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King Edgar’s Charter for Pershore (AD 972)

PETER A. STOKES

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 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 Orthodoxorum charters in general.

The Manuscripts

Peter Sawyer’s Annotated List gives five surviving copies of S 786, and this list is essentially unchanged in the Electronic Sawyer. 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)
T London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. xiii, 163v–164r (s. xi; contains only the bounds of Acton Beauchamp)
V London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius D. vii, 29r–30v (s. xvi)
D1 Oxford, Bodleian Library, Dodsworth 10 (S.C. 4152), 66r–67r (s. xvii; direct descendant of A; no bounds or witnesses)
D2 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.

The ‘Single Sheet’ Version (AD1D2)
The earliest surviving copy of the document is Augustus ii. 6. 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

8 Sawyer, Anglo-Saxon Charters, pp. 250–1; Electronic Sawyer, no. 786.
approximately 635 × 530–40 mm, with a writing-frame of approximately 590 × 495 mm;\textsuperscript{10} it is written in fifty-six long lines on the face and has an additional seventeen lines on the dorse.\textsuperscript{11} 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.\textsuperscript{12} 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,\textsuperscript{13} 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.\textsuperscript{14} 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 \(\textit{a}\) and the first d all Caroline, as shown in Figure 1. Indeed, Caroline d and \(\textit{a}\) are evident elsewhere in the document, although the round-backed ‘uncial’ d and single-compartment \(\textit{a}\) 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.\textsuperscript{15} Finally, the

\textsuperscript{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, \textit{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.

\textsuperscript{11} As noted by Thompson, \textit{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.

\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Facsimiles of Ancient Charters in the British Museum}, ed. E. A. Bond (London, 1873–8) III, 30.


\textsuperscript{15} For these different forms of \(\textit{s}\) in Anglo-Saxon script see N. R. Ker, \textit{Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon} (Oxford, 1957), pp. xxx–xxxi.
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. 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. 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

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.


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.\footnote{The hands are in BL Additional Charter 19792 (S 1326: Worcester, dated 969 and reproduced in Facsimiles, ed. Bond III, 28); Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, latin 10575 (Worcester?, probably s. x/xi), and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 12 (Worcester provenance; s. x\textsuperscript{2}). For the dating of BN lat. 10575, see D. N. Dumville, ‘On the Dating of Some Late Anglo-Saxon Liturgical Manuscripts’, Trans. of the Cambridge Bibliographical Soc. 10 (1991–5), 40–57, at 51; for CCC 12 see Ker, Catalogue, pp. 41–2 (no. 30); for this form of Square minuscule, termed Phase VI by Dumville, see his ‘English Square Minuscule: Mid-Century Phases’, pp. 155–6, and Stokes, ‘English Vernacular Script’ I, 95–6.}

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.\footnote{For now see Dumville, ‘Beowulf Come Lately’, and D. N. Dumville, ‘The Beowulf Manuscript and How Not to Date it’, Med. Stud. Eng. Newsletter (Tokyo) 39 (1998), 21–7.} Nevertheless, the similarity in letter-forms and appearance with other single-sheet charters dated to the 960s is striking.\footnote{As well as BL Add. 19792, for which see above, n. 19, other examples include those by ‘Edgar A’, specifically BL Cotton Augustus ii. 40, Cotton Augustus ii. 39, BL Harley Charter 43. C. 3, BL Cotton Charter viii. 28, and BL Stowe Charter 29 (S 687, S 690, S 703, S 706, and S 717, reproduced in Facsimiles, ed. Bond III, 22, 23, 25, 24, and Facsimiles of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts, ed. W. B. Sanders, 3 vols. [Southampton, Ordnance Survey, 1878–84] III, 30 respectively). All five charters are apparently original and dated 960–3. Similarities between the script of Augustus ii. 6 and that of ‘Edgar A’ have also been noted by Kelly, ‘S 786’, and Chaplais, ‘The Anglo-Saxon Chancery’, p. 49.} 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.\footnote{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 minimis, and tapered ascenders, none of which are present in the script of Augustus ii. 6.} 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...
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 *Sture* 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.

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 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 biblotheca 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>liminibus</td>
<td>liminibus</td>
<td>liminibus (altered from liminibus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dictu</td>
<td>die tu</td>
<td>dictu (altered from die tu or perhaps dic tu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praelucens</td>
<td>praelucens</td>
<td>praelucens (altered from praelucens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>congregatio apto elegerit</td>
<td>congregatio ......</td>
<td>congregatio apto elegerit consilio ......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consilio secundum [ . . . ]</td>
<td>. . . (series of dots)</td>
<td>(series of dots) iuste (clear; not altered or inserted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abbatem iuste</td>
<td>iuste</td>
<td>iuste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a rege uidelicet</td>
<td>aregeind the et</td>
<td>a rege nidelicet (altered from tregeind the et)</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>neniarn nec in theorica (written across fold)</td>
<td>vrinam . . . (series of dots) eroba</td>
<td>neniarn nec in theorica (clear; not altered or inserted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barathri incendid trusus cum (written across fold)</td>
<td>barrathi . . . (series of dots) cum</td>
<td>barathri incendid trusus cum (last word altered from lugubris; incendid unclear)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saphyra ingiter miserrimus cruciatur</td>
<td>Saphyra ingiter . . . (series of dots)</td>
<td>Saphyra ingiter miserrimus cruciatur. (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 Parcivelm 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

---

37 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.
is quite different, and three boundary-clauses, one very incomplete, are also included which are not known from anywhere else.\textsuperscript{38}

\textbf{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;\textsuperscript{39} 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: \textit{[tentative reconstruction]}. Ellipses ‘...’ indicate lost text which cannot be reconstructed, and angled brackets \texttt{<>} indicate supplied readings for which there is no space in the manuscript.

\textsuperscript{38} See below, pp. 57–65. \textsuperscript{39} See above, p. 34.
Latin ė in Joscelyn’s transcript is silently normalized to e, as is j to i and v to u, but ė 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, Britannia and once dipinxi in Vitellius for æclesia, æclesiasticus, decusatim, pro, Saphyra, Britanniæ and depinxi in Augustus. Similarly the practice of the single sheet in the use of æ, ė, 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 (ʄ) 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 þæt 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.
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famina stupenda cecinisse uidetur carmina, cui æclesia tota catholica consona uoce alti-bohando proclamat: ‘Beata es uirgo Maria que credidisti, perficientur in te que dicta sunt tibi a Domino.’ Mirum dictu incarnatur urburn et incorporatur, scilicet illud de quo euangelista supereminenus unuorsorum altitundine sensuum inquit: ‘In principio erat urburn et urburn erat apud Deum et Deus erat urburn’, et reliqua. Qua uidelicet sumpta de uirgine incarnatione antiquæ uirginis facinus demitut et cunctus mulieribus nitidis pracluens taumatibus decus irrogatur. Intacta igitur redolente Christi diuinitate passaque ipsius humanitate libertas addictis elementer contigit seruulis.

