted A

ford) thin vertical line added after ford A

bam] þam A

51
gemæra] gera A

[deleted]

cross-stroke of δ extremely faint, probably added, but ascender long like that of δ rather than d A

gere] ge inserted A

hinserted A

e inserted A

of δere] of altered letter before o erased, o formed from minim, e added; δ perhaps also an alteration A

hinancan] h inserted A

of] e inserted A

ryce] e inserted A

d lost, but top of δ visible, as is top of a red bracket which precedes it A
greatan] Birch and others printed blacan but greatan seems more likely given evidence of V and probable traces of g. See Stokes, ‘Rewriting the Bounds’.

broc] c inserted A

of gislan forda . . . sea pan] written in a smaller and more compressed hand A

streame] a inserted A

gereding] c inserted A

hongran] first n clumsily altered from ?c A

beorh] approx. 5–6 letters lost after beorh; next word perhaps swa A

bearding] Bond and others printed bearding; obscure in manuscript but i clear in facsimile A

broc] c inserted A

gyrd] perhaps on erasure; second d inserted A

lmp] δ inserted A

lang] l1 probably on erasure A

cumbe] first two letters unclear but pretty certainly cū, pace Bond and others, although suspension-stroke extremely faint and perhaps added A

beorna] first letter unclear but pretty certainly b, pace Bond and others A

vii . . . seofan] both extremely unclear; Bond printed asan for both, but V reads vii and this fits better for first word here; -san or -fan seems clear for second word; note also Seven Wells near modern Broadway at SP1235. A

on] o A

Text collated with V from here.

decce lxii] 972 (in ‘Arabic’ numerals) V

his testibus] h inserted and est cramped; scribe first wrote iste for his te[stibus]? A

Witness-list in five columns A Witness-list in long lines V

Dorobernensis] altered from Dorbbernensis A

regis] g inserted A

corroboraui] conprobaui V (S 788 reads corroboraui)

Ego . . . tauma] illegible in A Ego Ælfan [sic] . . . archimandrita tau[. . .] V tauma from S788

Ælfyrði] illegible; Bond printed Ælfhyrði A

Ego Sideman abbas] go . . . abbas illegible; Bond printed Ego Sideman abbas A clear in V

Peter A. Stokes
King Edgar’s Charter for Pershore (AD 972)

The following is only the portion of text which is significantly different from that of Augustus ii. 6, namely the list of estates, the bounds, and the appurtenances. The first three paragraphs of the document, the dating-clause and the witness-list are therefore omitted here but are included in the apparatus for Augustus ii. 6 above.


Prefato quoque coenobio trium iugerorum quantitas et duo predia in famosa urbe quæ ab accolis dicitur Wigornaceaster accidunt, quæ sub eiusde[m] conditione libertatis perpetuiter in nomine domini nostri Iesu Christi haberi præcessi pio, et ad usum conficiendi salis duobus in locis xvii doliorn situs on middelwic x, seven.oldstyle on neo omestan wic viii, et duarum fornaciorum st[a]tio on Wictune et uas quod dicitur Westringe, cum uno manso et dimidium mansi in loco qui dicitur Hortun, et dimidium mansi i[n] loco qui dicitur æt Westwuda; eiusdem perpetuiter sint libertati[s].

He[c] sunt termini illarum terrarum, quæ in circuitu monasterii ualen[t] 150k manentes.
Peter A. Stokes

[Pershore Estates] Ærest of pirigforda 7lang diec on ða pyri[gan], ðanan on ðâne langan mapolder, ðæt on ecap manna wyllan swa to n[ . . . ] hlawe a be ðere ecge on már cnol, ðanan on lind hoh, ðæt on clott[es] mor swa on már pul, ðæt on afene swa on caldan" wyllan, ðæt on w[yrd]" blinc, ðanan on hor pyt, ðæt on culfræ mere swa on hagan weg, [ðæt on] broc hrieq, ðanan on ða caldan dic, ðæt on swine swa on reod dic, ðæt [on] weorcs mere, ðanan on ða twycene, ðæt on ða hæxel rewæ swa [7]lang streames on hor wyllan, ðanan on ða langan dic on cym[man] leahe swa on sæfern up 7lang streames to hamstede, ða[man] 7lang stræt east to wuda, ðæt on hæđe burge weordi swa on hriegen on bisecope swyn hege, ðæt on bearton weg, ðanan [on calfan] leahe, ðæt 7lang dic to hæð halan, ðæt on heaeneg swa on piddes mere swa [ðeg on] wad beorhæs, ðanan on sealsæ mere 7lang sices on yrs[e], 7lang" yrse on hwitan dene, ðanan east on ðæne fulan py[t] on byrwn wynne dene, ðæt on hymel broc ðæt wuda forda, up 7lan[g bro]ces on oxan cars, ðæt to ðan stan gedelfe, ðanan 7lang dic on [hunig] burnan, ðæt eft on hymel broc, 7lang broces to beccan leahe [on] ða dic swa 7lang mære weges on ceafor leahe, ðæt on ða hege sto[wre, ða]nan on hennuc, ðæt on ða doræn rewe, ðonan east on ðone rah [hæge], ðæt be ðam ofre eft on ða dic, ðæt swa on pidelan stream up [7]lang [streames on ða caldan dic, ðæt 7lang furæ on ða haefdu æt[win][ter burnan swa on hereferðes meduwan, ðæt in ðæt sic, ðana[n on] ðane cumb swa on ða caldan dic, ðæt in pidelan, ðanan ymb [ . . . ] swa on pidelan, ðæt on afene up 7lang æfene eft on py[rig] ford.

[Flyford (Dormston?)] Ærest sint ðæra fif hida land gemæra to fleferð. Æ[rest] of ðam caldan slæpe on winter burnan, ðanan on ðone swyn [hæge], ðæt on et meres meduwan swa on hodes ac, ðæt 7lang heges on [ðone] weg, ðanan on winter burnan swa on hereferðes m[aduan, ðana]n] in ðæt sic, ðanan in ðane cumb swa on ða caldan dic[e in pidelan], ðanan ymbutan bradan hame eft in pidelan, ða[man] eft to ðam slæpe.

[?, Chaceley and Longdon] Ærest sind ðæra xxx hida land gemæra [ . . . . . . . . ] 7 to ceatæwes leahe into langa[n] d[u]næc. Ærest [of sæfern on w]ferðes medua hege, [of ðam bege . . . ] to ðrim [ . . . . ]

[Powick (including Leigh)] Ærest of sæfern on beornwalodæs sæt[an ðæt on hagan] geat, ðæt on secg leah[e]s [trod, ðæt on trob hrieq, ðæt] on tecles more, ðæt on baldan rieg swa on flotan rieg, ðanan on ða [sme ðan ac on ðind rieg swa on abbandunes wican, ðæt in baldan geat, ðonan 7lang dune on Ea[dwold] nec leahe middewecer 7 an æcer into beornodes leahe, of ðam æcere on [. . . ]" mæt hege, ðanan on secparan hyl swa on wæde burnan, ðæt on gundenling [rig], ðana on codran swa to syl beame, ðæt in crame ðanan[” on hwitan wyllan swa on h]agæn geat, ðæt on ða greatac an, ðanan on ða sand sæðas swa in temedel, ðæt on [ða l]itlan becas, ðanan on grondles bece, of ðam bece swa ðæt gemæra ligeð, ðæt on [tum]edan 7lang streames to eldres ege ymbutan yldres ege ðæt eft in temedan, [7]lan[g streames eft on sæfern.

[Acton (Beauchamp)] Ærest ðæra iii hida land gemæra æt ac [tum]e. Ærest[’ of horsa broc on heafoc rieg, ðanan on bylinge[½] broc, ðæt in at leahe [geal] swa in ða hlydan, ðanan on bicera fald swa on sand ford, ðæt on scotta [pa]ð, ðanan on gislan ford, ðæt on sand burnan swa on scæd wyllan, ðæt on ða lam [seau]ðas, ðanan on ledene, ðæt in linheæ swa on saltera weg, ðanan on hean ofer [in] suð broc, ðanan in west
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broc swa in cleg wyllan, ðan an on æðelstanes graf, [ðan an] in henxtes halh, ðæt eft in horsa broc.

[Martin Hussingtree] Dis sind ðara v hida land gemæra [æt] husan treo 7 æt mere tune. Ærest of ðære stræt 7lang dic to bradan for[de 7]lang burnan on sala werpan 7lang streames to col forda, ðan an 7lang [ðær]e miclan dic on æl broc, ðan an on dyran mor swa on ða dic, ðæt on feower [gemæra], ðan an on ðorn leahe swa on ða dic, ðæt eft on ða stræt.

