



Lowe, K. A. (2020) From memorandum to written record: function and formality in Old English non-literary texts. In: Gallagher, R., Roberts, E. and Tinti, F. (eds.) *The Languages of Early Medieval Charters: Latin, Germanic Vernaculars, and the Written Word*. Series: Brill's series on the early Middle Ages, 27. Brill: Leiden, The Netherlands, pp. 440-487. ISBN 9789004428119

(doi:[10.1163/9789004432338_013](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004432338_013))

This is the Author Accepted Manuscript.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/211313/>

Deposited on: 28 February 2020

From Memorandum to Written Record:
Function and Formality in Old English Non-Literary Texts

Kathryn A. Lowe

In this article, I consider a set of Old English non-literary texts of indeterminate date spanning the Conquest from the abbey of Bury St Edmunds within the context of other, more securely pre-Conquest, texts surviving from the archive. The texts discussed here, which range from booklists to funerary arrangements, are not well known, although all have been edited by Agnes Robertson.¹ Their marginalized status is reflected in the fact that three of them appear in appendices to Robertson's edition which contain, variously, post-Conquest documents, and undated documents. This partly accounts for their lack of discussion in scholarship, but another contributing factor is the way in which they have been classified, an issue which affects a number of documents from all archives. Together such vernacular texts constitute evidence for a wider use of the written word in Anglo-Saxon England than is still often acknowledged in scholarship.

Bury St Edmunds abbey and its archive

The early history of the abbey, located in West Suffolk, is difficult to establish, but it appears to have been transformed from some form of congregation dedicated to the cult of St Edmund into a monastic, Benedictine, foundation during Cnut's reign (1016-35); some years on, its first abbot, Ufi, was appointed. The Anglo-Saxon archive of this foundation is well known for its focus on the vernacular; this is surely the result of a peculiarity of the early history of the abbey whose wealth is due to the generosity of lay benefactors who donated lands to the foundation through bequest (customarily in Old English) rather than to royal grants of estates issued by diploma or grants of privilege (predominantly in Latin). The majority of charters from Anglo-Saxon England as a whole fall into this latter category; they constitute roughly two-thirds of the 1,500 or so of the total. By contrast, only seven charters (under 15 per cent) of Bury's pre-Conquest archive of 49 charters may be classified as diplomas or grants of

¹ *ASChart*.

privilege; three of these survive in both Latin and Old English versions.² The rest of the archive comprises a celebrated series of vernacular wills and bequests from the archive, first edited by Dorothy Whitelock in 1930 or by Robertson (1939; second edition 1956).³ They are complemented by a sequence of writs from the reign of Edward the Confessor, edited by Florence Harmer.⁴

The charter corpus

The foundation for the modern study of Anglo-Saxon charters was laid in 1968, when Peter Sawyer published his handlist of the corpus together with a note of the manuscripts witnessing each charter, editing history, and a summary of scholarship.⁵ Subsequently, this seminal reference aid has been put online and updated (comprehensively to 2010, sporadically thereafter), and there have been additions, both to that point and subsequently. These have been identified in a necessarily *ad hoc* way, generally as a consequence of preparing a particular archive for publication under the auspices of the British Academy Anglo-Saxon Charters series, or through the reporting of new discoveries. It is not straightforward to retrieve this information without trawling through the online index,⁶ and I therefore supply the information here in **Appendix 1**; it is unfortunate that subsequent additions to the database are not, it appears, identifiable as such, and therefore the procedure needs to be repeated in order to catch new entries.

Several of these new discoveries are entirely in the vernacular or incorporate text written in Old English, but are yet to find their way into the *Dictionary of Old English Corpus*.⁷ Other texts were already known but have since been reclassified for these purposes as charters (for example, the *Codex Aureus* inscription, *olim* Rec 6. 5, now S 1204a). Such reclassification disproportionately affects the *Dictionary of Old English* short-title series of

² S 980, S 1045, and S 1046. The tally of 49 charters excludes the records discussed further in this article which span or post-date the Conquest.

³ *Wills*.

⁴ *Writs*.

⁵ S.

⁶ <http://www.esawyer.org.uk/browse/sawno.html>

⁷ *Dictionary of Old English: A to I*, eds Angus Cameron, Ashley Crandell Amos, Antonette diPaolo Healey et al. (Toronto, 2007-): <https://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doe/>.

Rec(ords). This is currently a group of 86 texts, some of which are multi-part. They total around 19,000 words. The majority of these are of post-Conquest date, incorporating material from David Pelteret's catalogue which appears in its entirety (although with some, presumably accidental, omissions) in various places across the *Dictionary of Old English Corpus*.⁸ However, some of these texts cannot be dated; others are securely pre-Conquest. Of course, early volumes of the British Academy Anglo-Saxon Charters series, published before the *Dictionary of Old English Corpus*, the online Sawyer, and Pelteret did not include these texts. Thus, the first volume in the series, Rochester (1973),⁹ omits Rec 16.1 (now S 1481d, a list of estates), Rec 16. 2 (S 1481f, a list of slaves) and Rec 16. 3¹⁰ (a list of slaves). According to the Anglo-Saxon Charters Committee's guidelines, the following applies:

The new edition of Anglo-Saxon charters is intended to be a complete corpus of all pre-Conquest title-deeds known to have survived. It will include all documents relating to grants of lands and liberties, whatever their grantor ... whoever their beneficiary, whatever their diplomatic form ... and whatever the language in which they are written ... Documents which cannot be regarded as title-deeds, such as episcopal professions, will not be included. Such documents will be considered for separate treatment in one or more self-contained volume(s), within or outside the present scheme.

All manumissions will be edited together, in a separate volume (one section for each church where the manumissions were recorded).¹¹

The result of this is that some new, or newly reclassified, documents, despite being afforded a Sawyer number and thus canonical status, will nevertheless be excluded from the canonical

⁸ David A. E. Pelteret, *Catalogue of English Post-Conquest Vernacular Documents* (Woodbridge, 1990).

⁹ *Roch.*

¹⁰ David A. E. Pelteret, 'Two Old English Lists of Serfs', *Medieval Studies* 48 (1986), 470-513, at p. 493. Those omitted from the *Dictionary of Old English* are nos 32, 37, 40, 49, 52, 53, 55, 56, 58-60, 64-66, 69, 90, 111, 143, and 147.

¹¹ *British Academy-Royal Historical Society Committee of Anglo-Saxon Charters Guidelines for Editors* (1990), p. 1.

series. However, despite this statement, inclusion of a wider range of material is to an extent at the discretion of the editors. By way of example, the *Dictionary of Old English* Rec series include five items relating to Christ Church, Canterbury, four of which are pre-Conquest.¹² Two of these, Rec 6. 3 (a text inserted in a gospel book outlining the boundary between Canterbury and Rochester), and Rec 6. 5 (now S 1204a), are included in the Christ Church volumes for the Anglo-Saxon Charters series,¹³ but not Rec 6. 4, a notice of confraternity and list of names similarly inserted into another gospel-book datable by its contents to the reign of King Cnut,¹⁴ nor Rec 6. 6, a manumission by King Æthelstan. The surprise here is not the omission of Rec 6. 4 or Rec 6. 6 given the guidelines for the editors, but rather the inclusion of Rec 6. 5, now S 1204a, the celebrated *Codex Aureus* inscription, which trumpets the return of the gospel-book in which the record is written to Christ Church following its ransom from the vikings. This does not appear to answer any more readily to the Committee's definition of a charter than does, for example, S 1451a, an account of consecration, which is omitted from the Christ Church volumes.