Hinc ego Eadgar altithrono amminiculante Anglorum ceterarumque gentium in circuitu triuïatim persistentium basileus, ut huius libertatis altithroni moderatoris clementia mereat optimere consortium, coenobio loco celebri qui ab huius prosapie solicolis Perscoran nobili nuncupatur uocabulo situm, genetrici domini nostri semper uirgini Mariae, necnon beato Petro apostolorum principi eiusque coapostolo Paulo, dedicat habetur, monachis regulariter degentibus monasticí aeternam priuilegii concedo libertatem, quatenus post decessum Foldbrihti abbatis egregii cuiius temporibus hae libertatis restauratio Christo suffragante concessa est quem sibi unuersa praefati coenobii congregatio apto elegerit consilio 2secundum regularia beati Benedicti institutæ abbatam iuste ex codem fratrum cuneo eligens constituat

Huius priuilegii libertas deinceps usu perpetuo a cunctis teneatur catholicis, nec extraneorum quispiam tyrannica fretus contumacia in predicto ‘monasterio ius arripientes exerceat potestatis, sed eiusdem coenobii collegium perpetuum præfatum monasterium omnii terrae liberum esse prædicto providendo, ac in omnibus hae libertatis restauratio Christo suffragante concessa est quem sibi unuersa praefati coenobii congregatio apto elegerit consilio 2secundum regularia beati Benedicti institutæ abbatam iuste ex codem fratrum cuneo eligens constituat

b2Id est in Perscoran uidelicet [. . . .] mansi2, in Brihtulfingtune2 x mansi, in Cumbrincgtune x mansi, in Pedneshamme v2 mansi, in Eccyncgtune xvi mansi, in Byrlingahamme x mansi, in Deopanforda x mansi, in Strengesho x, in Bettesforda x2, in Cromban [. . .]2, in Stoce x, in Pyritune x, in Uuadbeorhan iii2, in Ciuincgtune2 iii2, in Broctune2 iii, in Piplincgtune2 x, in Snoddesbyri x, in Niuanunte vii, in Eadbrihtingtune iiiii2, in Uuihtlafestune v, in Flæferthn2 v, in Graftune v, in Deormodescaldtune v, in Husantreo 7o2 on Meretune v, in Broctune iii, into Hleobyri2 ii, [in] Langandune xxx, in Poineuguic vii, in Beornothesleahæ iii2, in Actune iii, in Suthstocce 7 on Hilleahæ2 7 on Tresham 7 on Cyllingcgotan 7 on Ealdanbyri 7 Dydimertune2 7 Badymncgtun 7 Uptun xl2, in Deorham x, in Longanege v, in Lidanege vi, in Uuigangate vi, in Beoleahæ v2, in Gyrdleahæ v2, in Sture x2, in Bradanuuge xx, in Cumpune2 v, in Uuiuguennar2 x, et ad usum conficiendi salis duobus in locis xviii doliorum situs, on middelwic x, 7 on neodemestan vic viii3, et duarum fornacium statio on Uuictune, et uas quod dicitur west rincge cum uno manso et dimidium mansi in loco qui dicitur Hortun3: eiusdem perpetualiter sint libertatis. [. . .]3
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Tempore siquidem quo rura quae domino deuoto animo inuiste a sancta Dei æclesia ablatia fuerant, perfidi quique nouas sibi hereditarias cartas usurpantes ediderunt sed in patris et filii et spiritus sancti nomine precipimus ut catholiconem nemo easdem recipiat, sed a cunctis repudiate fidellibus in anathemate deponentur ueteri iugiter uigente privilegio.

Saphyra iugiter requiem apostata obtineat ullam, sed æternis barathri incendiis trusus cum Anania et æclesiam rebellis agere præsumptis, nec in uita hac practica ueniam nec in theoria requiem apostata obvintat ullam, sed æternis barathri incendiis trusus cum Anania et Saphyra iugiter miserrimus crucietur.

Dis sindon þa lond gemæra 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 þone mgæþpur, of þam mapuldre, of þam mapuldre on ceap manna wyllan, [of þære wyllan] to þam h[æwe, be] þære h[æwe to þam bæninges byrig, of b]æninges byrig to wealh ge[at], of wæ[æh ge]æte to mæ[t] cnolle, of mær [c]nolle on lind hoh, of lind ho on clottes more, of clottes more on mær p[ull], ondlong pulles on afene, of afene on caldan wyllan, of caldan wyllan on wyrð hlinge, of wyrð hli[n]ece on hor pyt, [of] or hor pyt[t]te o[n] culfan mere, of þæm mere on hag[an weg, of hagan wege on b]roc [h]rycg, of broc hryge on þa caldan dic, of δ[ære 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 humani generis inimico liberatus est. Et cum Iuda Christi proditore sinistra in parte deputatus, ni prius hic digna satisfactione humilis penituerit quod contra sanctam Dei æclesiam rebellis agere præsumptis, nec in uita hac practica ueniam nec in theoria requiem apostata obvintat ullam, sed æternis barathri incendiis trusus cum Anania et Saphyra iugiter miserrimus crucietur.

Dis sindon þa lond gemæra þære tun londa þe into perscoran belimpað.
Peter A. Stokes