[Beoley] Dis sind [ðara] x hida land gemæra to beo leahe. Ærest of beo leahe on cunding æce[ras], ðan an on fearn healas swa on burh leahe, ðæt on iñhes ofer, ðan an on [stan] geat, ðæt on wulferes wyllan swa on deawes broc, ðæt on mapoldren geat, [ðan an] on bearding ford swa 7lang dic, ðæt on arewe up 7lang streames on [. . .] burnan, up 7lang burnan on febban leahe, ðan on on beadan æc, ðæt on blacan pyt, ðan an on ðos geat swa on [. . .]n æt mere, ðæt on fugges treo swa eft on beo leahe.

[Yardley] Dis sind ðara x hida [land] gemæra æt gyrd lea on colle, ðan an on ðær dic swa on blacan mearc[an ðæt] on ðane heð garan swa on ðægarding weg, ðan an on æc wyllan, ðæt on ða bra[dan æ]poldre, ðan an on ðær ðorn swa on smalan broc, ðæt on cyng tunes broc, [ðan an] on dyran ford swa on brorn halas, ðæt on hwitan leahe, ðan on on Leof[mann]incg wic swa on colle, ðæt on meos mor ufewarde ðan an on deope ðæl, ðæt [æt]ændan swa on spel broc, ðan an on ðulan wyllan swa on ða langan æc, ðæt on [mundeæ] dene, ðan an on colle, ðæt eft in gyrd leah.

[Aldermister] Dis sind w ðara x hida land ge[mæra] æt sture. Ærest of sture æt denewalding hemmes ende 7lang dic for[on byr]na scylfe 7lang stræt on ðær broc, swa on langan dunes ende, ðæt on pos [bliwæn, ðan an on sealt mere, ðæt on ægel mere, swa on baldreding æceras, ðan an on [steap]n hine, ðæt on horpyttes sic, ðan an on baran broc, swa ymbe widan cumb [on hæd] hylle, ðan an on stan hlinces ende, ðæt on ðum beorh, swa ðonne on ðone cealc [seadan, ða ðan to tilðegnes treowan, swa on ðoex beorh, ðæt on ðeoles dene 7lang [. . .]n² clop hylste, ðanne 7lang dic in sture swa ðæt calde ca ðen beliged.

[Broadway and (Childs) Wickham] Dis sind [ðara] x² hida land gemæra æt bradan wege 7 æt wicwenann. Ærest of ðær [cumbe]e on pes broc, ðan an on ða heafdu, ðæt on west meduwa, swa eft on ða he[afdu], ðæt on ðiðel mere 7lang slædes on pincan dene, ðan an upon beorna [dane] ufewarde, et swa on ðone stapol, ðæt on ðugel hlaw, ðan an on egæsan mor, [ðan an] on langan dune, ðæt on ðælde wyllan, ðan an on brer hlaw, swa ymbutan [nord h]ram 7lang dic ðæt on ðand broc, of ðæm broc on ðord ðigæ, ðan an on hor [pyttes] ridig swa up 7lang fura ðæt on cadan mynster, ðan an on ða æge, ðæt on [ða sealt] stræt swa on ðæt æc ægænæ manæ ðæt on vii wyllan, ðan an on [ðr]inga dene up 7lang² dene, ðæt on ða ðæt æt wad beorge², swa eft on hor [cumbe].²

[(South) Stoke] [Dis sind] ðara x² hida gemæra æt stocce. Ærest of ðæm[dene] wicewardre [on beaðo[æ] hil, ðæt 7lang middere dene on badan pyt swa on æc wyllan, ðæt on æfene swa [on broc] heardes ford, ðan on swyn burhan, ðæt on ðuntines burhan swa on bre[mer leah]h 7lang dene on stan leah,²³ ðanne 7lang seonecan dene middere [on eban fæ]ldes geate swa on gate wyllan, ðæt on ðynges crumblu 7lang dene on [rice mere]swa on æc dene, ðæt ord dene, ðæte² on ðone holan weg on luhhing [wædu on filde] leahe swa
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on sceortan graf, ðonan on æðeling wyllan 7 [adune on stream] up on hyrd wyllan swa on cynges crundel, ðæt on riecg wege, ðañan [on done stapol, ðan an on] ða hlydan, of ðæm streame be ðæm heafdon on mihan leah [easte weardne on done garan up 7lang weges, ðan on] be ðæm heafdon, ðæt on mæd be[orh.]

[Dyrham] [Dis sind ðara . . . hida] land gemæra ðet deor [hamme. Ærest of sulan forda on laddra wellan, ðonon on byld micel swa be abban [grafe to byrde wyllan, ðæt swa on eccan treo, ðonon on midlan] mæduwan, ðæt [on byld, ðonne on Hygeredincg aceras 7 swa bi clop acere nfa in sulig cumb, ðonon on mus beorh, ðæt swa to æðeredes wellan, ðonon on cæg wege be æric stede, ðæt swa bi sadol hongran on feorn beorh wuda on gemær broc, ðæt eft on sulan broc.]

[Lydney] [. . .] an bæce, ðæt on mær broc, swa on neowern, ðæt eft on sæfern.

[Wyegate] [Dis sind] ðæra vi hida land gemæra æt wiggan geat. Ærest of weg on clor br[ . . .] on clor leah, ðanan on preoste wyllan, ðæt on grenan hlaw, swa on [. . .] ðæt on smalan broc, ðanan on mylen broc, ðæt eft in weg.

[Cumbtune] Dis sin[d ðara] v hida land gemæra æt cumb tune. Ærest of besewe springe 7[lang] broces on ræges slæd up 7lang dune on cumbtunes broc, swa y[mb] ða fíf aceras ðæt on wad beorh, ðanan on eneda mere, swa on ða [. . .] æt rudan ofre, ðæt on holan cumb ufewearne ðanan on mot hylle 7[lang] weges, on cycggyan cumb ufewearnde swa eft on bes wyl sp[ringe].

7 Wærfer ðysceop gebocede anne hagan Æelune into Cumbr[incg]tune on Wigornecestre . lxx. p . xlv. ò

Peter A. Stokes
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2 cumbe first boundary-point in A is unclear but probably cumbe; last boundary-point in A is cumbe
3 lan lan
4 beorge messy deletion of one letter after this word
5 space initially left blank, x inserted in pencil or very faint ink
6 stan leah stan stan leah
7 n the position of this line is illegible due to fire-damage; probably inserted by original scribe
8 stan leah stan stan leah
9 minden money
10 stan leah stan stan leah
11 crundel crumbel
12 weg altered from wæg
13 Approx. nine lines of manuscript lost. Last lost line perhaps ‘... weg swa...’
14 säfern fæfern
15 br. lost due to fire, but first letter after b probably r
16 Text followed by anathema (si quis uero), dating-clause and witness-list as in A; see above, pp. 48–50.

Tiberius A. xiii, 163v–164r

The text below is the portion of S 786 which is preserved in ‘Hemming’s Cartulary’, namely the bounds of Acton Beauchamp, as it appears in that manuscript but with lost readings supplied from the Rawlinson copy.