There thus appears some inconsistency relating even to those records that are securely dated to the pre-Conquest period. Those that post-date the Conquest, or are of uncertain date, are generally excluded. However, by their use of the vernacular and through their text type, these records show continuity of practice with those dating from the pre-Conquest period, both relating and responding to them. My contention is that such texts can only be understood within the context of other vernacular records from the archive to which they belong. I demonstrate this by attention to those texts currently classified within the Rec series from Bury St Edmunds, none of which has to date been included in the Sawyer catalogue.

Records from Bury St Edmunds

There follows a brief description of each of the items belonging to the Rec series from Bury St Edmunds:

¹² The post-Conquest item, Rec 6. 10, a writ of William I, is misplaced in this series and should be reclassified (in *Dictionary of Old English* short-title terms) as Ch IWm.

¹³ *CantCC* 184 and 97.

¹⁴ N. R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957), p. 317.

- Rec 5. 2: an inventory relating to an unknown estate, including a list of people, animals and foodstuffs (s.xi^{4/4}).¹⁵
- Rec 5. 3: a fragmentary account of funerary arrangements (s.xii¹).¹⁶
- Rec 5. 4: a series of thirteen memoranda in six different hands regarding food-rents and charitable gifts. Contents include notice of food-farms due from estates, a list of holdings in various Norfolk hundreds, an inventory of movables (including books and ecclesiastical garments) in the church and treasure-house, charitable donations, gifts due to mark the anniversary of notables. Three are solely in Latin, one is glossed in Latin (s.xi^{mid}–s.xii^{mid}).¹⁷
- Rec 5. 5: two separate notes: a booklist, and a list of names associated with Bury St Edmunds, including that of Abbot Baldwin (1065x1097).¹⁸
- Rec 5. 6: an agreement with Ordric the cellarer relating to the collection of Peter’s Pence. A rubric dates this to the reign of Edward the Confessor (1042x1066).¹⁹

Of these texts, two (Rec 5. 3, Rec 5. 5) seem to have been written on pieces of parchment subsequently deployed as flyleaves, while one (Rec 5. 2) is written into the back of a book.²⁰ The series comprising Rec 5. 4 is copied on a separate quire apparently designed to be added to an existing book. One (Rec 5. 6) survives in multiple cartulary copies. I discuss each of these separately below, except 5. 4, which has been the focus of my attention elsewhere.²¹ I begin with those texts on flyleaves. The texts and translations presented here are from my and Sarah Foot’s forthcoming edition of *Charters of Bury St Edmunds and St Benet at Holme* for the Anglo-Saxon Charters Series, included at our request because of the importance of vernacular texts from the foundation. I am responsible for the texts and translations

¹⁵ *ASChart*, Appendix II.3, p. 248.

¹⁶ *ASChart*, Appendix II.8, p. 252.

¹⁷ Oxford, Corpus Christi College 197, fols 106v-109r; *ASChart*, no. 104, pp. 192-200.

¹⁸ *ASChart*, Appendix II.7, p. 250.

¹⁹ *ASChart*, no. 119, p. 220. For a recent study of Peter’s Pence, see Rory Naismith and Francesca Tinti, ‘The Origins of Peter’s Pence’, *EHR* 134 (2019), 521-52, with discussion of the Bury text at pp. 542-43.

²⁰ Manuscript details for each of these texts are supplied below [see pp. \$\$\$].

²¹ Kathryn A. Lowe, ‘Post-Conquest Bilingual Memoranda from Bury St Edmunds’, *Review of English Studies* 59 (2008), 52-66.

themselves, the description of the manuscripts, and history of the archives; Prof. Foot for the history of the abbeys and their benefactors, together with historical commentaries to the editions.

Rec 5. 3

MS: Cambridge, Pembroke College 83, front flyleaf

[Insert Figure 12.1: Cambridge, Pembroke College 83, front flyleaf]

Text:

& tƿælf oræn . under . prestæs & dæcnæs & clærcæs & fyf oræ . at his þruth & an & tƿænti peniges at his hoferbredles & seuen . peniges . at hale & tƿa ore [...] & an ære . at bræad & hoþær hærae . at an flychca & at an buch & seuæn & tƿænti peniges . at pax;

& fyf oræ . at te fyrræ . ærflæ . at malt & at hældyggæ & tƿa & fæouhærti peniges . at bræad & seuentene peniges . at an spin & tƿa ore . an reþær & an ærae þrae buces & viii. pe . an cese & þrae peniges . at fysc & fæouer pæniges . at milch.

& half tƿælf ere . at te hoþær . hærfælæ . & Hafslæin half marc & an mentel & Spædae . tƿa ore & at Spæg<n>ildæ . tƿa ore & Alfnop . prest . tƿa marc . Þægen & his sune i. marc . Þægen

[‘...and twelve ores for the priests and deacons and clerics, and five ores for his coffin, and twenty-one pennies for his pall, and seven pennies for ale, and two ores [...], and one ore for bread, and another ore for a flitch of bacon, and for a (male) goat, and twenty-seven pennies for wax. And five ores for the first funeral feast for malt and for fuel, and forty-two pennies for bread, and seventeen pennies for a pig, and two ores [for] an ox, and one ore for three (male) goats, and eight pennies for a cheese, and three pennies for fish, and four pennies for milk. And eleven and a half ores for the second funeral feast, and to Hafstein half a mark and a cloak, and to Swathi two ores, and for Sweinhild two ores, and to Ælfnoth the priest two marks. To Wagen and his son one mark...’]

Rec 5. 3 is a most curious document recording a set of funerary arrangements. It is written on the recto of the front flyleaf added to a manuscript of Bede's commentary on Luke's gospel (*In Lucae euangelium expositio*), originally from Saint-Denis (now Cambridge, Pembroke College 83).²² The manuscript itself dates to the first half of the ninth century, or to its middle. The hand of the record, described aptly by Rebecca Rushforth as 'very unpractised and difficult to date',²³ may perhaps best be compared with charter script as it develops after the Conquest. It is probably of the first half of the twelfth century, perhaps somewhat closer to the middle of that century than to its beginning.²⁴ Attention to the verso of the leaf on which the memorandum appears confirms this *terminus ante quem*. It contains a statement 'Incipit epistola Accae epistoli ad Bedam de postulanda expositione in Lucam', written in the first half of the twelfth century, that generally prefaces the text itself of Acca's letter to Bede. The letter itself begins on the following folio. The surface of the folio containing the memorandum appears to have residue on it, perhaps of paste. If so, it may be taken as evidence that the statement postdates the memorandum, and was written on a piece of scrap parchment containing the record. The manuscript was catalogued by Henry of Kirkestede in the mid-fourteenth century;²⁵ its absence from earlier lists should not be taken as significant given the disorganization of the library before Kirkestede set to work; as a Saint-Denis book, it may well have arrived at Bury in 1065 with its new abbot, Baldwin, who had been a monk there.²⁶

The record itself is markedly informal in terms of its execution, but nevertheless seems to be a copy of an existing text: what appears to be an error of copying <l> for <t> in

²² The manuscript is listed with bibliography in Helmut Gneuss and Michael Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A Bibliographical Handlist of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100* (Toronto, 2014), no. 134.