[wifer gemæra into ceatewes leahe
weorpan to col forda, of col forda
of secg broce to mere, of healre mere to
Ærest of an burnan to cumbran weor
æsce to brycg geleagan, of brycg geleagan on bradan ford on glencincg,
glencincg, wixena broc, ondlang broces on pidelan, 7lang pidelan þæt eft on wihtlaes gemæra.
[Flyford (Dormston?)] Dis sind þa lond ge<max>ra³ into fle[ferð. Æ]res[t] of þam ealdan slæde on [w]inter burnan, of þære burnan on þane swyn hege, 7lang heges on comeeres mæduan, of þam mæduan on hodes ac, of þære ac 7lang heges to þæm wege, 7lang weges on winter burnan, 7lang burnan on hereferðæ 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[ç e]ft in pidelan, 7lang pidelan eft to þæm slæpe.
[(Martin) Hussingtree] Pis sind þa lond gemæra to husan treo. Ærest of þære stræt 7lang dic to bradan 7lang burnan on³ seale weorpan, ondlang seale weorpan to col forda, of col forda 7lang þære miclan dic on alr broc, 7lang broces on ðecornan¹³ mor, of þam more 7lang dic on feower gemæra, of þæm gemærton to þorn lehe, of þorn lehe 7lang dic eft on þa stræt.
[Longdon] Dis sind þæs londes gemæra into langan dune. Ærest of sæfern on wiferðæ mæduan hege, of þam hege³ of þone hricg, of þam hricge on þone wulf hagan midne of þam wulf hagan to þam ðrym gemærnan, of þæm ðrym gemæra to pis breece, of pis breece to tidbrihtig hamme, of þan hamme on pyrt broc, 7lang broces to pytuan heale, of peartan healle to halgan geate, of hagan geate to twy forde, of twy fyrdre to luf bece, of luf bece betweonan dune, of pyrtan heale, of peartan heal[e] to hagan geate, of hagan geate to twy forde, of twy fyrdre.
[Chaceley, Eldersfield, Staunton, and Wynburh Edisce] Dis sindan þa lond gemæra into ceatewes leahe 7 to yldres³ felda 7 to stan tune 7 to wynburhæ edisce. Ærest of an burnan to cumbran weorðe, of cumbran weorþe to þære mæran ec, of ðære⁴ ec to stan hlincan, of stan hlincan³ to reade burnan, of reade burnan to healre³ mere, of healre mere to þære ec, of þære ec to hagan leahe, of ðære leahe on secg broc, of secg breece to þan hean dore, of[ð] þan dore to bræd breece, 7lang broces þæt in glencincg, 7lang glencincg þæt in ledene, 7lang ledene to mær broce, of mær broce to brycg geleagan, of brycg geleagan on bradan ford on glencincg, 7lang glencincg to blacan mores forda, of blacan mores forda to þan halgan geate, of þan halgan geate to risc heale, of hrisc heale to þam ho, of þam ho a be wuda to þam [æscel], of þam ðæc to þære ege, of [þære ege] to bradan leahe, of bradan leahe to feæs græfe, of feæs græfe to cram pull to þam mær hege, of ðæm hege on s[æ]fern, of sæfern eft on an burnan.
[Powick] Pis sindon þa lond gemæra into poinæ wican. Ærest up of sæfern on beornwoldes sætan, of beornwoldes sætan on hagan geat, of hagan geate on secg lages strod, of secg lahes strode on troh hryçg, of troh hryçge on tecles mor, of þæm [more] on baldan rycg, of baldan rycge on flotan rycg, of flotan rycge⁴⁴ on þa smæðan ac, of ðære ac on lin[d] rycg, of lind rycge on abban dunes wican, of abban dunes wican in baldan geat, of baldan geate on cust leahe, of cust leahe in eadwoldingæ leahe mid-dewearde of eadwoldingæ leahe on steapan leahe, of steapan leahe in ð[a] greatan lindan,
of ðære lindan on cardan stigele, of þæ[r[e] stigele in wearnan dene to hreod broc geate, of þam geate on ðæðe burnan, ȝ lang ðæðe burnan þæt wiðutan þone snæd hege þæt to scir hylt geate, of scir hylt geate on codran ford, ondlang codran on c[ð]om[a] þæt to ðære caldan stræt, ondlong ðære stræt t[o] maw pul, ȝ lang pulles on temedan, ȝ lang temedan eft in s[þeñrn].

[Leigh] D[is sind]\[^{b/t}^4] P[a] land gemæra into beornnoðes leahe. Ærest of cadvoldincg leahe an æcer, of þæm æc[e]ere on mer helge, ȝ long mer[e] hege[s] on seanp[an] h[yl], [of sean]þan hyle on ðæðe burnan, of þære burnan on g[unden]ng rycc, of þam rycc ge on codran, of codran to syl beame, of syl beame to crome, of crome to hwitan wyllan, of þære wyllan to hagan geate, of hagan geate to þæ[re grea]tan\[^{e/d}^4] æc, of ðære æc on þa sand seaðas, of þam seaðan in temedan, of temedel on þa lytlan becas þanan [on grindles bec]e, of grindles bece swa þæt gemere ligð in tem[eda]n, of temedan onbutan elders ege þæt eft in temedan, andlang temedan þæt eft in maw pul.

[Acton (Beauchamp)] Ðis sind þa lond gemæra into ac tune. Ærest on horsa broc, of horsa broce in heafoc rycc, of heafoc ryce on bilincg broc\[^{d}^4] , of byling broce in at leahe geat, of at leahe geate in þa hlydan, of þære hlydan in bycera fald, of bycera [fal] de on sand ford, of sand forda in scotta þæð, of scottan þæðe in gyslan ford, \^[o]f gyslan forda on sand burnan, of sond burnan on scead wællan, of scead wellan in lam seeðan\[^{e}^4] , of lam seaðan in ledene, of ledene in lin leahe, of lin leahe in saltæra weg, of saltæra wege in hean ofer, of hean ofre in suð broc, of suð broce in we[st] broc, of west broce in cleg wyllan, of cleg wyllan in æðelstanes graf, of æðelstanes graue on hengestes healh, of h[e]ngestes heale eft in horsa broc.

[South Stoke] Ðis sind þa para vii land gemæra into suð stocce. Ærest of mæddene westewardre on beaduc hyl ȝ lang dene on badan pyt, of þam pytte on æsc wyllan broc, ȝ lang broces on afene, ȝ lang afene on broc hardes for[d, of þam] forda on swyn burnan, of swyn burnan on funtes burnan, of funtes burnan on bremer leah, of bremer lea ȝ lang dene on stan leah, of stan lea on seonecan dene, ȝ lang dene on chan feldes geat þonne on gate wyllan, of gate wyllan on cyneges crundlu, of cyneges crundlan ȝ lang dene on rise mere, of rise mere on æsc [de]ne, of æsc dene on hord dene, of hord dene on þone holan weg on luhinc wudu on fileð leahe, of filet leahe on æðelan wyllan, of þæm wyllan adune on stre[am], 

[Athelstan] æ[re grea]tan æc, of byling broce in at
dane into beorno

[Beoley] Ðis sind þa land gemæra into beo leahe. Ærest of beo leahe on cundincg æceras, of cundincg æceran on fearn healas, of fearn healan on burh leahe, of burh leahe on geahes ofer, of geahes ofre on stan geat, of stan geate on wulferes wyllan, of
Peter A. Stokes

écoute wyllan on deawes broc, of þære broce on mapoldren [geat], of þære geate on beard[n]cg<sup>4</sup> ford, of bearding forda eft on beo leahe.

[Yardley] Dis sind þa land gemëra into gyrd lea. Ærest of gyrd lea on colle, of colle on mær dic, of mær dice on blacan mearcan, of blacan mearcan on þo[n]e ðæð garan on dagarding weg, of dagarding wege on ac wyllan, of ac wyllan on bradan apold[e, o]f ðære apoldre on mæres ðorn, of ðan ðorne on smalan broc, of smalan broce on cinc tunes broc<sup>4</sup>, of þære broce on dyrnan ford, of dyrnan for[da] on brom halas of brom halan on hwitan leahe, of hwitan leahe on leommaningeg weg ðonan on colle, of colle on mæs mor, of mæs more on ciondan, of ciondan on spel broc ðonan on bulan wyllan, of bul[an] wyllan on þa langan æc, of ðære langan æc [on] mundes dene, of mund[e]s dene on colle, of colle eft on gyrd<sup>4</sup> leahe.