[Acton (Beauchamp)] ðis synd þara iii hida land gemæra æt ac tune. Ærest of horsa broce on heafoc hrycg, of heafoc hryce þanon on byling broc 7 swa in at leahgesb geat 7 swa onc þa hlydan, of ðære hlydan on bikera fald, of bikera falde ond sand ford, of sand forda þæt on scotta e þæt 7 swa on gislan ford, of gislan forda þæt on sand burnan, of þære burnan on scead wyllan 7 swa on þa lam seadas, of þam seadan þæt on leden, 7 of leden in lin leahge, of lin leahge on saltera weg, of þam wegie on hean ofer 7 swa in suð broc, of suð broke on west broc, of west broke in clæg wyllan, of þære weallan on Ælfstanes graf, 7f of þam grafe in Henxtes halh, 7 of þam hale þæt eft in horsa broc.

a heafoc inserted T
b leahges h inserted R
c on illegible due to fire-damage; probably inserted by original scribe T
d bikera falde on illegible due to fire-damage T
e scotta otta illegible due to fire-damage T
f 7 inserted T

Comparison of the Texts

The larger structural differences between the two versions of S 786 are summarised in Table 2, along with the other charters in the Orthodoxorum group. There are many more differences in phrasing and detail than are listed here, but the similarities between them are still evident, and both versions of the Pershore charter belong clearly in this group. Comparing the two versions of S 786 shows that they have essentially the same content as each other but that the order of this content has been reworked. Both have the same core and are based on the same model, the primary difference being the position of the list of estates and the block of boundary-clauses, as well as the section beginning
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Indeed the transcript and S 788 are unique among the Orthodoxorum group in the way they position this section and this suggests that the transcript might be a reworking of the single sheet. Specifically, the structure of Augustus ii. 6 shows some influence from the model of S 658 but is otherwise almost identical to that of S 673, except for the added list of estates and section ‘prefato quoque coenobio’. One might therefore speculate that the single sheet was drawn up from a model very much like that of S 673 and that the list of estates was inserted and the ‘prefato quoque coenobio’ added at that time. Perhaps, then, this text was subsequently reworked to produce the transcript version, with the list of estates updated, some boundary clauses added and reworked, the ‘tempore siquidem’ clause moved, the bounds placed before the anathema, and the ‘prefato quoque coenobio’ integrated into the list of estates. This order of material seems more logical and is more consistent with the usual structure of Anglo-Saxon charters and so is more likely to be the result of revision than the other way around.

Moving from structure to detail, one important difference between the two versions is the list of estates claimed by Pershore, as noted above and summarized in Table 3. The two lists share a common ancestry as blocks of names are identical or very similar in the two versions. However, the differences are not simply the result of scribal omission or uninformed alteration as two estates are included in the single sheet which are not in the transcript, and fourteen estates are in the transcript but not the single sheet. The differences have proven difficult to explain and do not seem to correspond with obvious patterns in location, organisation, or holdings before or after a given date. A full discussion of the complexities of Pershore’s land-holdings is beyond the scope of this article and so I simply note the differences here and observe that both lists seem to reflect a fairly thorough knowledge of the community’s holdings, presumably at two slightly different dates.

The boundary clauses are also different, as shown in Table 4: the order of the bounds is different and each version has details (and indeed entire bounds) which are missing from the other, but the versions are nevertheless not entirely independent. Most bounds do appear in both versions, and most of those common bounds have identical boundary-points. Kelly has noted that the phrasing in the bounds of the single sheet is very homogeneous and probably reflects some degree of standardization by the copyist, and indeed the same applies to the transcript. Such homogenisation is particularly evident in the

41 The two estates are Pensham and Libbery, and the fourteen are Guthbrington, H[.]ton, Meretun (probably Castle Morton), Wy[.]land (perhaps Welland), Stithaneg, Chaceley, Eldersfield, Staunton and Wynburgh Edisc, Wieresham, Hobislan, Taf[.]lanleah, Grootan Cav[.]aleah (Great Whitley?), and Westwood (Westwood Park).
single sheet where the first letter of each boundary-clause alternates between D and P. The only exception to this is the combined bounds of Chaceley, Eldersfield, Staunton and Winburh Edisc, where D is used as in the previous bounds of Longdon. Although there is no clear evidence that the combined bounds were inserted, it is perhaps significant that Longdon, Chaceley, and perhaps Eldersfield, Staunton and Winburh Edisc as well, were all incorporated into a single boundary-clause in Vitellius D. vii. Furthermore the D which begins the second boundary-clause in the single sheet is the smallest and least prominent of all the initials in that copy. Despite this homogenization in both versions, however, the phrasing in each is consistently different from the other. The bounds in Augustus ii. 6 almost always repeat the boundary-point, normally using the formula ‘of A on B, of B on C’. Those in Vitellius D. vii, on the other hand, do not normally repeat the boundary-point and usually instead use either pet on, ðætan on, or less often swa on.

Although the boundary-clauses in the two versions are usually very similar, some show large structural differences. Perhaps the most notable of these is Powick and Leigh: these are given two separate bounds in the single sheet but are presented as a single combined estate in the transcript.\(^4^2\) Similarly, as noted above, the estates of Chaceley and Longdon seem to be combined in the transcript but are separate in the single sheet. Another interesting case is that of Acton Beauchamp: as discussed above, the boundary-clause for this estate survives in three versions. Even here, though, the boundary-points in the three versions are essentially the same, and even the spelling is quite similar, but again the phrasing is different. The third copy, that in ‘Hemming’s Cartulary’, is much less formulaic than either of the Pershore texts and does not seem especially close to either one of them. Other differences between the two main versions are relatively small but still significant. Della Hooke has argued from the single sheet that the estate of Broadway included Childs Wickham, and indeed the transcript version states this explicitly and so confirms her argument.\(^4^3\) The bounds of Beoley in the transcript contain some additional points which are not included in the single sheet: where the former includes only the southern and eastern boundaries, the transcript lists some ten further points.\(^4^4\) Some of these points can be identified relatively easily: the boundary follows the River Arrow (‘ðæt on arewe up 7lang streames’), then probably runs along Dagnell Brook, as the modern boundary still does (‘on . . . burnan, up 7lang


\(^{43}\) Hooke, *Worcestshire*, p. 229, referring to S 1174.

\(^{44}\) For these southern and eastern boundaries, see Hooke, *Worcestshire*, pp. 219–21 (no. 291).
### Table 2: Structure of the *Orthodoxorum* Charters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S 786 (Aug. ii.6, AD 972)</th>
<th>S 786 (Vitell. D.vii, AD 972)</th>
<th>S 788 (Worcester, AD 972)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Dis [...] (lost to erasure)</em></td>
<td><em>[Lost to fire]</em></td>
<td><em>Dis is se freclose</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>... 7 sancta Marian.</em></td>
<td><em>[... 7 sancte Benedicte ...]</em></td>
<td><em>... 7 sancte Benedicte.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodoxorum...</td>
<td>Orthodoxorum...</td>
<td>Orthodoxorum...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruimur...</td>
<td>instruimur...</td>
<td>instruimur...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinc ego Edgar...</td>
<td>Hinc ego Edgar...</td>
<td>Hinc ego Edgar...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ut huius libertatis...</td>
<td>ut huius libertatis...</td>
<td>ut huius libertatis...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coenobio loco...</td>
<td>coenobio loco...</td>
<td>coenobio loco...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huius priuilegii libertas...</td>
<td>Huius priuilegii libertas...</td>
<td>Huius priuilegii libertas...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a processore nostro...</td>
<td>[a processore nostro...]</td>
<td>a processore nostro...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a me ipso...</td>
<td>a me ipso...</td>
<td>a me ipso...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See below)</td>
<td>[Tempore siquidem... concessi...] precipimus...</td>
<td>Tempore siquidem... concessi... precipimus...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Start of text lost to fire)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Id est in Perscorum...</td>
<td>Hec sunt nomina terrarum...</td>
<td>Hec sunt nomina terrarum...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(List of estates follows)</td>
<td>(List of estates follows)</td>
<td>(No estates follow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See below)</td>
<td>Prefatio quoque coenobio... et ad usum conficiendi...</td>
<td>Prefatio quoque coenobio... et ad usum conficiendi...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et ad usum conficiendi...</td>
<td>et dimidium mansi...</td>
<td>et dimidium mansi...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eiusdem perpetualiter...</td>
<td>eiusdem perpetualiter...</td>
<td>eiusdem perpetualiter...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Erased passage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hec sunt termini...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempore siquidem... concessi... precipimus...</td>
<td>(See above)</td>
<td>(See above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si quis uero...</td>
<td>Si quis uero...</td>
<td>Si quis uero...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis sindon ṣa lond...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anno dominice...</td>
<td>Anno [dominice]...</td>
<td>Anno dominice...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His testibus... caraxantur...</td>
<td>[His] testibus... caraxantur...</td>
<td>His testibus... caraxantur...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefatio quoque [coenobio]...</td>
<td>(See above)</td>
<td>(See above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Structure of the *Orthodoxorum* Charters. The dotted boxes indicate sections only found in S 786 and S788.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S 658 (Abingdon, AD 959)</th>
<th>S 673 (Abingdon, AD 958 for 959)</th>
<th>S 812 (Romsey, AD 967×975)</th>
<th>S 876 (Abingdon, AD 993)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priuilegium Edwii regis...</td>
<td>Priuilegium Edgari regis....</td>
<td>Priuilegium Æthelredi regis...</td>
<td>Priuilegium Æthelredi regis...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodoxorum...</td>
<td>Altithroni...</td>
<td>Christo orthodoxorum...</td>
<td>Altithroni...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruimur...</td>
<td>instruimur...</td>
<td>instruimur...</td>
<td>instruimur...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinc ego Eadwig...</td>
<td>Hinc ego Edgar...</td>
<td>Ego Edgar...</td>
<td>Hinc ego Æthelred...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ut huius libertas...</td>
<td>ut huius libertatis...</td>
<td>ut huius libertatis...</td>
<td>non immemor...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coenobio loco...</td>
<td>rura que olim...</td>
<td>coenobio loco...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huius priuilegii libertas...</td>
<td>Huius priuilegii libertas...</td>
<td>Huius priuilegii libertas...</td>
<td>Huius priuilegii libertas...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a predecessoribus nostris...</td>
<td>a predecessoribus nostris...</td>
<td>a predecessoribus nostris...</td>
<td>a predecessoribus nostris...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a me ipso meoque patruo...</td>
<td>a me ipso meoque patruo...</td>
<td>a me ipso...</td>
<td>a me ipso meoque patruo...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See below)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(See below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eiusdem perpetualiter...</td>
<td>eiusdem perpetualiter...</td>
<td>eiusdem perpetualiter...</td>
<td>eiusdem perpetue...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nam rex prefatus...</td>
<td>Nam rex prefatus...</td>
<td>Nam reges prefati...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempore siquidem...</td>
<td>Tempore siquidem...</td>
<td>Tempore siquidem...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concessi... precipimus...</td>
<td>concessi... precipimus...</td>
<td>restaurai... precipimus...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si quis uero...</td>
<td>Si quis uero...</td>
<td>Si quis uero...</td>
<td>Si quis uero...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro silua ... data sunt...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis sind þa land gemæra...</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hiis metis ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anno dominice...</td>
<td>Anno dominice...</td>
<td>(No date or witnesses)</td>
<td>Anno dominice...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His testibus... caraxantur...</td>
<td>His testibus... caraxantur...</td>
<td>His testibus... caraxantur...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3 List of estates in Augustus ii. 6 (left column) and Vitellius D. vii (right column).
Table 4 Order of boundary clauses in Augustus ii. 6 (left column) and Vitellus D. vii (right column)
burnan’). The ‘lea’ and ‘Beadgyth’s spring’ or ‘well’ (‘febban leahe, ðonan on beadegyðe wyllan’) could have been somewhere around SP061738, where the modern boundary leaves the brook, and ‘byric æcer’ seems likely to have been Birch Acre, which is on the modern boundary at SP069734. ‘Fos geat’ cannot refer directly to the Fosse Way, as that road ran some twenty miles south-east of Beoley, but was presumably a ditch in the area.\(^{45}\) The Ordnance Survey maps also show many pits in the area, any one of which could have been the ‘black pit’ (‘blacan pyt’). To establish the bounds more securely requires further investigation but it seems that at least some of these new points can be securely located.