²³ Rebecca J. Rushforth, 'The Eleventh- and Early Twelfth-Century Manuscripts of Bury St Edmunds Abbey' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 2002), p. 62.

²⁴ I am most grateful to Prof. Julia Crick for her opinion on the dating of the script and to Prof. Tessa Webber for hers on the dating of the incipit statement.

²⁵ Henry of Kirkestede, *Catalogus de libris authenticis et apocrifis*, eds Richard H. Rouse and Mary A. Rouse (Oxford, 2004), K84. 23, p. 153.

²⁶ Herman the Archdeacon and Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, *Miracles of St Edmund*, ed. and trans. Tom Licence (Oxford, 2014), pp. 60-61.

‘Hafslæin’ (cf. ON *Hafsteinn*) along with the erased phrase ‘& fyf oræ’ at the start of the final section, apparently the result of accidentally restarting the previous section, suggests this.²⁷ The end of the text looks as though it has been blotted out by the scribe who perhaps thought that whatever remained of his exemplar was not worth the effort of recopying.

The language of the record similarly supports a dating of the twelfth century. We have the consistent writing of *a* for *æ* in *at* (no fewer than fifteen times) and in the personal name ‘Alfnōth’.²⁸ There is monophthongization of *ea* and merger with *æ* throughout, for example, ‘hale’ (PDE *ale*), ‘pax’, ‘malt’, and ‘half’.²⁹ All of this suggests twelfth, rather than eleventh, century. However *ēa* retains its traditional spelling as a diphthong (to a degree, if <æa> can be described as traditional; see further below) in ‘bræad’.³⁰ *eo* is consistently *e* (in ‘seuen(tene)’ on three occasions).³¹ The fortunes of *ēo* are mixed, with monophthongization and unrounding in ‘prestæs’, ‘þræ’, but retention in ‘fæouer’, ‘fæouhærti’. Hogg observes that such monophthongization is very infrequently represented in texts until the very end of the period, and it is generally characterized as a twelfth-century feature.³² The spellings with <æ> are likely inverse, reflecting the collapse of the front vowels to /e/ exhibited in other

²⁷ In this chapter standard headwords are printed in italics, while citations from original manuscripts are provided in quotation marks.

²⁸ For the sound change and its chronology from the Old English perspective, see Richard M. Hogg, *A Grammar of Old English. Volume 1: Phonology* (Oxford, 1992), §5.216; and from the Middle English perspective, Richard Jordan, *Handbook of Middle English Grammar: Phonology*, ed. Eugene J. Crook (The Hague, 1974), §32.

²⁹ Hogg, *A Grammar of Old English*, §5.212, §215; Jordan, *Handbook of Middle English Grammar*, §58. The <æ> of the stressed syllable of *dæcnæs* may derive from what the Oxford English Dictionary describes as a ‘popular’ form of the Latin loan (*Oxford English Dictionary Online*, Oxford University Press, www.oed.com, December 2018, s.v. ‘deacon, n.1’).

³⁰ Hogg, *A Grammar of Old English*, §5.212; Jordan, *Handbook of Middle English Grammar*, §81.

³¹ Jordan, *Handbook of Middle English Grammar*, §73.

³² Hogg, *A Grammar of Old English*, §5.211; Jordan, *Handbook of Middle English Grammar*, §84.

Bury charters; this also accounts for the use of the graph <æ> for <e> in ‘tƿænti’, ‘tƿælf’.³³ The Norse diphthong /øɣ/ in the singular form of Present-Day English *ora* ‘a Danish unit of account’ OE *ȝre* (cf. Olcel. *eyrir*) is monophthongized to /y:/. Here, with the merger of /y:/ to /e:/, considered a Kentish phenomenon, but recorded in several Bury charters, it is spelled ‘ere’,³⁴ together with a slew of inverse spellings in <æ> (‘ære’ etc).³⁵

Perhaps more striking is the use of <æ> for <e> in unstressed syllables (‘oræn’, ‘prestæs’, ‘dæcnæs’, ‘clærcæs’, ‘hoþær’, ‘seuæn’, ‘oræ’, ‘fyræ’, etc.), and as the first element of diphthongs ‘bræad’, ‘fæouer’. Other Bury records from this period do not exhibit such features. For example, the last in a series of texts constituting Rec 5. 4 was copied around the middle of the twelfth century by the sixth hand working on that set, in other words, no earlier than our funerary arrangements record. It reads as follows:

Dis is *sancte* Eadmundes ferme on Byrtune .iiii. met maltes under masc & grut . halmet hpæte . an ryðer . & ii. spin .iiii. ges .xx. hennen . Of Ruham ealspa mycel . & of Redgraue ealspa Of Pakenham & of Stantune ealspa mycel . Of Elmespelle & of Ðulpet & of Grotene ealspa . Of Herningpelle & of Cunegestune ealspa mycel Of Palegraue & of Ðorpe ealspa mycel . Of Horningeseorðe & of Risby ealspa micel . Of Kokefelde & of Ceorlespurðe ealspa micel . Of Hpepstede & of Bradefelde ealspa mycel . Of Ðyrllingpurðe & of Saham ealspa mycel . Of Rungetune . & of Culeforde & of Fornham ealspa mycel . On Brokeforde & of Rikingehale ealspa mycel . Of Tifteshale .i. met maltes under masc & grut & .i. lepene hpæte . & feorðendæl an ryðer & an half spin & an gos & .v. hennen.

³³ Kathryn A. Lowe, ‘Linguistic Geography, Demography, and Monastic Community: Scribal Language at Bury St Edmunds’, in *Interfaces between Language and Culture in Medieval England. A Festschrift for Matti Kilpiö*, eds Alaric Hall, Olga Timofeeva, Ágnes Kiricsi, and Bethany Fox (Leiden, 2011), pp. 147-178, at 172 and discussion.

³⁴ Hogg, *A Grammar of Old English*, §5.194; Lowe, ‘Linguistic Geography’, pp. 152-53 with examples, Appendix, pp. 171-75.

³⁵ Sara M. Pons-Sanz, *The Lexical Effects of Anglo-Scandinavian Linguistic Contact on Old English* (Leiden, 2013), §2.2.1.3.

[‘This is St Edmund’s food-rent from [Great] Barton: three measures of malt including mash and grout, a half-measure of wheat, one ox and two pigs, four geese, twenty hens. From Rougham just as much and from Redgrave the same. From Pakenham and from Stanton just as much. From Elmswell and from Woolpit and from Groton the same. From Herringswell and from Coney Weston just as much. From Palgrave and from Thorpe just as much. From Horringer and from Risby just as much. From Cockfield and from Chelsworth just as much. From Wepstead and from Bradfield just as much. From Worlingworth and from [Monk] Soham just as much. From Runcton and from Culford and from Fornham just as much. From Brockford and from Rickinghall just as much. From Tivetshall one measure of malt including mash and grout, and one basket of wheat, and a quarter of an ox, and half a pig, and one goose, and five hens.’]³⁶

While this text shares the late phonological features such as (in part) monophthongization of diphthongs noticeable in the funeral feast record (‘ferme’, ‘half’, ‘malt’, ‘Rikingehale’, ‘Tifteshale’), it displays none of the confusion between *æ* and *e* in unstressed syllables manifest in Rec 5. 3. It seems that it was perfectly possible, then, to write unexceptional late Old English in the mid-twelfth century at Bury; none of the other records listed above, albeit shorter, manifest the kind of variation seen in Rec 5. 3.