[Alderminter] Dis sind þa land gemëra þæs londes þe lymp<sup>7</sup> to sture, þæt is ðonne, æt ærestan denewalding hommes ende scyt on sture, þonne scyt se dic [þæt hit] cyman foran to byrman scytle, þonne þonan 7lang þære ealdan stræte þæt hit cyman on mær bro[c], 7lang mær broces þæt hit cyman to langan dun[es c]nde þonon þæt hit cyman to po[s] hlawan, þonne of pos hlawan to sealte mere, of sealte mere on fugel mere, of fugel mere on steapanc hlinne, of steapanc hlince on bara broc, of bara broce ymb wydan cumb, of widan cum[be to b]æ æm broce on dyrnan ford, of dyrnan for[da] on brom halas of brom halan on hwitan leahe, of hwitan leahe on leommaningeg weg ðonan on colle, of colle on mæs mor, of mæs more on ciondan, of ciondan on spel broc ðonan on bulan wyllan, of bul[an] wyllan on þa langan æc, of ðære langan æc [on] mundes dene, of mund[e]s dene on colle, of colle eft on gyrd<sup>4</sup> leahe.

[Broadway] Dis sind þa land gemëra to brada[n wege]. Ærest of mær cumbe<sup>4</sup> on pes broc, þonon on þa heafda æt west mæduwan, of west medwan on þa heaf[da] þæt on þêstel me[re, of þæm me[r]e 7lang slædes on pincan dene, of p[incan dene] þæt up on beornæ<sup>4</sup> dune ufew[ea]rde þonon on þone stapol, of þæm stapole of[e] þone ealdan feld þæt on fugel hlæw, of þæm [hlawe] on egstan mor, of ðan mor[e] up andlang dune þæt [on] bædde wellan, of bæddes wellan on brer hlæw, of þæm hlæwe on norð ham onbutan norð ham 7lang þære ealdan dic þæt on sand broc, of sand broce on bord riðig, of bord riðig on hor pyttes riþig, of hor pytte 7lang fura þæt on eadan mynster þonon on þa ege þæt on þa sealte stræt, 7lang stræt on þa ealdan dic æt nanes mannanes lande, of ðære dic on<sup>4</sup> [vii] wyllan, of [seol]fan<sup>4</sup> wyllan on þristlinga dene, of ðristlinga dene ufewfead þæt on þa ealdan dic æt wad beorhe, 7lang dic eft o<n><sup>4</sup> mær cumbe.

<sup>4</sup>Anno dominicae incarnationis decece lxxii<sup>4</sup> scripta est huius munificentiae sinigrapha his testibus<sup>4</sup> consentientibus quorum inferius nomina secundum uniuscuiusque dignitatem utriusque ordinis decusatim domino disponente caraxantur:

Ego Dunstan Dorobernensis<sup>4</sup> æclesie archiepiscopus eiusdem regis<sup>4</sup> beniuolentiam confirmaui.

Ego Oswold Eboracensis basilicæ primas huic regali dono adsennus prebui.

Ego Ædelwold Wintoniensis presul edis canonica subscriptione manu propria depinxii.

Ego Ælftan Lundoniensis cathedre pontifex signum sanctæ crucis latus impressi.
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Ego Alfwold Scireburnensis cathedre antistes hoc intepidus donum corroboraui.
Ego Brihtelm plebi Dei famulus huius regis dapsilli ati letabundus aplausi.
Ego Alfwold legis Dei catascopus testudinem agie crucis iussu regis impressi.
Ego Aelfstan Rofensis sedis archimandrita tau[majlow] crucis agie hilaris imposui.
Ego Eadelm commissarum plebium speculator hoc eulogium gaudens firmaui.
Ego Wynsige Dei allubescente gratia spiritualis ouilis opilio hane largitionem consoli-
dau.
Ego Aðulf domino codrus amminiculante hoc donum tropheo sancte crucis confir-
mau.
Ego Ælfric abbas subscripsi.
Ego Ælfgryð præfati regis conlaterana hoc sintahma cum sigillo sancte crucis sub-
scripsi.
Ego Ælfric abbas subscripsi.
Ego Æscwig abbas conscripsi.
Ego Osgar abbas dictaui.
Ego Ægelgar abbas impressi.
Ego Cynewead abbas depinxi.
Ego Foldbriht abbas descripsi.
Ego Ælfeah abbas confirmaui.
Ego Sideman abbas corroboraui.
Ego Oswead abbas con[ensi].
Ego Brihtehab abbas impressi.
Ego Godwine abbas cons[ensi].
Ego Brihtnoð abbas ass[ensi].
Ego Germanus abbas firmaui.
Ego Ælferc dux.
Ego Oslac dux.
Ego Æðelwine dux.
Ego Brihtnoð dux.
Ego Æðelweard minister.
Ego Wulfstan minister.
Ego Ælfweard minister.
Ego Ælfsige minister.
Ego Æðelsige minister.
Ego Wulfric minister.
Ego Ælfwine minister.
Ego Wulfgeat minister.
Ego Wulfstan minister.
Ego Æðelmær minister.
Ego Eanulf minister.
Ego Eadwine minister.
Ego Æðelweard minister.
Ego Ælfric minister.
Ego Aðelwold minister.
Ego Alfwold minister.
Ego Wulfmær minister.
Ego Ælfweard minister.
Ego Ælfelm minister.
Ego Ælfric minister.
Ego Leofwine minister.
Ego Leofric minister.
Ego Ælfelm minister.
Ego Leofsige minister.
Ego Leofwine minister.
Ego Wulfric minister.
Ego Ælfric minister.
Ego Ealdred minister.
Ego Ælfeah minister.
Ego Leofstan minister.
Ego Ælfric minister.
Ego Ælfric minister.
Ego Brihtric minister.
Ego Leofa minister.
Ego Brihtric minister.

Prefata\textsuperscript{5} quoque [. . .] trium iugerorum quantitas et duo predia, in famosa urbe quæ ab accolis dicitur Wygornceastre accidunt, quæ sub eiusdem condicione libertatis perpetualiter in nomine domini nostri Iesu Christi haberi precipio.

\textbf{[Endorsement]} \textsuperscript{5}[XP] DIS [IS SE FREOLSE] 7 \textit{bara landa boc} [DE] EADG[AR] CINING GEUDE INTO PERSCORAN SWA HIS YLDRAE HIT ÆR GESETTAN GODE TO LOFE 7 SANCTA MARIAN\textsuperscript{5}

\textsuperscript{a} Fundacio Abbathiae de Persor per Regem Edgarum Ex Carta Originali penes Thomas Cotton Baronetum 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

\textsuperscript{b} + \textit{Au} om. VD\textsuperscript{1}

\textsuperscript{c} ut perhaps two letters lost at start of line V

\textsuperscript{d} microcosmum] micocrosmum A

\textsuperscript{e} formauerat[formauerat [fo]rmauerat V

\textsuperscript{f} amoenitatis| e inserted A

\textsuperscript{g} decentissime| ss underlined in pencil A

\textsuperscript{h} alogia| alogie V

\textsuperscript{i} prophetis| prophetis V 6–8 letters erased after prophetis A

\textsuperscript{j} infrustrans| u altered from ?o V

\textsuperscript{k} supernis| supernus V

\textsuperscript{l} que| que \textit{in} V

\textsuperscript{m} Perscoran| Perscoram V c inserted A

\textsuperscript{n} priviilegi| altered from priuilegium V

\textsuperscript{o} Foldbrhiht| Foldbrinti V

\textsuperscript{p} quem sibi uniuersa| illegible A written as que . . . universa D\textsuperscript{1}D\textsuperscript{2}