Three boundary-clauses are found only in Vitellius D. vii and are therefore ‘new’ insofar as they have not been studied before. One of these can be identified easily, namely Wyegate in Gloucestershire (‘Wiggangate’). The second is Cumbtune, presumably the Comtune of Augustus ii. 6 which has not been identified but which Kelly has suggested should be near Broadway and Childswickham.\(^{46}\) Indeed it is striking that the bounds of Broadway and Cumbtune both include references to *wad beorh*, ‘woad barrow’. If these references are both to the same place, and if Hooke is correct in her reconstruction of modern Buckland or Snowshill, Gloucestershire.\(^{47}\) The bounds of Cumbtune are not inconsistent with this as they contain several references to steep slopes which match the geography of that area (*slæd*, ‘valley’; *beorgh*, ‘barrow’; *ofre*, ‘bank’; *cumb*, ‘coomb’; *hyll*, ‘hill’), but locating specific features has not yet proven possible and the location of the estate is by no means certain. The third boundary-clause is very incomplete, with only the last four boundary-points surviving, and so it cannot be identified with absolute certainty. However, one of these points is *neowern*, a good candidate for which is modern Newerne near Lydney. As Kelly has pointed out, only three estates are named in the list of Augustus ii. 6 but are not covered by the boundary-clauses of that document, namely Longney, Lydney and Wyegate, all in Gloucestershire. Wyegate and probably Lydney have now been accounted for, and it is entirely possible that the bounds for Longney preceded those of Lydney in the transcript but are now lost to fire. Finally, a rather cryptic comment is included in the transcript after the bounds: ‘γ Wærfereð byscœop gebœcede anne hagan Æðelune into Cumbr[incg]tune on Wigorneceastræ. lxx

\(^{45}\) Perhaps relevant here is a moat at SP084715, or perhaps Moss Lane at SP080695 if some corruption is allowed in the text. \(^{46}\) Kelly, ‘S 786’.

\(^{47}\) The common points are ‘on þa ealdan dic æt wad beorhe’ and ‘swa þ[m] ða fif æceras δæt on wad beorh’ respectively; for the former, see Hooke, *Worcestshire*, pp. 226 and 229. The ‘besewe springe’ in the bounds of Cumbtune might also be a corruption of Broadway’s ‘seofan wyllan’.
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p. xlv, p.

This ‘Wærferð’ was presumably Wærfrith, bishop of Worcester 869 × 872 – 907 × 915, who appears in a number of charters and other records from this time, but none of these refers to this transaction with Æthelhun. Indeed it is unclear who this Æthelhun was, as several possibilities are evident: perhaps the most intriguing is Wærfrith’s successor as bishop of Worcester (907 × 915 – 915 × 922), but other possibilities include three different abbots and a Mercian dux.

S 788: Somers Charter 16

Given the similarities between the two main versions of S 786, and given the good Old English in both, it seems that the two versions’ boundary-clauses, like the lists of estates, were produced relatively close to each other in both time and place, and that both were produced with detailed knowledge not only of Pershore’s holdings but also of the landscape itself. The question remains how the two versions relate to each other and why two versions were produced, but to progress with this some further documents must be considered. The first of these, Somers Charter 16, is not a copy of S 786 but is integral to any discussion of the pancart from Pershore. The Somers charter is in favour of Worcester Cathedral and dated 972. The document is now lost but it was printed by Smith and also summarized by Patrick Young. It has long been recognized that this document is a forgery, and specifically that the text is based very closely on that of S 786. Indeed, much of the text is identical, and the few changes are very crude indeed, such as altering the name of the abbot from Foldbriht to ‘N’ (for nomen), presumably because the forger did not know what name to insert. Given that there are two versions of S 786, however, the question that naturally arises is which version was used when fabricating S 788. For once there is little doubt: examination of the documents’ structures makes it clear that the forger used the transcript-version, not the single sheet. S 788 has exactly the same structure as the transcript, including the relative positions

48 ‘And Bishop Wærferth booked a haga to Æthelhune at Comberton in Worcester’. The numbers and abbreviations are obscure; possibilities include a sum of money (seventy pounds and forty-five pence) or an area of land (seventy perticae by forty-five perticae), but both of these seem much too large for a single haga.


50 Æthelun 12 through Æthelun 18’ in Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England.

51 Bede, Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum, ed. J. Smith (Cambridge, 1722), pp. 775–7. Young’s text is preserved on 131r of Cotton Vitellius C. ix and has been described somewhat misleadingly as an incomplete copy of S 788; see Sawyer, Anglo-Saxon Charters, p. 252, and Electronic Sawyer, no. 788.
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of the *tempore siquidem* and *prefato quoque coenobio* clauses. This means first of all that the forger was even less inventive than previously thought: his apparent changes to the structure of the single-sheet version are instead simply blind copying of the previously unnoticed transcript-version. More importantly, though, it suggests very strongly that a copy of the transcript-version was kept in the Worcester Cathedral archives. Indeed, to my knowledge the similarity of S 788 is the only evidence in favour of S 786 being described as from the archive of ‘Worcester (ex Pershore)’. The transcript-version might reasonably be described thus, but the cathedral archive may never have held a copy of the single sheet, let alone Augustus ii. 6 itself.