Could the language itself of Rec 5. 3 result from the record’s informality? It is certainly the case that the final text in Rec 5. 4 is far more carefully written than our funerary record. As a group, the texts constituting Rec 5. 4 were inserted on a separate quire, ruled similarly, to accompany a copy of the Rule of St Benedict. Rushforth has argued that the formality of the first hand suggests that it was always intended to be added to the book,³⁷ and this may have led to a greater degree of care taken in copying the subsequent records. Rec 5. 3, by contrast, is something of a mess, looking at best casual.

While this seems an attractive hypothesis on the face of it, it may not be the case. Such <æ> for <e> forms in unstressed syllables, while sporadic elsewhere, are a notable feature, for instance, of some of the charter copies produced by the main hand responsible for

³⁶ The text and its translation are taken from our forthcoming edition.

³⁷ Rushforth, ‘Eleventh and Early-Twelfth Century Manuscripts’, p. 16.

the earliest part (essentially to fol. 110v)³⁸ of the *Codex Wintoniensis* (London, British Library, Add. 15350) from the Old Minster, Winchester. This is similarly datable to the first half of the twelfth century (1129×1139), and is a most handsome production, written in a fine bookhand.³⁹

And heo þanne gæornlicæ of þam god geþæncað and for uncre sawle geornlicæ
beo and brucæ heo þæs landæs æt Batencumbæ hyræ dæg and æfter hire dæge
ga hit an Ælfwærdes hand unces suna gif hæ lifæs beo gyf hæ næ beo gyf hæ
næ beo [*sic*] for mine broðorn⁴⁰

[‘And she is to remember God zealously [with almsgiving] from the property,
and be zealous for the welfare of our souls. And she is to possess the estate at
Batcombe for her time and after her death it is to pass into the possession of
our son Ælfweard if he is still alive. If he is not, my brothers are to succeed to
it’]

Although such spellings appear on occasion throughout the work of this scribe, there is, however, a marked cluster of them. This led R. A. Williams to argue that the *Codex Wintoniensis* scribe copied texts running from fols 91r–111v (beginning with his text of S 304 and ending with S 336) from an exemplar already including those texts.⁴¹ Williams’s work requires revision; it is impossible to identify the sequence with such precision, because the majority of charters in the manuscript contain only a small amount of English (in the form of bounds), and the end of the sequence as identified by Williams is in fact copied by another scribe. It is, though, certainly the case that the four wholly vernacular texts within the tranche (S 1485, S 1402, S 1484, and S 1476) are different in character from the rest of the scribe’s copies of Old English texts elsewhere in the manuscript. While, then, the main text scribe of

³⁸ Alexander R. Rumble, *Property and Piety in Early Medieval Winchester* (Oxford, 2002), p. 6.

³⁹ The hand is described by Rumble, *Property and Piety*, pp. 6-7.

⁴⁰ S 1485 (*Wills* 9, pp. 22 l. 31–p. 24 l. 4 with translation p. 23, p. 25 as quoted here).

⁴¹ R. A. Williams, ‘Die Vokale der Tonsilben im *Codex Wintoniensis*’, *Anglia* 25 (1902), 393-517, at pp. 396-97.

the *Codex Wintoniensis* produced a formal copy of his exemplar(s), we cannot tell what they in turn looked like. However, the range of charters included in the cluster suggests that the exemplar must also have been a product of the Old Minster scriptorium.

There is, however, a comparandum from the Bury archive itself, one that appears a century earlier. The same alternation appears in the single sheet of the wills of Ælfflæd and her sister, Æthelflæd (S 1486, S 1494), probably of the final quarter of the tenth century. This is a text whose language I have studied in some detail elsewhere.⁴² The example below manifests all of the same features.

ic an ... twægra bæha on twera punda gepihtē . & tƿa soƿcuppan . & an
sæolfran fæt; & þæ leof æadmodlice bidde for godes luuan . & for mines
hlafordæs sawle lufan . & for minræ spystor saƿlæ lufan þæt þu amundie þa
halgan stopæ et Stocæ þæ mine ylðran on restap.⁴³

[‘I grant... two armlets of two pounds in weight, and two drinking-cups and a silver vessel. And I humbly pray you, Sire, for God’s sake and for the sake of my lord’s soul and for the sake of my sister’s soul, that you will protect the holy foundation at Stoke in which my ancestors lie buried’]

It is worth noting in this regard that Bury is by no means the only (or even the major) beneficiary of either of these wills, and it seems most likely in fact that the surviving single sheet originated from the foundation of Stoke-by-Nayland, just over twenty miles to the south of Bury, close to the Essex border. The language, I have argued, is best explained as the output of a scribe working at a foundation less important than Bury and therefore less of a centre of scribal production.⁴⁴ However, the language of the wills is unusual because of its tenth-century date rather than the forms themselves, which are encountered with reasonable frequency in the twelfth century; we therefore cannot conclude that Rec 5. 3 was not written at Bury judging from morphology and phonology alone.

⁴² Lowe, ‘Linguistic Geography’, pp. 153-55.

⁴³ S 1486 (*Wills* 15, p. 38 ll. 2, 6-10 with translation p. 39 as quoted here).

⁴⁴ Lowe, ‘Linguistic Geography’, p. 155.

While the phonology of Rec 5. 3, then, does not preclude a Bury origin, what of its other features? The text includes unusual lexical items drawn from Norse. Norse vocabulary is studded through the Bury archive, owing both to its location in the eastern Danelaw, and the overwhelmingly eleventh-century skew of its surviving charters. The pre-Conquest names which appear throughout the benefactors' lists from the abbey are similarly testament to this shared heritage: Thurkil, Thurketel, Thurstan, Ulftkel, Ketel, and so on. Below appears a list of the Norse-derived terms in texts from the archive, compiled from Sara Pons-Sanz's monograph on Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact, with the exception of the almost ubiquitous *eorl* and the money term *mark*.⁴⁵

elding, 'fuel' (cf. OIc *elding*) Rec 5. 3; *erfle*, 'funeral feast' (cf. OIcel *erfiql*) Rec 5. 3; *brynige* 'coat of mail' (cf. OIcel *brynja*) S 1537, S 1531, S 1519; *fæt*, 'clothes' (cf. OIcel *fat*) S 1531; *feolaga*, 'partner' (cf. OIcel *félagi*) S 1531; *feolagscipe*, 'partnership' (cf. OIcel *félagskapr*) S 1519, S 1531; *fro*, 'from' (cf. OIcel *frá*) S 1083, S 1527; *fyrre(r)*, 'first (of two things)' (cf. OIcel *fyrri*) Rec 5. 3; *goldwrecen*, 'inlaid with gold' (cf. OIcel *gullrekinn*) S 1537; *griðbryce*, 'breach of the peace' (cf. OIcel *griðabrek*) S 1078, S 1084; *hamsocn*, 'offence of attacking a man in his own home; privilege relating to the offence' (cf. OIcel *heimsókn*) S 1078, S 1084; *lagu*, 'law' (cf. OIcel *lög*) S 1083; *unlagu* 'illegality' (cf. OIcel *úlög*) S 1077; *lysing*, 'freeman' (cf. OIcel *leysingi*) S 1529; *maldæg*, 'covenant' (cf. OIcel *máldagi*) S 1531; *manslot*, 'share of land, holding' (cf. OIcel *mannshlutr*) Rec 5. 4; *mund*, 'bride-price' (cf. OIcel *mundr*) S 1531; *yre*, 'unit of account' (cf. OIcel *eyrir*) S 1531, Rec 5. 3, Rec 5. 4; *sceppe*, 'a dry measure' (cf. OIcel *skeppa*) Rec 5. 4; *scoru*, 'the number of twenty' (cf. OIc *skor*) Rec 5. 4; *toft*, 'homestead' (cf. OIcel *topt*) S 1525, S 1527, S 1531.