\textsuperscript{q} apto . . . abbatem| illegible A written as a series of dots D\textsuperscript{4}

\textsuperscript{r} secundum . . . abbatem| written as a series of dots D\textsuperscript{2}

\textsuperscript{s} eligens constituat| eligens c lost to fire V
King Edgar's Charter for Pershore (AD 972)

deinceps usu perpetuo] usu perp lost to fire deinceps written twice V

catholicis] lic lost to fold A

extraneorum . . . tyrannica] neorun quispam ty lost to fire V

in] illegible A

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

coenobi . . . libertatis] lost to fire V

nostro] nostri D\textsuperscript{1}

priuilegio . . . concessi sunt] lost to fire but passage seems to be followed by Tempore siquidem clause (see note d\textsuperscript{3} and pp. 60–1, Table 2) V large ^ added in black ink after sunt A

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

mansi] erasure before mansi in A

Brihtulfingtune] i inserted, l on erasure A

v] probably on erasure A

x] possibly on erasure A

g] numeral erased A

iiii] on erasure A

g] unclear; looks like c in A but clearly g in D\textsuperscript{1}D\textsuperscript{2}

iiii] on erasure A

Broctune] tune illegible in A but clear in D\textsuperscript{1}D\textsuperscript{2}

Piplingtune] followed by illegible note in right-hand margin? A

iii] on erasure A

Flæferth] l inserted A

om. D\textsuperscript{1} cl (but very unclear) D\textsuperscript{2}

h] probably inserted (parchment damaged so unclear) A

iiii] on erasure A

Suthstocoe] S underlined A

Hilleah] second l inserted A

Dydimeretune] second e perhaps on erasure A

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

v] on erasure A

w] unusual form; probably altered from x A

x] probable erasure after which was part of numeral A

Cumtune] first w unclear but fairly certain; perhaps o A

Usiguennan] g unclear and perhaps c A Wicwennan D\textsuperscript{1} Uuicuuennan D\textsuperscript{2}

v] vertical line added after numeral A

Hortun] 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

parte] at illegible in A but clear in V, om. (rows of dots) in D\textsuperscript{1}D\textsuperscript{2}

juger] text ends here (with line of dots) D\textsuperscript{1}

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

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

dic] text ends here D\textsuperscript{2}

bæninges] c inserted A

ondlong] d inserted A

∂orn] ðor A

∂an] inserted A

ford] thin vertical line added after ford A

\textsuperscript{3}pam] ðan A
Peter A. Stokes

gemæra] gera A

on] inserted A

deornan] cross-stroke of $\delta$ extremely faint, probably added, but ascender long like that of $\delta$ rather than d A

hege] ge inserted A

hwitan] h inserted A

ef] e A

yldres] letter erased before y A

of ðere] of altered; letter before o erased, o formed from minim, i added; $\delta$ perhaps also an alteration A

hlican] h inserted A

healre] e inserted A

of] inserted A

tyre] e inserted A

Dis sind] lost, but top of $\delta$ 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 fordā . . . sea[pān] written in a smaller and more compressed hand A

streame] a inserted A

geredincg] c inserted A

hongran] first n clumsily altered from ð A

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

beardingc] Bond and others printed beardyncg; obscured in manuscript but i clear in facsimile A

broc] c inserted A

gyrd] perhaps on erasure; second d inserted A

lymp] δ inserted A

/lang] 71 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 lxxii] 972 (in ‘Arabic’ numerals) V

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

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

Dorobernensis] altered from Dorbbernensis A

regis] g inserted A

corborauui] conprobauui V (S 788 reads corborauui)

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

Ælfðryð] illegible; Bond printed Ælfðryð A

Second column of witnesses begins here A New line begins here V verbs of subscription heavily abbreviated and sometimes ambiguous AV

conscripsi] cons A coscρi V (so not consensi, pace Birch)
dictauui] lost to fire V

cyneweard] y unclear but pretty certain; i unlikely, pace Bond, Birch and others A (S 788 reads Cineweard) V clear in V

abbas descriptui] lost to fire V

Ælfæh] Ælfæh illegible; Bond and Birch printed Ælfhæh A Ælfhæh clear in V

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

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

Ego . . . consensi] Ego Osweard abbas illegible; verb written as con so ambiguous A con[sensi] lost to fire V

consensi] cons A cos V (abbreviations ambiguous)

abbas assensi] abb ass A abbass assensi lost to fire V Abbreviation ambiguous; Birch printed assensim [sic] prebui, presumably supplied from Oswald of York's attestation, but assensi not uncommon in witness-lists. (S 788 reads assensi)

Third column of witnesses begins here A New line begins here V

Ego Oslac . . . Brihtnoð dux] Ego Oslac, Æðelwine, Brihtnoð duces V

Ego Æðelweard minister] begins new line; minister omitted; all occurrences of Ego and minister omitted or lost from here on V

Æðelsige] sige illegible (but printed by Bond) A

Wulfriç] lost to fire V

Fourth column of witnesses begins here A No new line here V

Æðelweard] lost to fire V

Ælfriç] lfric lost to fire V

Leofwine] lost to fire V

Fifth column of witnesses begins here A No new line here V

Ealdred, Ælfheah] lost to fire V

Leofa, Brihtric] lost to fire; end of page so further material may be lost V

prefata] sic V reads praefato (see below)

XP ðis . . . Marian] badly worn; for reconstruction see below, pp. 66–7 A

**BL. Cotton Vitellius D. vii, 29v–30v**

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 ad accolis dicitur Wigornaceaster accidunt, quæ sub eiusdem[m] conditione libertatis perpetualiter in nomine domini nostri Iesu Christi haberipreci p[rio], et ad usum conficiendi salis duobus in locis xviili dolorium situ[s] on middelwic x, 7 on neodœmostan wic viii, et duarum fornacium 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 perpetualiter sint libertati[s].

Hec sunt termini illarum terrarum, quæ in circuitu monasterii ualen[t] 150⁴ manentes.