The significance of S 788 in discussion of S 786 is manifold. It is important for questions of provenance, as has just been discussed. It is also useful for establishing the text of S 786 as it can supply lost readings, particularly given the extensive damage suffered by both Augustus ii. 6 and Vitellius D. vii. Of these lost readings, perhaps the most tantalizing is the endorsement. All but one of the *Orthodoxorum* charters has a rubric or endorsement of some sort, but for most this is the rather uninteresting *Charta Eadgari Regis* or similar. Those from Pershore and Worcester seem to have rather more to offer, but most of the evidence from Pershore is lost. Joscelyn’s transcript once had a heading of some sort but this has been almost entirely destroyed by fire; the only text to survive is the phrase *7 sancte Benedicte* (‘and to Saint Benedict’). The single sheet had a lengthy endorsement but this was subsequently subjected to very heavy wear or erasure and has not hitherto been successfully read. However, new techniques in digital image-enhancement have helped significantly, and a large portion of the text can be recovered in this way. Furthermore, Smith printed

53 See above, Table 2.
55 Most of the text was recovered from a digital photograph of the endorsement by mixing the red and blue channels at -56% and 100% respectively, then adjusting the levels and overlaying the result on top of the original image. For these and other techniques, see especially J. Craig-McFeely and A. Lock, *Digital Image Archive of Medieval Music: Digital Restoration Workbook*, Oxford Select Specialist Catalogue Publications (Oxford, 2006) <http://www.methodswork.ac.uk/redist/pdf/workbook1.pdf> (last accessed 5 June 2008), and P. A. Stokes, ‘Recovering Anglo-Saxon Erasures: Some Questions, Tools and Techniques’, *Palimpsests and the Literary Imagination of Medieval England*, ed. R. Chai-Elsholz and T. Silec (forthcoming). Much more sophisticated techniques are being developed by Hao Zhang and Nick Kingsbury in the Department of Engineering at the University of Cambridge but these were not sufficiently developed at the time of writing. For the principles involved, see especially N. G. Kingsbury, ‘Complex Wavelets for Shift Invariant Analysis and Filtering of Signals’, *Jnl of Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis* 10 (2001), 234–53 and I. W. Selesnick, R. G. Baraniuk and N. G. Kingsbury, ‘The Dual-Tree Complex Wavelet Transform’, *IEEE Signal Processing Mag.* 22 (2005), 123–51.
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a vernacular clause at the end of his text of S 788, and the position and formulation of this clause suggests very strongly that it was the endorsement of the original charter. The note reads ‘Dis is se freolse 7 ðara landa boc ðe Eadgar cyning geuðe into Wigera ceastre Gode to lofe 7 Sancta Marian 7 Sancte Benedicte’. That which can be read of the endorsement of Augustus ii. 6 suggests that its text is very close to that printed by Smith for S 788. Combining this assumption with image-enhancement, different lighting, and the sizes and shapes of otherwise illegible letters, a likely reconstruction of the text is ‘[XP] ðis [is se freolse] 7 ðara landa boc [ðe] Eadg[ar] cining geuðe into Perscoran swa his yldran hit ær gesettan Gode to lofe 7 Sancta Marian’. Interestingly there is no sign of any reference to St Benedict here, unlike both S 788 and Joscelyn’s transcript; such a reference may have been particularly thoroughly worn but this seems unlikely and there is no evidence to suggest it, although there is sufficient space on the parchment. On the other hand, Sancte Benedicte is the one phrase that does survive in the transcript, and this with the other similarities in text suggest that the transcript-version once had an endorsement which was very close or identical to that of S 788, mutatis mutandis.

Provenance

There are two pieces of evidence which demonstrate beyond reasonable doubt that at least one version of S 786 was at Worcester, probably by the late eleventh century and certainly by the mid-twelfth. The first of these is S 788, which was produced at Worcester and which draws very heavily on the transcript-version of S 786, as discussed above: this suggests very strongly that either Joscelyn’s exemplar or a descendent of it was at Worcester, and it may not be a coincidence that this version is the one which contains a note relating to Wærfrith who was bishop there. However, we must also remember Joscelyn’s note, which Wanley preserved and which implies that Parker obtained his exemplar directly from Pershore. This document may have gone from Pershore to Worcester and back again, but perhaps more likely is that another copy of the same version was held in the cathedral archives.

The second piece of evidence is yet another document: BL Cotton Augustus ii. 7, the next in sequence after the single sheet from Pershore. Augustus ii. 7 is a comparatively small piece of parchment measuring approximately

56 ‘This is the privilege and grant of lands which King Edgar gave to Worcester in praise of God and St Mary and St Benedict.’
57 ‘This is the privilege and grant of lands which King Edgar gave to Pershore just as his elders did previously in praise of God and St Mary.’ Letters in square brackets are postulated on the basis of S 788; all other letters have been read with a reasonable degree of confidence, either from the original manuscript or with the image-enhancement described above, n. 55.
58 For the note, see above, pp. 64–5.
59 See above, p. 41.
240–5 × 72 mm. It is written in a hand of the twelfth century and consists of a letter from Godfrey, archdeacon of Worcester, to one ‘Pope A’. The archdeacon refers to a charter, specifically an ‘original of this copy’ which has three seals attached to it: although the evidence is circumstantial it seems reasonable to assume that the he was referring to Augustus ii. 6. Certainly the sequential numbering of the two documents in Cotton’s library suggests that they have been associated since the seventeenth century, but such an association may have resulted from early modern rather than medieval activity. There is somewhat stronger evidence to support an early connexion, however.

One such piece of evidence relates to the seals which Godfrey described. These were apparently those of King Edgar, Dunstan archbishop of Canterbury, and Ælfhere earl of Mercia. They have presumably been lost or destroyed – they certainly have not been identified to my knowledge – but if they were attached to Augustus ii. 6 then one would expect evidence of this to remain in the parchment, and there are indeed slits at the bottom of the single sheet. The evidence is not entirely straightforward, however. Two slits are clearly visible, one about 20 mm long and starting about 45 mm in from the left-hand edge, and the other about the same length and starting about 175 mm from the same edge. The bottom of the charter is in poor condition around the middle and right-hand side, however, and it has been repaired in places; it is therefore difficult to tell where any further slits may have been. Fortunately the nineteenth-century facsimile was printed before the repairs took place but this clearly shows five slits, all of similar length. This evidence is further supported by some early descriptions of the document which also mention the slits, although the descriptions are not entirely consistent. None of the slits is


61 ‘Noverit . . . quod contrascripti huius scriptum originale . . . sigilla tria . . . commendant.’

62 Facsimiles, ed. Bond III, 30. For the fifth slit, see below, p. 70.

63 G. Hickes, Dissertatio epistolariis, in vol. III of his Linguarum veterum septentrionalium thesaurus grammatico-criticus et archaeologicus 3 vols. (London, 1703–5), p. 71: ‘verum charta illa, cui in collectione Cottoniana, . . . non tres (quod pace Seldeni dictum velim) sed quinque . . . incisuras habet’ (‘but that charter in the Cottonian collection has not three but five slits, pace Selden’). Selden described S 786 unambiguously and referred also to the letter of Godfrey; he did not specify that the charter was Cotton’s but this seems clear in the context. See J. Selden, A Brief Discourse Touching the Office of Lord Chancellor of England (London, 1671), pp. 2–3 (Ch. 2). Finally, six slits were described by Stevenson, ‘Yorkshire Surveys’, p. 6, n. 17, but (judging from the facsimile) his sixth slit looks more like accidental damage than deliberate cutting.
particularly neat or straight, nor are they any more than approximately parallel to the bottom edge, and it is possible that they are simply splits in the parchment, as can certainly be found elsewhere on the document. However, the presence of five such splits, all between the writing and the bottom edge of the parchment, all approximately horizontal and all approximately the same length, suggests human agency rather than accidental damage.