Rec 5. 3 includes four words (along with *mark*) that are demonstrably Norse-derived. *yre*, the money term, is found elsewhere in charters from Bury, including twice in the series of records comprising Rec. 5. 4. *fyrre(r)* (*Dictionary of Old English Online* s.v. *fyrre*, *fyrre*) is also found in the first continuation of the Peterborough Chronicle in the entry for 1131

⁴⁵ Pons-Sanz, *Anglo-Scandinavian Linguistic Contact*.

(written around that time) as a synonym for OE *forma*, the way in which it is used here.⁴⁶ *elding* ‘fuel’ and *erfle* ‘funeral feast’ are not found anywhere else in Old English. According to *Oxford English Dictionary*, *elding*’s (s.v. ‘elding, n.1’) next occurrence in the written record dates to the fifteenth century, although in a text believed to have been composed in the fourteenth century. *Erfle* (s.v. ‘arval | arvel | arvill, n’) is next recorded in the middle of the fifteenth century; neither *Oxford English Dictionary Online* entry currently includes this example.

It is not just the language that is unusual: the text, of course, makes provision for not one, but two, funeral feasts. Most recently Victoria Thompson has argued that this is a Scandinavian practice.⁴⁷ This milieu is also suggested by the names: all the people in the text, with the exception of the priest, Ælfnōth, have Norse-derived names: ‘Hafslæin’ (< ON *Hafsteinn*), ‘Spædæ’, perhaps the Norse byname *Svaði*, ‘Spægildæ’ <? **Sveinhildr* (an unattested feminine personal name), and ‘Þægen’ (< ODan *Wagn*).⁴⁸ The forms of *Hafsteinn* and *Sveinhildr* seem to have been corrupted in the course of transmission and, as noted above, the <l> instead of the <t> in ‘Hafslæin’, as well as the accidental repetition of the start of the first paragraph at the beginning of the second, suggests that this is a copy of an existing text. Although what survives describes funerary arrangements and therefore was relevant only until after burial, we have lost the start of the text. The garbling of the personal names indicates that they were unfamiliar to the copyist and/or that they were unclear in the original text, rather implying that they were copied at one remove or more in terms of time or location from the original. It is possible that the missing part outlined bequests of value (or which subsequently became of value) to Bury, which prompted its recopying. With no mention of any estates or the name of the testator in the text that survives, there is no way of testing this conjecture. Alternatively, and perhaps more likely, scrap parchment could have migrated to

⁴⁶ *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition. Vol. 7, MS. E*, ed. Susan Irvine (Cambridge, 2004), p. 132.

⁴⁷ Victoria Thompson, *Dying and Death in Later Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge, 2004), p. 127.

⁴⁸ I am grateful to Prof. John Insley for help with interpreting these forms.

the foundation from outlying areas, perhaps (in this case) from a local church, where laymen were more commonly buried in the late Anglo-Saxon period.⁴⁹

The next text I consider is similarly written on a flyleaf, and is one of two early booklists surviving from the archive.

Rec 5. 5

MS: Bodleian, Auct. D. 2. 14, fol. 173r

[Insert Figure 12.2: Oxford, Bodleian, Auct. D.2.14, fol. 173r]

Text

Ʒas bocas haueð Salomon preost . Ʒæt is Ʒe codspeltraht .
& Ʒe martyrluia .⁵⁰ [& Ʒe.....]⁵¹ & Ʒe æ<n>glisce saltere
& Ʒe cranc . & ðe tropere
& Ʒulfmer cild . Ʒe atteleuau . & pistelari . [& Ʒee]⁵²
⁵³& ðe innere . & ðe captelari⁵³ & Ʒe spelboc .
& Sigar preost . Ʒe leceboc . & Blake ha<n>dboc .
& Æilmer ðe grete sater .
& ðe litle tropere forbea[r]nde . & ðe \do/natum .

.xv. bocas .

Ealfric . Æilpine . Godric .⁵⁴

⁴⁹ Helen Gittos, 'Creating the Sacred: Anglo-Saxon Rites for Consecrating Cemeteries', in *Burial in Early Medieval England and Wales*, eds Sam Lucy and Andrew Reynolds (London, 2002), pp. 195-208. I owe this reference to Prof. Sarah Foot.

⁵⁰ martyrluia MS.

⁵¹ This entry has been erased; traces of letters are visible; number of dots indicates likely number of letters affected.

⁵² This entry has been erased.

⁵³...⁵³ This is written over erased text.

⁵⁴ A word of four or five letters has been erased following this name.

Bealdepuine abbot . & Freoden. & Hu[....]⁵⁵ . & Ðuregisel

[‘Salomon the priest has these books: that is, the homiliary, and the lives of the martyrs [?], and the..., and the English psalter, and the chronicle, and the troper.

And Wulfmær Cild the gradual, and an epistolary, and the..., and the hymnal, and the collectar, and the homiliary.

And Sigar the priest the leechbook, and Blaca a manual, and Æthelmær the great psalter.

And the small burned troper and the Donatus.

Fifteen books.’]

These two separate texts, a booklist, and a list of names, are written on the flyleaf to an Italian gospel-book dated by David Dumville to the sixth or seventh century.⁵⁶ The book seems to have arrived in England by the end of the eighth century, when annotations were made in it that link it to Mercia, probably Lichfield.⁵⁷ How, or whether, the book arrived at Bury is unknown; as Rushforth observes, there is no evidence that it was ever at the abbey, and the flyleaf may have been added following the book’s acquisition by Sir Robert Cotton.⁵⁸ The flyleaf is considerably shorter than the volume to which it now belongs and looks to be a piece of scrap parchment. There is a large hole towards the bottom of the parchment which has led to the loss of perhaps three letters in the penultimate name. The reverse contains the Latin service *Ad introitum portae* in a hand of the second half of the eleventh century. It is unrelated to the text considered here.⁵⁹

The texts are linked to Bury’s monastic community as a result of the (separate) list of names towards the bottom of the leaf, which include Abbot Baldwin and Frodo, probably his brother. It is in a larger and slightly more formal hand than the booklist that precedes it on the

⁵⁵ A torn hole in the parchment results in the lost of three or four letters at the end of the name followed by a punctus.

⁵⁶ Gneuss and Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*, no. 529; David N. Dumville, *Liturgy and the Ecclesiastical History of Late Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge, 1992), p. 102.

⁵⁷ Dumville, *Liturgy and the Ecclesiastical History*, p. 102.

⁵⁸ Rushforth, ‘Eleventh- and Early Twelfth-Century Manuscripts’, pp. 19-20.