53
Peter A. Stokes

Pershore Estates]. Ærest of pirigforda 7lang dic on dā pyri[gan], ðānan on dāne lan gan mapolder, ðæt on ceap mann a wyllan swa to n[...].] hwæt a be ðære ecge on mærcnol, ðānan on lind hoh, ðæt on clott[es] mor swa on mær pul, ðæt on afene swa on caldan[7] wyllan, ðæt on w[yr] blice, ðānan on hor pyt, ðæt on culfræ mere swa on hagan weg, [ðæt on] broc hriegg, ðānan on dā caldan dic, ðæt on swine swa on reod dic, ðæt [on] woece mere, ðānan on dā twycene, ðæt on ðæt hæxel rewæ swa [7]lang streames on hor wyllan, ðānan on dā langan dic on cym[man] leahe swa on sæfern up 7lang streames to hamstede, dā[an] 7lang stræt east to wuda, ðæt on heade burge weordi swa on hrieges on biscopeces swyn hege, ðæt on beartan weg, ðānan [on caldan] leahe, ðæt 7lang dic to hæð halan, 7lang dic on piddles mereco w[eg on] wad beorhæs, ðānan on sealmar mere 7lang sices on yrs[e], 7lang yrse on hwitan dene, ðānan east on dān[e fulan pyt] on byrn wynne dene, ðæt on hyml broc æt wuda forda, up 7lang[ro]ces on oxan cars, ðæt to dān stan gedelfe, ðānan 7lang dic on [bunig] burnan, ðæt eft on hyml broc, 7lang broces to beccan leahe [on] dā die swa 7lang mare wegæs on cealfor leahe, ðæt on dā hege sto[wre, dānan on hennuc, ðæt on dā dorne rewe, ðōnan east on dōne rah [hege], ðæt be ðām ofre eft on dā die, ðæt swa on pidelan stream up 7[lang] streames on dā caldan dic, ðæt 7lang fura on dā heafdu æt wīt? ter burnan swa on hereferdæs meduwan, ðæt in dāt sic, dānan[on] dāne cumb swa on dā caldan dic, ðæt in pidelan, ðānan ymb [. . .] swa on pidelan, ðæt on afene up 7lang afene eft on pyt[rig] ford.

[Flyford (Dormston?)] Dis sint dāra fif hida land gemæra to fleferð. Æ[rest] of dām caldan slæpe on winter burnan, ðānan on dōne swyn [hege], ðæt on et meres meduwan swa on hodes ac, ðæt 7lang heges on [dōne] weg, ðōnan on winter burnan swa on hereferdæs m[æduan, dānan] in dāt sic, dānan in dāne cumb swa on dā caldan d[ic in pidelan], ðānan ymbutan bradan hame eft in pidelan, dānan eft to dām slæpe.

[?, Chaceley and Longdon] Dis sind dāra xxx hida land gemæra [. . . . . . . .]p 7 to ceatewes leahe into langa[n] d[u]næc. Ærest [of sæfern on w]ferdæs medua hege, [of ðām hege . . .] to ðrim [. . .]n

[Powick (including Leigh)] [Dis sind dāra . . . . hida land gemæra to poing wican. Ærest up of sæfern on beornwoles] sæt[an ðæt on hagan] geat, ðæt on sceg leah[es] s[trede, ðæt on troh hriegg, ðæt] on tecles more, ðæt on baldan ricg swa on flotan ricg, ðānan on dā [smæ dān ac on] lind ricg swa on abbandunes wican, ðæt in baldan geat, ðōnan 7lang dune on E[adwold]neg leahe middewearder 7 an æcer into beornodes leahe, of ðām æcer on [. . .]mærc hege, ðānan on scean ran hyl swa on wædæ burnan, ðæt on gundenling [rig], ðāna on codran swa to syl beame, ðæt in creme ðānan in hwigon wyllan swa on hag[an geat, ðæt on dōna greatan ac, ðānan on dā sand seaðas swa in temedel, ðæt on [dā] lītan becas, ðānan on gryndles bece, of ðām bece swa ðæt gemæra ligeð, ðæt on [tum]cān 7lang streames to eldres ege ymbutan yldres ege ðæt eft in temedan, [7]lang streames eft on sæfern.

[Acton (Beauchamp)] Dis sind dāra iii hida land gemæra æt ac [tum]. Ærest['] of horsa broc on heafoc riigg, ðānan on byling[3] broc, ðæt in at leahe [geat] swa in dā hlydan, ðānan on bicera fald swa on sand ford, ðæt on scotta [pa]d, ðānan on gislan ford, ðæt on sand burnan swa on scead wyllan, ðæt on dā lam [sæ]dās, ðānan on ledene, ðæt in linleæhe swa on saltera weg, ðānan on hean ofer [in] suð broc, ðōnan in west
broc swa in clæg wyllan, ðan on ægelstanes 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 tynne. Ærest of ðære streæt 7lang dic to bradan for[de 7]lang burnan on sala werpan 7lang streames to col forda, ðan on 7lang [ðæt]e miclan dic on æt broc, ðan on dyran mor swa on ða dic, ðæt on feower [gemæra], ðan on œorn leæhe swa on ða dic, ðæt eft on ða streæt.

[Beoley] Dis sind [ðara] x hida land gemæra to beo leæhe. Ærest of beo leæhe on cunding æce[ras], ðan on fœarn healas swa on burh leæhe, ðæt on ðæsat ofer, ðan on [stan] geaæt, ðæt on wulfæres wyllan swa on ðæveæw broc, ðæt on ðamoldæn ætæt. ðan on bearæding ford swa 7lang dic, ðæt on æreæwe up 7lang streames on [. . .] burnan, up 7lang burnan on feææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææææ
on sceortan graf, ðonan on æðeling wyllan 7 [adune on stream] up on hyrd wyllan swa on cynges crudel2, ðæt on riecg wege2, ðanæn [on ðone stapol, ðanæn on] ða hlydan, of ðam streame be ðam heafdon on mihan leah [easteweardne on ðone garan up 7lang weges, ðanæn] be ðam heafdon, ðæt on mæd be[orh.]

[Dyrham] [Dis sind ðara . . . hida] land gemæra æt deor [hamme. Ærest of sulan forda on loddra wellan, ðonon on byld micel swa be abban [grafe to byde wyllan, ðæt swa on eccan treo, ðonon on midlan] mæduwan, ðæt [on byld, ðonne on Hygeredincg aeras 7 swa bi clop aecere ufa in sulig cumb, ðonon on mus beorh, ðæt swa to æðeredes wellan, ðonon on clog weg be ciric stede, ðæt swa bi sadol hongran on feam beorh wuda on gemær broc, ðæt eft on sulan broc.]

[Lydney] [. . .]anæxece, ðæt on mær broc, swa on neowern, ðæt eft on sæfern2.

[Wyegate] [Dis sind] ðæra vi hida land gemæra æt wiggan geat. Ærest of weg on clor br[. . .]2 on clor leah, ðanæn on preoste wyllan, ðæt on grenan hlaw, swa on [. . .] ðæt on smalan broc, ðanæn 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 aeceras ðæt on wad beorh, ðanæn on eneda mere, swa on ða [. . .] æt rudan ofre, ðæt on holan cumb ufweardne ðanæn on mot hyl[le 7lang weges, on cycgga cumb ufweardne swa eft on wes wyl sp[ringe].


a Brintulfingtune] for Brihtulfingtune
b Deormodestun] letter deleted after n (probably e)
c Guthbrihtingtun] prob. C altered to G
d H . . tun] Approx. two or three letters lost to fire.
e (Tresham . . Cumbtun)] sic parentheses are in MS
f Wy[.]land] one or two letters lost; perhaps Wynland for Wenland (=Weland)
g Wynbur Edisc] two letters deleted after Wynbur (perhaps he?); fire-damage after Edisc but probably nothing lost (unless perhaps an e)
h Bettesford] + in left-hand margin before Bettesford
i Wiceresham] or perhaps Piceresham
j Cwelaleah] perhaps one letter lost after Cwela
k 150] sic in Arabic numerals; cl deleted before number
l Approx. 2–3 letters lost.
m caldan] or perhaps caldan (A reads caldan)
n wyr[?] x in left-hand margin before hline
o 7lang 7land
p Approx. 12 letters lost.
q One line lost from medua hege to to ðrim, then approx. 15–16 lines lost. Lost text is approximately the same length as the bounds of Longdon in the single sheet.
r Approx. 5–7 letters lost.
s ðanæn] ðanæn
t Ærest] aeres
u byling] perhaps altered from byinig
v Approx. 3 letters lost.
w sind] snid (very clear, with no confusion of minims)
x Approx. 6–8 letters lost.
y ðara x] letter immediately before x illegible and could be part of numeral or preceding word.
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King Edgar’s Charter for Pershore (AD 972)