The second piece of evidence for the letter’s association with the surviving single sheet begins with yet another early-modern manuscript. This is a copy of the archdeacon’s letter which was made by John Joscelyn and which survives in Corpus Christi College in Cambridge. The copy has the heading ‘Hoc scriptum appensum fuit magnæ chartæ de cœnobio Parshorensi in testimonium eius chartæ’. This states unambiguously that Godfrey’s letter was physically attached to the ‘great charter’ when Joscelyn saw it, and indeed it was apparently still so in the eighteenth century when it was described by George Hickes as being attached to a charter in Cotton’s collection. Joscelyn did not specify which ‘great charter’ he was describing, and so the letter could conceivably have been attached to the exemplar of Vitellius D. vii, but this would require an otherwise unknown charter to have been lost from Cotton’s collection some time after Hickes saw it. However, if the letter was indeed attached to the single sheet then one might expect to see physical evidence of this attachment. Neither Susan Kelly nor I have been able to find any evidence of stitching on either the charter or the letter, but other physical evidence suggests that the two documents were indeed joined. The pattern of folds in the single-sheet charter is somewhat unusual in that it has a pair of vertical folds down the centre, rather than a single fold. The two folds are about 18–20 mm apart; the one to the left is approximately vertical, but the one on the right angles slightly towards the left as it comes down. Similarly, the twelfth-century letter also shows two vertical folds which are themselves about 18 mm apart and again with the right-hand one angled slightly in to the left. Indeed, careful comparison of the two charters together reveals that the folds match

64 The copy is Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 111, p. 135, part of a small section written by Joscelyn and now bound between a twelfth-century cartulary from Bath Abbey and a set of transcripts by the antiquarian Robert Talbot. See M. R. James, A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1909–12) I, 242–3 (no. 111). I again thank Simon Keynes for bringing this copy to my attention.
65 ‘This writ had been attached to the great charter from the monastery of Pershore in witness to that charter.’
66 ‘Verum charta illa, cui in collectione Cottoniana, Godefridi litterae suffixæ cernuntur . . .’ (‘But that charter in the Cottonian collection, to which Godfrey’s letter has been attached beneath . . .’): Hickes, Dissertatio epistolaris, p. 71. However, Wanley made no suggestion that the two documents were attached: see Wanley, Librorum veternum catalogus, p. 258.
67 Kelly, ‘S 786’. 
extremely closely, and this indicates that the two pieces of parchment were once folded together. Specifically, the lower edge of Augustus ii. 7 was once aligned with the bottom line of text in Augustus ii. 6, and on the horizontal axis the letter was apparently placed approximately in the middle of the single sheet. The problem of stitch-marks remains, but even this can probably be accounted for. The letter has been trimmed, at least along the bottom edge, as the bottom of the letters in a sixteenth-century note on the dorse have been cut off. Much more significantly, Augustus ii. 6 has a slit on the bottom between the two vertical folds, and the letter also has a slit at the same point between its corresponding folds. Furthermore, the bottom five lines of writing on the single sheet seem to be slightly more smudged than those immediately above, and these lines correspond to the area that would have been covered by the letter if it had been attached as just described. This difference in smudging is very slight and may be due to any number of other circumstances, but it does match the other evidence very well. Finally, Hickes’s description of the letter as suffixa (‘attached below’), rather than the more general appensa (‘attached’) used by Joscelyn, also suggests attachment at the bottom, although Hickes may not have meant the word so literally. None of these points is conclusive in itself, but in combination it seems certain that Augustus ii. 7 was attached to Augustus ii. 6 before Joscelyn’s time and also that the document which Archdeacon Godfrey described was most likely our surviving single sheet.

Some questions remain, however. Godfrey wrote that the seals were attached to ‘the copy of this charter’; this implies that his letter was referring to a copy which lacked seals rather than the original which had them, but it seems entirely reasonable that a copy of the letter would have been stored with the original charter. The evidence seems to suggest that Augustus ii. 6 was the original at Pershore; Godfrey’s copy was probably derived from this, unless it was a copy of the other version and he, like so many after him, failed to notice the difference. Another question is that if Joscelyn saw Augustus ii. 6 with the archdeacon’s letter attached, and if he thought that seals had been attached to

---

68 For the note, see below, p. 77.
69 See above, note 66. It is perhaps relevant that surviving single-sheet charters with parchment attached seem to be stitched along the bottom, although this stitching need not have been (and in some cases was certainly not) Anglo-Saxon. Examples include BL Cotton Augustus ii. 98 (S 163; Facsimiles, ed. Bond II, 9), BL Stowe Charter 17 (S 293; Facsimiles, ed. Sanders III, 17), BL Cotton Charter viii. 16A (S 416; Facsimiles, ed. Bond III, 3), and perhaps BL Cotton Augustus ii. 29 (S 1171; Facsimiles, ed. Bond I, 2), although the holes in this last document look very different and seem to have served a different purpose. For these, including digital photographs, see S. Keynes et al., ‘A Classified List of Anglo-Saxon Charters on Single Sheets’ <http://www.trin.cam.ac.uk/kemble/singlesheets/ss-index.html> (last accessed 22 March 2008), nos. 33, 56, 91 and 2 respectively.
this document – indeed the seals may still have been in place at that time\textsuperscript{70} – then why did he choose to copy the other version? Although there are many possibilities, perhaps the simplest is that he made his copy before he was aware of Augustus ii. 6. Joscelyn’s comment in his notebook that he obtained the original from Matthew Parker suggests that he may have copied it in Cambridge or Lambeth before going to Worcester or Pershore.\textsuperscript{71} Although it is unknown when Parker obtained the exemplar which Joscelyn copied, the comment at least allows the possibility that it was acquired not long after the abbey was dissolved in 1537, at a time when Parker was still Master of Corpus Christi College in Cambridge and when Joscelyn was still a young child. Furthermore, Augustus ii. 6 may never have been at Worcester at all: Godfrey could have travelled to Pershore, or the document could have travelled to the archdeacon. Joscelyn may then have found Augustus ii. 6 some time during the period 1560–77 when he was prebend at Hereford and spent time at Worcester collecting manuscripts and making transcripts, as demonstrated not only by the number of Anglo-Saxon books from Worcester Cathedral which entered Matthew Parker’s library but also by the number of texts in Vitellius D. vii which he copied directly from manuscripts at Worcester.\textsuperscript{72} Joscelyn would therefore have had ample opportunity to find any document if it was at Worcester, and it is entirely likely that he would also have travelled the nine miles or so to Pershore to examine the holdings there, just as Leland had done a generation or so before.\textsuperscript{73}

Whatever the case, someone at some time seems to have compared the two versions and to have recognized the differences between them. As discussed above, some words in the single sheet have been underlined in a dark ink, and a caret-symbol added.\textsuperscript{74} These annotations are not random, however: the ones in dark ink all correspond precisely to the points where the two texts deviate (see below, Table 5, and compare above, Table 2). There is insufficient evidence to date the annotations at all closely, but the darker ink is not typically Anglo-Saxon, and a possible candidate for adding them must again be John Joscelyn. There is little doubt that he saw both versions of the charter, given

\textsuperscript{70} The seals were missing by the time Selden described the document in the 1670s (\textit{A Brief Discourse}, pp. 2–3), but they may perhaps have been present still in the sixteenth century.

\textsuperscript{71} See above, p. 41.


\textsuperscript{73} For Leland’s movements and acquisitions for King Henry VIII, see \textit{Catalogus Librorum}, ed. Atkins and Ker, pp. 8–9, as well as J. Leland, \textit{De rebus Britannicis collectanea}, 2nd ed., 6 vols. (London, 1770) IV, 160. \textsuperscript{74} See above, p. 38.
his copy of the one and his copy of the letter attached to the other. It may also be significant that dots are visible in the left-hand margin of Joscelyn’s notebook alongside the last three boundary-clauses. These dots appear to be in the same ink as the main text and are presumably Joscelyn’s. Unfortunately we cannot be certain if any other bounds had similar dots because the left-hand margins of most pages have been destroyed by fire. Nevertheless, it is a striking coincidence that the boundary-clauses which are so marked are precisely the ones which are not found in the single-sheet version, and this may also suggest comparison of the two versions. Perhaps, then, our early-modern antiquaries had noticed the difference in texts which most twentieth-century scholars had not.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annotation</th>
<th>Reading in Aug. ii.6</th>
<th>Reading in Vitell. D.vii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pencil underline</td>
<td>decentissime collocuit</td>
<td>decentissime collocuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ink ‘caret’</td>
<td>concessi sunt. ^ Id est in Percoran</td>
<td>concessi sunt. Tempore siquidem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ink underline</td>
<td>Actus Suthstoce [Start of group]</td>
<td>Stock Upton [Not in group]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical line</td>
<td>wic viii</td>
<td>et duarum fornacium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ink underline</td>
<td>Hortun: eiusdem perpetualiter . . .</td>
<td>Hortun, et dimidium mansi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ink underline</td>
<td>uigente privilegio. Si quis uero . . .</td>
<td>uigente privilegio. [Hec] sunt nomina . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical line</td>
<td>[Bounds of Whitlafston]</td>
<td>[Bounds of Whitlafston omitted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red bracket</td>
<td>[Between bounds of Powick and Leigh]</td>
<td>[Powick and Leigh have single boundary-clause]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ink underline</td>
<td>crucietur. Æis sindon</td>
<td>Æa lond gemæa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Annotations in Augustus ii. 6. Those in dark ink are given here with grey background.