⁵⁹ Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts*, no. 290.

parchment, and is similar in aspect to the hand of Rec 5. 2, discussed below. The mention of Baldwin and the general appearance of the hand has been used to date the texts to his abbacy (1065-97), but the language of both texts suggests a rather later, twelfth-century, date: the determiner is consistently levelled to ‘þe’ or ‘ðe’, ‘bocas’ has an analogical plural, not found elsewhere in the Old English corpus, and both texts include inverse spellings of <ea> for <æ> (in ‘Ealfric’ and, probably, ‘forbea[r]nde’) following the monophthongization of *ea* in the twelfth century (with sporadic forms recorded earlier). The list of names might, of course, have been recopied (for whatever reason) from an earlier list: the unusual spelling ‘Bealdepuine’, with <p> replacing one of the two <u>s which together represent the same sound, and what looks to be an oblique ending on ‘Freoden’ might support this theory.

The booklist itself is written in handwriting that Michael Lapidge describes as ‘excessively crude’.⁶⁰ Two scribes appear to have been at work on the list, although their contributions are at times hard to distinguish. The messy appearance is compounded by the lack of ruling and by the series of erasures and overwriting. Both scribes use Caroline **a**, but a combination of long **r** and Caroline **r** (and once a majuscule), apparently at random. The first scribe seems to have written everything as far as ‘leceboc’ except ‘& ðe tropere’; the second adds the subsequent entries and supplies the total number of books. To the right of this is what seems to be a tally, a series of 11 vertical strokes disposed in two rows of five and a final single stroke. Although it is possible that further strokes could have been lost at the right-hand edge, the total could not have matched the sum of 15 books noted in the text if the first two rows were even in number.

The booklist seems to have been a working document updated over a period of time, perhaps as books were returned to the library; it is noteworthy that there are two erasures, and the first two items on the fourth line, ‘& ðe innere. & ðe captelari’, have been written over a longer set of entries, inexpertly erased. Despite the overall untidy effect, the total of 15 books given at the bottom is the total of the books as modified.

The booklist is entirely different in type from the other surviving specimen from the archive during this period, the third in the series of records comprising Rec 5. 4. Here ten books kept within the church are listed as part of an inventory of the abbey’s possessions when Leofstan became abbot; they appear from their nature to be important volumes required

⁶⁰ Michael Lapidge, ‘Surviving Booklists from Anglo-Saxon England’, in *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England*, eds Michael Lapidge and Helmut Gneuss (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 33-89, at 74.

for the celebration of mass and the saying of the Divine Office; also included is a *vita* of St Edmund. This record begins with an extraordinary preamble, which I have argued elsewhere may be a translation of a charter proem celebrating Leofstan's appointment as abbot in 1045.⁶¹ After the list of books, the inventory continues with a list of vestments, fittings, and furniture for the church held in the treasury, and concludes with a list of (liturgical) books and related items in the possession of seven named individuals, four of whose names recur in another context in the first record in the series. This final part of the record runs directly on from what precedes it, and seems therefore to be part of this commemorative snapshot of a moment in the abbey's history.

Rec 5. 3 was written on a piece of parchment later deployed as a flyleaf to a book. Charters and records find their way into spare leaves or spare gaps in a variety of high-grade service books, bibles or other works, or, as in the case of Rec 5. 4, added on a separate quire. These seem deliberate attempts to preserve important transactions, produced at a time prior to the production of a general cartulary in the early thirteenth century. The next text I look at, Rec 5. 2, also appears to fall into this category, but such an interpretation presents a number of problems.

Rec 5. 2

MS: Cambridge, Pembroke College 88, fol. 167v

[Insert Figure 12.3: Cambridge, Pembroke College 88, fol. 167v]

Text:

[.x]l peorcpyrðra manna .xviii. oxana .
[.]xxvi faldhriþera hundteontig spina & .ui.
[hu]ndnigontig sceapa. sifon hund flicca .
[ty]n hund ceasa .vii. systras huniges . oþar
[ha]lf hund foþra cornes .ccc. æcera asapen.

⁶¹ Lowe, 'Bilingual Memoranda', p. 60.

[‘...forty able-bodied men, eighteen oxen, ...and ...stalled cattle, one hundred pigs and ninety-six sheep, seven hundred fitches of bacon, one thousand cheeses, seven sesters of honey, one hundred and fifty fothers of corn, three hundred acres sown.’]

The inventory is written on the verso of the final (mutilated) leaf of a late tenth-century copy of Laidcenn’s *Egloga de ‘Moralibus in Job’*.⁶² There is considerable debate about whether the host manuscript is English or Continental. T. A. M. Bishop identified one of the hands working within it as one responsible for a stint in a manuscript (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. D. inf. 2. 9) almost certainly produced at St Augustine’s, Canterbury,⁶³ an attribution supported by the most thoroughgoing analysis of the script in the context of that scriptorium, that of Helen McKee.⁶⁴ She concludes that he was likely a Continental scribe working at the foundation,⁶⁵ and dismisses Gneuss’s suggestion that the manuscript hailed from Saint-Denis, noting that the script has no connection with the script practised there at that time.⁶⁶ An *ex-libris* inscription places the manuscript at Bury around 1200.⁶⁷ The text of the *Egloga* is incomplete, but it seems as though a final ten- rather than the standard eight-leaf, quire, if James’s collation is accurate, was used in order to fit what remained of the text.⁶⁸

⁶² Gneuss and Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*, no. 135.

⁶³ T. A. M. Bishop, *English Caroline Minuscule* (Oxford, 1971), p. xxv.

⁶⁴ Helen McKee, ‘St Augustine’s Abbey, Canterbury: Book-Production in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries’ (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 1997). McKee rejects another scribal attribution by Bishop, p. 121.

⁶⁵ McKee, ‘St Augustine’s Abbey’, p. 122. It may be noted that the association is rejected by R. C. Barker-Benfield, *St Augustine’s Abbey, Canterbury*, 3 vols (Oxford, 2008), 3:1824 as being without ‘independent evidence of provenance’.

⁶⁶ McKee, ‘St Augustine’s Abbey’, p. 121 n. 265. Gneuss repeats the suggestion in the summary information to the entry in Gneuss and Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*, no. 135.

⁶⁷ Henry of Kirkestede, *Catalogus*, eds Rouse and Rouse, p. xlv n. 57.

⁶⁸ Montague Rhodes James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Pembroke College, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1905), no. 88, p. 81. The text ends approximately halfway through Lathcen’s final *Egloga XXXV* as edited by Adriaen (who only partly collates this manuscript), though the leaf has been cut away (*Egloga quam scripsit*

The text of the inventory occupies the first five ruled lines of what was a blank folio with a generous top margin. The bottom of the page has been cut away, and a narrow strip of parchment has been roughly removed at the fore-edge extending from the top of the parchment to the bottom of the memorandum. The resultant loss is probably no more than a couple of letters from the beginning of each line. The text of the inventory is written in a large round minuscule which Rushforth dates to the late eleventh century;⁶⁹ it features a curious **y** with no tail, almost **v**-shaped, and an **n**-shaped **r** without descender, similar to the half-uncial type. **a** is occasionally Caroline.