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 ðara iii hida land gemëra ðet ac tune. Ærest of horsa broce on heafoc\(^a\) hrycg, of heafoc hryce ðanon on byling broc \(7\) swa in at leahges\(^b\) geat \(7\) swa on\(^c\) ða hlydan, of ðære hlydan on bikera fald, of ðikera falde on\(^d\) sand fordan, of sand fordan ðæt on scotta\(^e\) ðæð \(7\) swa on gislan fordan, of gislan forda ðæt on sand burnan, of ðære burnan on scead wyllan \(7\) swa on ða lam sceðas, of ðam sceðan ðæt on ledene, \(7\) of ledene in lin leahge, of lin leahge on salteræ weg, of ðam wegie on hean ofer \(7\) swa in suð broc, of suð broke on west broc, of west broke in clæg wyllan, of ðære weallan on Ælfstanæ graf, \(7\) of ðam grafe in Henxtæs halh, \(7\) of ðam hale ðæt eft in horsa broc.

\(^a\) heafoc e 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
tempore siquidem. 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 struc-
ture of Augustus ii. 6 shows some influence from the model of S 658 but is oth-
erwise 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 tran-
script 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 di
ference between the two
versions is the list of estates claimed by Pershore, as noted above and summa-
rized 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.41 The differences have proven dif-
ficult to explain and do not seem to correspond with obvious patterns in loca-
tion, 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[j]ton, Meretun
(probably Castle Morton), Wy[.]land (perhaps Welland), Stithaneg, Chaceley, Eldersfield,
Staunton and Wynburgh Edisc, Wicherham, Hobislan, Taflenleh, Greotan Cwelveleah (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 Winurb 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 Winurb 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 pat on, ðan 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. 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. 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. Some of these points can be identified relatively easily: the boundary follows the River Arrow (‘ðæt on arewe up þlang streames’), then probably runs along Dagnell Brook, as the modern boundary still does (‘on . . . burnan, up þlang


44 For these southern and eastern boundaries, see Hooke, *Worcesteshire*, pp. 219–21 (no. 291).
<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>Dis [...] (lost to erasure) ... 7 sancta Marian.</td>
<td>[Lost to fire] [...] 7 sancte Benedictie [...]</td>
<td>Dis is se frecose... ... 7 sancte Benedictie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodoxorum... instruimur...</td>
<td>Orthodoxorum... instruimur...</td>
<td>Orthodoxorum... instruimur...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinc ego Edgar... ut huius libertatis... coenobio loco...</td>
<td>Hinc ego Edgar... ut huius libertatis... coenobio loco...</td>
<td>Hinc ego Edgar... ut huius libertatis... coenobio loco...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huius priuilegii libertas... a processore nostro... a me ipso...</td>
<td>[Huius priuilegii libertas... [a processore nostro... [a me ipso... (End of text lost to fire)</td>
<td>Huius priuilegii libertas... a processore nostro... a me ipso...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See below) [Tempore siquidem... concessi... precipimus... (Start of text lost to fire)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tempore siquidem... concessi... precipimus...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il est in Perscoran... (List of estates follows)</td>
<td>H[ec] sunt nomina terrarum... (List of estates follows)</td>
<td>Hec sunt nomina terrarum... (No estates follow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See below) Prefato quoque coenobio... et ad usum conficiendi... et dimidium mansi...</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prefato quoque coenobio... et ad usum conficiendi... et dimidium mansi...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et ad usum conficiendi... eiusdem perpetuariter... (Erased passage)</td>
<td>eiusdem perpetuariter... Hec sunt termini...</td>
<td>eiusdem perpetuariter...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempore siquidem... concessi... precipimus... (See above)</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 ūa lond...</td>
<td>Anno dominice... Anno [dominice]...</td>
<td>Anno dominice...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anno dominice...</td>
<td>His testibus... caraxantur...</td>
<td>His testibus... caraxantur...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His testibus... caraxantur...</td>
<td>[His] testibus... caraxantur...</td>
<td>[His] testibus... caraxantur...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefato 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.
<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>Christo orthodoxorum...</td>
<td>Priuilegium Æthelredi regis...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodoxorum...</td>
<td>instruimus...</td>
<td>instruimus...</td>
<td>instruimus...</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>a predecessoribus nostris...</td>
<td>Huius priuilegii libertas...</td>
<td>Huius priuilegii libertas...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a me ipso meoque patruo...</td>
<td>a predecessoribus nostris...</td>
<td>a me ipso...</td>
<td>a predecessoribus nostris...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a me ipso meoque patruo...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(See below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(See below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eiusdem perpetualiter...</td>
<td>eiusdem perpetualiter...</td>
<td>eiusdem perpetualiter...</td>
<td>eiusdem perpetue...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nam rex prefatus...</td>
<td>Nam rex prefatus...</td>
<td>Nam reges prefati...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tempore siquidem...</td>
<td>Tempore siquidem...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>concessi...</td>
<td>concessi...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>precipimus...</td>
<td>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></td>
<td>Pro silua...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>data sunt ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dis sind þa land gemæra...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hiis metis ...</td>
<td></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></td>
<td>His testibus... caraxantur...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 List of estates in Augustus ii. 6 (left column) and Vitellius D. vii (right column).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Left Column</th>
<th>Right Column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... Perscoran ...</td>
<td>... Perscoram ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Brihtufingtune x mansi</td>
<td>Brihtufingtune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Cumbrinctune x mansi</td>
<td>Cu[mbrin]ctune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Pedneshamme v mansi [hdage altered]</td>
<td>Eccintun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Ecyngtune xvi mansi</td>
<td>Byr[ing]aham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Byrflingahamme x mansi</td>
<td>Depa[ford]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Deopanforde x mansi</td>
<td>Strengeshoh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Strengesho x</td>
<td>Cromhan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Bettesforde x [hdage altered?]</td>
<td>Pyrg[ut]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Cromban [erased numeral]</td>
<td>Wadbeorbas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Stoce x</td>
<td>Cyf[ing]tun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Pyritune x</td>
<td>Broctune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Pip[ling]tun</td>
<td>Pip[ling]tun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Snoddes[byr i] x</td>
<td>Snoddesbe[ri]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Broctune ii</td>
<td>Gra[r]tun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Pip[ling]tune x</td>
<td>Deormode[stun]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Snoddes[byr i] x</td>
<td>Broctune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Niuanantine vii</td>
<td>Fle[fer]th [Five hides]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Eadbrithningtune iii [hdg, altered]</td>
<td>Wib[t]festun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Uuiuhtalestune v</td>
<td>Eadbyr[r]tingtun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in [i][l] Langandune xxx</td>
<td>Niwantun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Poing[ua]cui vii</td>
<td>Langandun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Beornosthesleh vii [hdg, altered?]</td>
<td>[sic] Tresham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Actune iii</td>
<td>Cylling[ec]tan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Suthst[oc]e</td>
<td>Eldal[pl]burh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 on Hilleah</td>
<td>Dydemeretun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 on Tresham</td>
<td>Bad[ym]etrun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 on Cylling[ec]tan</td>
<td>[in] Langandune xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 on Ealdanbyr</td>
<td>Gathbirhthingtun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Dydemeretun</td>
<td>Deorham [7 hides]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Badym[etrun]</td>
<td>H[s] tun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Uptun xl [hdage altered?]</td>
<td>Liganeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Deorham x</td>
<td>Liganeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Longaneg v</td>
<td>Wiggangeat [Six hides]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Lidanege vi</td>
<td>Comtun ) [sic] [Five hides]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Uiggangeate vi</td>
<td>Mortun, Wy)n/land, Stithaneg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Beoleahe v [hdg, altered from 7x]</td>
<td>Creawwele[th], Yldre[i]f, Siantun, Wynbur Eidic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyrdleah v [hdg, altered from x]</td>
<td>Bettesford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Sture x [hdage altered]</td>
<td>Poingwic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Bradaneuge xx</td>
<td>Wic[er]sham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Comtune v</td>
<td>Beornos[the]leh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Uuiu[gu]enman x</td>
<td>Iholyslan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et ad usum conficiendi salis</td>
<td>Actun [Three hides]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duobus in locis xv[ii] dolorum situs</td>
<td>Husantreo, Meretun [Together at five hides]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on middelwic x</td>
<td>Beoleah [Ten hides]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on neodomestan wie vii</td>
<td>Gyrdleah [Ten hides]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 on neodomestan wie vii</td>
<td>Taflamleah, Gr[oe]tan Care[la] leah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et durum fornacium ... on Uuic[ten]</td>
<td>Sture [Ten hides]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et us quod dicitur west ringe</td>
<td>Bradanweg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cum [1,5 mansi] in ...</td>
<td>Wicweyman [Ten hides with Bradanweg]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... Hortun</td>
<td>Stoce [Ten hides; later addition]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et d[emi]dium mansi ... at westwunda</td>
<td>Uptun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et ad usum conficiendi salis</td>
<td>Hyldesle[th]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duobus in locis xvii] dolorum situs</td>
<td>... trium ingeni[um quantitas et duu pre[dia]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| on middelwic x | ...
Table 4 Order of boundary clauses in Augustus ii. 6 (left column) and Vitellus D. vii (right column)
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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. 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 (‘Wiggangeat’). 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. 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 Broadway’s bounds, then Cumbtune must be immediately south of Broadway in modern Buckland or Snowshill, Gloucestershire. 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 newerne, 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 Wærferð byscycop geboceede anne hagan Æðelune into Cumbr[incg]tune on Wigorneceastre . 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 γ[mb] ða fif æceras ðæt on wad beorh’ respectively; for the former, see Hooke, Worcestershire, 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.