Concluision

Many questions still remain from this discussion. The precise relationship between the two versions has not been fully elucidated, nor the question why they were both apparently produced at about the same time. Perhaps one hint towards an answer is the number of alterations to Augustus ii. 6; it almost looks as if this is an early working copy, although the script seems too careful and consistent for a simple draft, and even if it was first planned as such the seals clearly indicate that it was later deemed authoritative. However, Pershore’s land-holdings were very unstable during the first third or so of the eleventh

---

Another possibility is that these were added when the text was reworked to produce the transcript version, if this was the sequence of events; see above, p. 58.
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King Edgar’s Charter for Pershore (AD 972)

This instability may explain the need for alteration, if Augustus ii. 6 was indeed kept at Pershore and updated as events unfolded. The threat to Pershore’s holdings could also help to explain the need for two early charters, as additional documentation may well have helped any attempts to retain the land. It also suggests that both versions were drawn up between the purported date of 972 and the irrevocable loss of estates to Westminster during the Confessor’s reign. An alternative factor may be the fire which burnt down Pershore Abbey, apparently in the first few years of the eleventh century; the original document could have been destroyed then and a new version drawn up almost immediately afterwards, and the palaeography and philology both seem to allow such a date. The monks at Pershore may have already lodged a copy at Worcester before the fire but need not necessarily have used this when recreating their archive, instead updating the text by use of other records. This is all speculative but it might explain the need for two different versions produced in such quick succession, and the number of erasures and alterations in the single sheet could also reflect a somewhat haphazard production. Certainly the Orthodoxorum charters remain a fascinating but complex source of evidence for Anglo-Saxon England during the tenth century, but it is also worth remembering that their importance and interest extended well beyond the Norman Conquest, with the two versions from Pershore demonstrably receiving attention at least once in almost every century from the eleventh to today.

APPENDIX I:
THE TRANSLATION OF AUGUSTUS II. 6

This translation includes all of the Latin text but omits the bounds and witness-list. It was first made independently of Hudson’s edition and translation of the closely related

---


77 Leland, Collectanea I, 242 and 244; J. Leland, The Itinerary of John Leland the Antiquary, 3rd ed., 9 vols. in 5 (Oxford, 1770) V, 2. Note also the statements of witnesses recorded in an attempt to establish Pershore’s holdings after the monastery was again burned down and their register destroyed in the thirteenth century; the document is BL. Add. Charter 42,605 and was printed by R. Dodsworth and W. Dugdale, Monasticon Anglicanum, 3 vols. (London, 1655–73) I, 205–8; see also Victoria History, ed. Willis-Bund and Doubleday II, 128 and 130.

78 I thank Rosalind Love for her comments on the translations in this paper, and Simon Keynes for his assistance and comments; any errors that remain are, of course, entirely my own. I also thank the Isaac Newton Trust and the Leverhulme Trust for their financial support, without which much of this would not have been possible.
By the counsel of orthodox men of ecclesiastical strength we are most frequently instructed that we, entirely subjected subjects, serve Him who, arranging the fabric of the whole world in a marvellous and ineffable sequence, set up the microcosm (namely Adam), most fittingly with Eve side by side (namely as a companion) with the joy of paradisiacal delightfulness. Adam was formed at last with four-formed material and inspired with nourishing breath to a likeness of Himself, and He placed him over all things which He had formed in the world below except for one thing forbidden as a test. Led astray—oh woe!—by diabolical sophistry, enticed by the chameleonic and persuasive virago’s subterfuge, with the prohibition silenced, the glutton bit into the forbidden fruit, was cast down, and fully earned perpetual death for himself and his descendants in this wretched world.

Since the prophets were foretelling and disclosing with hidden doctrine the highest king’s eternal prognostics from heaven, a shining angel brought down from on high the good word to the orthodox, not as the factious loquacity of the Jews speaks ineptly, but encompassing the most agreeable eloquence of the ancients and moderns, rendering useless the Arian and Sabellian incantations by crushing them under foot with mystical speech, and calling us from the blindness of powerless darkness to the tearlessness of heavenly inheritances; the angel slipped down from the thresholds on high and is seen to have sung amazing songs into the ear of the undefiled virgin, as the evangelical utterances promulgate; the whole (namely catholic) church cries out to her by bellowing high with one voice: ‘Blessed are you, virgin Mary, you who believed; those things will be fulfilled in you which were told to you by the Lord.’ Amazing to say, the word is made flesh and is made body, namely that of which the evangelist, towering above with the height of all perceptions, says ‘In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God’, and so on. That is, after this incarnation was taken up from the virgin, the crime of the ancient virgin is removed and on all women is bestowed glory renowned in its shining marvels. Thus after the sweet-smelling divinity of Christ was left untouched, after his humanity had suffered, happily liberty came to the bounden servants.

Hence I Edgar, by the support of the high-throned one ruler of the English and the other peoples living all around far and wide, so that I may deserve to obtain participation in this liberty by the mercy of the high-throned governor: to the monastery held to be located in that famous place which is named by the inhabitants of this race with the noble name Pershore, and dedicated to Mary the ever-virgin mother of our Lord and also to blessed Peter, chief of the apostles, and to his fellow apostle Paul; to monks living by the Rule I grant eternal liberty of monastic privilege, insofar as after the death of the exemplary abbot Foldbriht in whose times this restoration of liberty has been granted with Christ favouring it, let the whole congregation of the aforementioned monastery appoint as abbot him whom it will have elected for itself with a fitting council, choosing him rightly from that same troop of brothers according to the regulating institutes of blessed Benedict.

Historia Ecclesia, ed. Hudson I, 60–5 (S 658), 94–9 (S 673) and 140–50 (S 876).
Let the liberty of this privilege be held hereafter in perpetual use by all catholic people, and let no outsider, relying on tyrannical obstinacy and seizing the right of power, exercise it in the aforementioned monastery, but may the community of the same monastery glory in the privilege of perpetual liberty as I have said before. Moreover let the aforesaid monastery be free of all earthly servitude in the same way in which it had been freed by our predecessor, namely by King Coenwulf, the most vigorous in orthodox faith, just as is contained in an ancient privilege which Earl Beornoth obtained: indeed the fields which were granted to our Lord Jesus Christ and his mother Mary by me myself restoring that right, for use of the monks in times ancient and modern, by kings and religious people of both sexes, that is namely [. . .] hides belonging to Pershore: ten hides at Bricklehampton, ten at Comberton, five at Pensham, sixteen at Eckington, ten at Birlingham, ten at Defford, ten at Strensham, ten at Besford, [. . .] at Croome, ten at [Severn] Stoke, ten at Pirton, four at Wadborough, three at Chevington, three at Broughton, ten at Peopleton, ten at Snodsbury, seven at Naunton [Beaufort], four at Abberton, five at Wiblafestune, five at Flyford, five at Grafton [Flyford], five at Dormston, five at Martin Hussingtree, three at Broughton [Hackett], two at Libbery, thirty at Longdon, seven at Powick, three at Leigh, three at Acton [Beaufort], forty at South Stoke, Hillesley, Tresham, Kilcott, Oldbury, Didmarton, Badminton and [Hawkesbury] Upton, ten at Dytham, five at Longney, six at Lydney, six at Wyegate, five at Beeley, five at Yardley, ten at Alderminster, twenty at Broadway, five at Compton; ten at [Childs] Wickham, and sites of eighteen vats in two places for the purpose of manufacturing salt, ten at Middlewich and eight at Netherwich, and a station of two furnaces at Witton and a vat which is called Westringge, with one and a half hides at the place called Horton [Hampton Lovett]; let them hold the same liberty in perpetuity.

Since, at the time when the lands which I have granted with devout mind to the Lord had been unjustly taken away from the holy church of God, some treacherous men, usurping the hereditary charters, issued new ones to themselves, yet in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit we have commanded that no catholic should accept these same charters but they should be considered as having been repudiated in anathema by all the faithful with the old privilege thriving continually.

But if some madman is so led astray with the folly of avarice (which we do not wish) that he should try with impudent daring to infringe this abundance of our munificence, may he be estranged from the community of the holy church of God and likewise from participation in the sacred body and blood of Jesus Christ the Son of God through whom the whole orb of lands has been freed from the ancient enemy of the human race, and may he be numbered on the left side with Judas, betrayer of Christ, unless first he shall have humbly repented with due satisfaction that he presumed to act as an insurgent against the holy church of God; may the apostate not obtain any forgiveness in this active life nor rest in the contemplative one, but may the most miserable man be driven into the eternal fires of the Pit with Ananias and Saphira and tormented without end. [. . .]80

80 The charter bounds are given here but these are not translated; for further details see above, n. 40.
Peter A. Stokes

In the year of the Lord’s Incarnation 972 the written contract of this munificence was written with these witnesses agreeing whose names are recorded below, laid out each in its own order according to the authority of each, with God supporting. [. . .]