The language of the record cannot certainly establish its provenance either. ‘sceapa’ is a West Saxon (hereafter WS) form, with $\bar{a} > \bar{e}a$ through palatal diphthongization.⁷⁰ The expected form in non-WS would be *scepa*. ‘sifon’ is another WS form. Here the normal development is $i > io$ through *u*-umlaut.⁷¹ Initial *sio* developed in Early WS to *sie*, and *y* in Late WS,⁷² subsequently unrounded to *i* (evidenced in what Richard Jordan calls ‘West Saxon subdialects’ already in late Old English).⁷³ ‘systras’, however, seems to be an inverted spelling of *sestras*, with similar examples found in both Kent and Bury.⁷⁴ There is no sign of monophthongization of diphthongs, for example in ‘weorc’, nor evidence of the merger of /æ/ and /ɑ/ (so still ‘æceras’ rather than *aceras*); the only other late (i.e. eleventh-century) form is ‘opar’, where the *a* of the unaccented syllable indicates that the back vowels had merged with /e/.⁷⁵ The form ‘cesa’ is unexampled elsewhere and is perhaps to be explained as patterned on ‘sceapa’ earlier in the same line. *cesa* or *cysa* would be the expected form at Bury (or Canterbury), with *i*-mutation in WS of $\bar{e}a$ giving *cīesa*. In sum, the language of this text looks

Lathcen filius Baith de moralibus Iob quas Gregorius fecit, ed. M. Adriaen (Turnhout, 1969), p. 361, l. 106, ending ‘omne malum’).

⁶⁹ Rushforth, ‘Eleventh- and Early Twelfth-Century Manuscripts’, p. 63.

⁷⁰ Hogg, *A Grammar of Old English*, §5.19.

⁷¹ Hogg, *A Grammar of Old English*, §5.24.

⁷² A. Campbell, *Old English Grammar* (Oxford, 1959), §299(c).

⁷³ Jordan, *Handbook of Middle English Grammar*, §41.

⁷⁴ Examples of inverse spellings in the single-sheet wills from the archive are provided in the Appendix to Lowe, ‘Linguistic Geography’, pp. 171-75.

⁷⁵ Hogg, *A Grammar of Old English*, §5.215.

broadly standardized, with only one clearly non-WS spelling which would be equally as likely found in Canterbury as Bury St Edmunds.

Similar lists can be found in a number of archives, including Bury itself, where the sixth in the series of memoranda comprising Rec 5. 4 itemizes a list of goods left at an estate in Egmere (Norfolk) after Cola (presumably a tenant) left it. The main text of this record is written by the first scribe producing the series, datable to the middle of the eleventh century, but it also has an interlinear word-for-word Latin gloss in a hand of the end of the eleventh or beginning of the twelfth century.

Her onstent gepriten hpæt man funde æt Eggemere syððan Cole hit let . Ðæt is
.vii. oxen .& .viii. cy . & .iiii. feldhrypera . & .ii. stottas .& .v. scora scæp . &
.xv. scæp under ealde & iunge . & .viii. score æcere gesawen & .i. flicce & .i.
swin & .xxiiii. cesen.⁷⁶

[‘Here stands written what was found at Egmere (Nf) after Cola left it: that is, seven oxen and eight cows, and four grazing bullocks, and two young horses, and one hundred sheep, and fifteen underage and young sheep, and one-hundred-and-sixty sown acres, and one flich of bacon, and one pig, and twenty-four cheeses.’]

Perhaps a closer comparator is S 1448 from Peterborough, again one in a series of memoranda:

Þis is þæt erfegeprit æt Geaceslea: þryttene pepmen peorcepyrfþe, & .v.
pimmen, & æhta geonge men, & .xvi. oxan, fal\d/reþere, & .iiii. hund scea &
.v. scep, & .xxx. spina, & hundteongig fliccena, & eal þa smean ðe þerto
gebyriað, & .xxx. forþer cornes, & hund ehtetig æcere gesapen, & an egþpirf,
& .vi. bidenfate, & .ii. cuflas, & þry trogas & lead & trefet, & .ic. pinterstellas,
& .i. fedels spin.⁷⁷

⁷⁶ Oxford, Corpus Christi College 197, fol. 108r (also printed in *ASChart*, no. 104, p. 196, ll. 10-19).

⁷⁷ *Pet* 29e, p. 325, with translation p. 330 quoted here.

[‘This is the inventory of the stock at Yaxley: 13 able-bodied men and five women and eight young men and 16 oxen, a stalled ox and 305 sheep and 30 swine and 100 fitches of bacon and all the delicacies that belong to them, and 30 fothers of corn and 80 acres sown and one *ecghworf* and six barrels and two tubs and three troughs and a cauldron and a trivet and nine year-old stallions and one fat pig.’]

The estate in question (Yaxley, Huntingdonshire) seems to have passed to Thorney at an early stage, and therefore there appears no obvious reason for keeping the record; Kelly conjectures that on-going litigation concerning the estate may have prompted its retention. This is a possibility as well for the Egmere record in Rec 5. 4.⁷⁸

Despite the loss of letters at the left of the page, Rec 5. 2 appears complete. It is significant that, while the bottom of the leaf is missing, there is plenty of space both above and below the existing text; it is therefore not in itself fragmentary, but seems instead to be an excerpt from a longer text. It does not include the name of the estate and as such has no obvious utility as a document. Nor was the text written on a spare piece of parchment later deployed as an endleaf; instead it was copied into an existing book, on the blank verso following the end of Laidcenn’s text (as transmitted in this manuscript) on the recto; a further page completes this final ten-leaf quire of the original book. While the overall aspect of the script of the record is quite grand and therefore, as Rushforth notes, invites comparison with the script of other Bury productions such as Rec 5. 4 and Rec 5. 5, the scribe appears inexperienced, and the mixture of letter-forms is unusual.⁷⁹ I wonder if it is best explained as a copying exercise conducted on a temptingly blank page. The mutilated leaf has been subject to a series of rough pen-trials and jottings, including, towards what is now the bottom, an attempt to replicate the final three words. There are also a variety of post-Conquest pen-trials and short notes on this page and on the subsequent one, as well as activity elsewhere, including a name and captions dated to the eleventh century,⁸⁰ together with an untalented drawing seemingly captioned ‘min hors’ (‘my horse’).

⁷⁸ *Pet*, p. 330.

⁷⁹ I am grateful to Prof. Peter Stokes for very useful discussion on this hand.

⁸⁰ These are indexed by Donald Scragg, *A Conspectus of Scribal Hands Writing English, 960-1100* (Cambridge, 2012), nos 188-193.

The final text I look at, Rec 5. 6, is identified by its rubric as an agreement dating to the reign of Edward the Confessor. As such, it looks as though it should be included in e-Sawyer. Although its claims to authenticity are doubtful, were forgeries to be excluded from Sawyer, the result would be a slim volume indeed.

Rec 5. 6

MSS: Cambridge, University Library, Add. 6006, fol. 51r; Cambridge, University Library, Ee. 3. 60, fol. 161r; Cambridge, University Library, Gg. 4. 4, fol. 220r

[Insert Figure 12.4: Cambridge, University Library, Add. 6006, fol. 51r]

Text (edited from Cambridge, University Library, Add. 6006 and Cambridge, University Library, Ee. 3. 60):

Þis foreward was maked wid Ordric horder; þat is þat ælc man in *sancte* Eadmundes byri husfast on his owe land sal gifen to þe halegenes bidripe þe horder on peni at Peter mæsse on ginning herefest, & sea þe syt on oderes land sea sceal giuen oan halpini, for þat he \a/alle scolden sceren þe halegenes corn. Fram þis sceal næfre no mæn be scyr buton *sancte* Ædmundes þewes.⁸¹ & sea cnytes <h>agen⁸¹ & seo preostes inne þeo singen⁸² at þo wyuedes.⁸²

God seonde heore frieond þe worden *sancte* Ædmund.