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.

of the *tempore siquidem* and *prefato quoque coenobio* clauses.53 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)’.54 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.55 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 ‘ðís is se freolse þæra landa boc ðe Æadgar cyning geuþe into Wigera ceastre Gode to lofe 7 Sancta Marian 7 Sancte Benedicte’.\(^{56}\) 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] ðís [is se freolse] 7 ðæra landa boc [ðe] Æadg[ar] cining geuðe into Perscoran swa his yldran hit ær gesettan Gode to lofe 7 Sancta Marian’.\(^{57}\) 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.\(^{58}\) However, we must also remember Joscelyn’s note, which Wanley preserved and which implies that Parker obtained his exemplar directly from Pershore.\(^{59}\) 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’.\(^60\) The archdeacon refers to a charter, specifically an ‘original of this copy’ which has three seals attached to it:\(^61\) 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.\(^62\) This evidence is further supported by some early descriptions of the document which also mention the slits, although the descriptions are not entirely consistent.\(^63\) None of the slits is

\(^60\) The text is edited and translated in Appendix II of this paper, and I thank Simon Keynes for bringing it to my attention. Godfrey was archdeacon 1144–1156 and c. 1158–9–1167 × 8: see John Le Nègre, Fasti ecclesiae Angliaeae, 1066–1300, ed. D. E. Greenway, J. S. Barrow and M. J. Pearson, 10 vols. (London, 1968–) II, 105, and English Episcopal Acta 33: Worcester 1062–1185, ed. M. Cheney, D. Smith, C. Brooke and P. M. Hoskin (Oxford, 2007), pp. 180–4. Unfortunately there were three popes in succession during this time with the initial ‘A’: Anastasius IV (1153–4), Adrian IV (1154–9), and Alexander III (1159–81).

\(^61\) ‘Noverit . . . quod contrascripti huius scriptum originale . . . sigilla tria . . . commendant.’

\(^62\) ‘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.

\(^63\) G. Hickes, Dissertatio epistolarius, 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’).
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 suffixae cernuntur . . .’ (‘But that charter in the Cottonian collection, to which Godfrey’s letter has been attached beneath . . . ’): Hickes, Dissertatio epistolari, p. 71. However, Wanley made no suggestion that the two documents were attached: see Wanley, Librorum veterum 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 chose 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 note-
book 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 strik-
ing 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 anti-
quaries had noticed the difference in texts which most twentieth-century schol-
ars had not.75

<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 collocauit</td>
<td>decentissime collocauit</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>Actum 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 fornicium</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. Dis sindon</td>
<td>a lond gemæra libertatis. Hec sunt termini</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**CONCLUSION**

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

75 Another possibility is that these were added when the text was reworked to produce the tran-
script version, if this was the sequence of events; see above, p. 58.
century, as Edward the Confessor gave most of its estates to Westminster.  
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*


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 delightfulfulness. 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 Foldibliht 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.

79 Historia Ecclesiæ, 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 Croomebe, 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 [Beauchamp], four at Abberton, five at Wibthlafeste, 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 [Beauchamp], forty at South Stoke, Hillesley, Tresham, Kilcott, Oldbury, Didmarton, Badminton and [Hawkesbury] Upton, ten at Dyram, five at Longney, six at Lydney, six at Wyegate, five at Beoley, 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 Westringe, 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.
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. [. . .]¹⁸¹

Also to the monastery falls the aforementioned quantity of three ıugera 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.⁸²

TEXT

⁸¹ The witness-list is found here, for which see above, pp. 48–50.⁸² See above, p. 43.
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.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,84 nor shall he go up higher so that at the same time there be honour for him before those sitting at the table.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,86 for the sake of this matter being exceedingly zealous87 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

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 Ælshere, 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.  