Also to the monastery falls the aforementioned quantity of three ingera and two praedia in that well-known city which is called Worcester by its inhabitants, which (quantity) I grant to be held under condition of the same liberty in perpetuity in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord.

APPENDIX II:

THE LETTER FROM GODFREY, ARCHDEACON OF WORCESTER

The text and translation of Godfrey’s letter is provided below. Two manuscripts were collated for this text:

A  London, British Library, Cotton Augustus ii. 7 (s. xii)
C  Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 111, p. 135 (s. xvi)

The principles of editing are the same as those used for S 786 above.

TEXT

Reuerentissimo domino et patri A. summo pontifici, minimus sanctitatis sue servus Godefridus dictus Wigornensis archidiaconus, offerre domino incensum dignum in odorem suavitatis.

Inter cetera uirtutum indumenta quæ decent seruum bonum et fidelem presertim coram domino suo, ulde necessarium estimo sinceritatis et ueritatis ornamentum. Si quis enim huiuscemodi uestem nuptialem non habuerit, non intromittetur ad nuptias, sed eicietur foras, nec ascendet superius, ut sit honor ei coram simul discumbentibus. Quia qui sine ueritate est, patrifamilias placere non potest. Ego itaque, ut tamen non loquatur os meum opera hominum, huius rei gratia ueritatis emulator existens, ad ueritatem uocatus, ueritati testimonium perhibeo, ut ex temporali ueritatis exequutione ab eo qui ueritas est ueritatem mereamini mercedis tern. Nouerit itaque sanctitas uestra uerum esse quod contrascripti huius scriptum originale in uirtute sanctitatis sigilla tria, trium personarum autenticarum, ad ueritatem triplici confirmatione commendant. Est autem sigillum primum illustris regis Ægari, secundum Sancti Dunstani Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi, tercium Alferi ducis Merciorum. Sicut ex diligenti litterarum impressarum inspectione euidenter accipi. Operetur igitur si uobis placet filiæ uestraæ sanctæ Persoensæ ecclesiæ detrimentum intolerabile. Operetur inquam infra pietatis paternæ uiscera compassionem, compassio restitutionem, restitutio consolationem, et quæ ex toto fere defecit, quia non erat qui adiuuaret; nunc, nunc tandem, cum acceperitis tempus iustitias iudicandi, sentiat prophetam esse in Israel,

81 The witness-list is found here, for which see above, pp. 48–50. 82 See above, p. 43.
coque efficatius, quoniam et domnus\textsuperscript{i} abbas et ceteri fratres inibi Deo seruientes per uit\text{\textae} qu\text{\textae} coram Deo est sanctitatem et ab hiis qui foris sunt testimonii sani meruere celebritatem. Valeat in perpetuum Sanctitas Vestra.\textsuperscript{a}

\textsuperscript{a}Hic A. fuit Alexander tertius cuius tempore Galfridus Nothus Hentici Secundi fuit Archidiaconus Wigornensis, Lincolnensis, et\textsuperscript{e} Eboracensis et Cantuariensis\textsuperscript{k}, et postea anno 1174 electus episcopus Lincolnensis. Ut Mattheus Parisiensis, et Mattheus Westmoniensis anno praedicto. Et anno 1178 decorauit eum cingulo militari. Et Florilegus anno 1182 dicit Galfridum renunciasse ministerium episcopalem ex superbia generis. Hic Galfridus fuit 32 Archiepiscopus Eboracensis anno domini\textsuperscript{i} 1189 factus, et eo anno impetitus fuit per Hugonem Dunelmensem et Hubertum Sarum, ut eo anno scribit Walterus Couentrensis.\textsuperscript{m}

\textsuperscript{m}Vide Wilhelmmum Nouiburg libro secundo capitulo 22 et libro quarto capitulo 2.\textsuperscript{n}

\textsuperscript{a} Hoc scriptum appensum fuit magna charte de cenobio Persoran Parshorensi in testimonium eius chartae heading in C
\textsuperscript{b} suc\text{\textae} tue C
\textsuperscript{c} non\text{\textae} noti C
\textsuperscript{d} loquantur\text{\textae} loquantur C
\textsuperscript{e} perhibeo\text{\textae} exhibeo C
\textsuperscript{f} executione\text{\textae} execucione C
\textsuperscript{g} contrascripti\text{\textae} conscripsi C
\textsuperscript{h} Israel\text{\textae} isr\text{\textae} A Israe C
\textsuperscript{i} domnus\text{\textae} dominus C
\textsuperscript{j} et\text{\textae} om. C
\textsuperscript{k} et Cantuariensis\text{\textae} inserted A
\textsuperscript{l} domini\text{\textae} om. C
\textsuperscript{m} Hic . . . Couentrensis.] written on dorse in an early modern hand in A; written at end of text in C
\textsuperscript{n} Vide . . . cap. 2.] marginal note to preceding paragraph in A; written after preceding paragraph in C

\textbf{TRANSLATION}

To the most reverend lord and father, Pope A, Godfrey, called Archdeacon of Worcester, the least servant of your Holiness to offer the lord an incense worthy in the odour of its sweetness.\textsuperscript{83}

Among other clothing of virtues which above all befit a good and faithful servant before his lord, I hold especially necessary the ornament of sincerity and truth. For if anyone shall lack wedding clothes of this sort he shall not be admitted to the wedding but shall be thrown out the door;\textsuperscript{84} nor shall he go up higher so that at the same time there be honour for him before those sitting at the table.\textsuperscript{85} Because he who is without truth cannot please the head of the family. Accordingly, so that my mouth speaks not the works of men,\textsuperscript{86} for the sake of this matter being exceedingly zealous\textsuperscript{87} for the truth, called to truth, I offer witness to truth, so that, out of a moment's execution of the truth, from him who is truth you might deserve the truth of eternal reward. And so may your Holiness know that it is true that three signs of three authenticating

\textsuperscript{83} Ecclus. XLV.16. \textsuperscript{84} Matt. XXII.12–13. \textsuperscript{85} Luke XIV.10. \textsuperscript{86} Ps. XVI.4. \textsuperscript{87} Gal. I.14.
people in virtue of the holy Trinity do commend the original of this copy to the truth with triple confirmation. For the first is the seal of the most famous King Edgar, the second of St Dunstan, archbishop of Canterbury, the third of Ælfhere, earl of Mercia; I have accepted it as evidently thus from careful inspection of the letters which have been stamped on it. It could, therefore, affect an intolerable loss for your daughter the holy church of Pershore if it pleases you. It could, I repeat, effect compassion with the mercy of paternal love, compassion could bring about restitution, restitution consolation, and that is something which has been almost entirely lacking because there was noone who would help; now, now at last, since you have accepted that it is time to judge with right judgements, let him know that there is a prophet in Israel, and all the more efficaciously, since both the lord abbot and the other brothers serving God there through the holiness of a life in God’s sight as well as from those who are outside the community have deserved a cause for celebration at sound testimony. May your Holiness fare well in perpetuity.

This A. was Alexander III, in whose time Geoffrey the bastard son of Henry II was archdeacon of Worcester, Lincoln, and York (and Canterbury), and afterwards was elected bishop of Lincoln in 1174 (as Matthew Paris and Matthew of Westminster under the aforementioned year). And in 1178 he was knighted. And Florilegus says that in 1182 Geoffrey had renounced his bishopric out of pride of birth. This Geoffrey was made thirty-second archbishop of York in 1189, and in that year was attacked by Hugh of Durham and Hubert of Sarum, as Walter of Coventry writes for that year.

See William of Newburgh, Book 2 Chapter 22, and Book 4 Chapter 2.

88 Ps. LXXIV.3. 89 IV Kings V.8.
90 Sic: the author of this note has apparently confused Archdeacon Godfrey with Geoffrey Plantagenet, archbishop of York.
92 ‘Florilegus’ is again ‘Matthew of Westminster’: see Historia Anglorum, ed. Madden, xx, for discussion, and Rogeri de Wendover liber qui dicitur Flores historiarum ab anno domini MCLIV, ed. F. Madden, RS [44], 3 vols. (London, 1886–9) II, 128–9 for the text.