[‘This agreement was made with Ordric the cellarer; that is, that each man in Bury St Edmunds occupying a house on his own land shall give to the cellarer one penny for the saint’s reaping-work on St Peter’s Day at the beginning of harvest; and he who occupies the land of another shall give one half-penny, because they all ought to cut the saint’s corn. No one shall ever be exempt from this except St Edmund’s servants and the retainers’ messuages and the priests within who sing at the altars.

May God be a friend of those who honour St Edmund.’]

81...⁸¹ A space here is left in place of this phrase in both manuscripts. The gap is filled in Ee. 3. 60 by another hand. *agen* is corrected from *asen*.

82...⁸² Ee. 3. 60; *atco windes* Add. 6006.

Copies of this text are found in three manuscripts, the earliest of which is Cambridge, University Library, Add. 6006, a thirteenth-century customary datable to after 1265.⁸³ The text appears in a section there relating to the cellarer's customers and rents, and is copied in a fairly formal book-hand with colour-tipped initials and penwork decoration to the opening initial. It is closely related textually to that of another surviving (fourteenth-century) copy in the abbey's Pinchbeck Register, Cambridge, University Library, Ee. 3. 60, although in a part that is not original to it. Cambridge, University Library, Add. 6006 has a gap between 'pewes' and '& seo preostes' and it seems that the exemplar could not be read at this point; the copy in Cambridge, University Library, Ee. 3. 60 has a similar gap but one that is filled subsequently, perhaps by the same scribe, apparently copying from the shared exemplar. A final copy, in the first part of the abbey's gargantuan Cellarer's Register (Cambridge, University Library, Gg. 4. 4), dates from the fifteenth century, and is copied from Cambridge, University Library, Ee. 3. 60.

The exemplar used by Cambridge, University Library, Add. 6006 and Cambridge, University Library, Ee. 3. 60 appears to have presented difficulties at other points: the opening instance of 'hordere' in the latter is inserted over an erasure and glossed 'Hordere, id est cellerario uel thesaurario' in a fourteenth-century hand. *Hordere*, while recorded in ME, is not especially common after the end of the thirteenth century (*MED Online*, s.v.).⁸⁴ This is considerably more successful than the same corrector's gloss of 'agen' (< OE plural *hagan*), mistaken for a form of the verb *āgān*, and glossed 'inire'. It is unsurprising that this baffled him (as it has baffled editors of the text), given the loss of the initial <h> on the noun, and the decidedly unhelpful morphology. The clue to its meaning is provided in the Latin account that precedes the copy of the charter 'Et antequam villa fuit libera solebant homines metere vt serui. Sola hospicia militum et capellanorum et seruiciencium metere vt serui',⁸⁵ in which 'sea cnytes [h]agen' is a reasonable approximation to 'hospicia militum'.

⁸³ Rodney M. Thomson, *The Archives of the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds* (Woodbridge, 1980), p. 149.

⁸⁴ *Middle English Dictionary*, ed. Robert E. Lewis, et al. (Ann Arbor, 1952–2001). Online edition (henceforth *MED Online*) in *Middle English Compendium*, ed. Frances McSparran, et al. (Ann Arbor, 2000–2018) <<http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/>>. Accessed 26 February 2020

⁸⁵ Printed in *ASChart*, p. 472.

Rec 5. 6 is unusual in a number of ways. It is not included in the Sacrist's Register (Cambridge, University Library, Ff. 2. 33), the major, late-thirteenth-century, cartulary that contains copies of almost all the pre-Conquest charters from the abbey. This is not in itself necessarily a suspicious feature: the text relates to the office of the cellarer, and may therefore not have been considered relevant. It does, though, make the language harder to gauge; the Sacrist's Register, itself descended from a lost exemplar of similar date,⁸⁶ modernizes its texts in a generally consistent way in terms of its morphology and phonology, and there is minimal updating, for example, of lexis. However, this text, if it is to be considered genuine at all, has been very substantially altered.

Several words appear in this charter that are otherwise either extremely rare or unrecorded in Old English: 'husfast', with only one comparable form, from the thirteenth century (*Oxford English Dictionary Online*, s.v. 'housefast, *adj.*'), 'bedrip' (with one other example in Old English in *Rectitudines* and examples in Middle English from the end of the twelfth century), *ginning* (not recorded elsewhere in OE; examples in the *MED Online* only from the fourteenth century). The sense deployed here of the verb 'giuen' (< OE *giefan*) in 'ælc man... sal gifen... to þe halegenes bidripe þe horder on peni' (*Oxford English Dictionary Online* s.v. 'give, v.', IIIa) as 'to make over to another in exchange for something else' is first recorded in the *Ormulum* (c.1180). Another difficulty with the charter's wording as it stands is the phrase 'oan halpini', which appears to imply a coin rather than cut coinage. This coin-type is generally believed first to have entered circulation during the reign of Edward I (1272-1307); it is certainly the case that examples of the noun in Middle English date to the beginning of that reign (*MED Online*, s.v. 'hal-penī n.'). However, sporadic recent finds have been made of halfpennies of Henry I (1100-35) and Henry III (1216-72). Other forms (*owe* < OE *agen*; updating of the preposition *mid* with *wid*) suggest that the exemplar for the surviving copies was produced, at the earliest, in the late twelfth or early thirteenth century.

The charter's opening words are couched in terms of an agreement. While *foreweard* is the term used in Old English for a contractual arrangement, it is accompanied in that period by the verb *wyrcan* rather than *macian* (e.g. S 1516 'þis is þe forward þe Wlfric and Eadwine ... wrouhten hem bituen'⁸⁷). The Peterborough Chronicle has the older construction *s.a.* 1109

⁸⁶ I reconstruct the pre-Conquest contents of this register in my 'The Anglo-Saxon Contents of a Lost Register from Bury St Edmunds', *Anglia* 121 (2004), 515-34.

⁸⁷ *Wills* 33.

(probably copied around 1121),⁸⁸ but uses *maken s.a.* 1140 (around 1154).⁸⁹ Rec 2. 1 (from Bath; after 1109 in a hand of the first half of the twelfth century)⁹⁰ has the formula with *makien*.⁹¹ The end of the charter has some parallels (in broad terms) with the closing salutation of two writs from Bury St Edmunds: S 1085, Edward the Confessor's very frequently copied grant of a moneyer to Bury St Edmunds 'God seo eop alre freond' ('May God be the friend of you all'),⁹² and Ch1Wm, a confirmation of S 1084 relating to the sokes of the eight-and-a-half hundreds 'God sy eower freond' ('May God be your friend').⁹³ The formula is not found elsewhere in documentary texts.

Some features which look early need careful assessment. One might perhaps expect that *sanctus* would be replaced by *seint* by the thirteenth century (its last recorded appearance in the [MED Online](#) is in the Trinity Homilies which were probably composed before 1200), though there is evidence that in a Bury context, the Latin loan was retained longer with conjunction with Edmund than with the names of other saints.⁹⁴ Similarly, forms such as 'Eadmund' or 'Ædmund' are found late in copies of Old English material from the foundation where other examples of the original *ēa* diphthong are spelled *e*.

Both the phonology of this text and its inflexional system is strange. The exemplar seems to have added either *-o* or *-a* variously to a number of <e>s in final position and sporadically elsewhere ('sea þe', 'sea cnytes hagen', 'seo preostes ... þeo', 'frieond'). Comparable forms are found in the *Cartae antiquae* roll text of S 1045 and S 1084,⁹⁵ with examples including 'heo' for the masculine nominative singular personal pronoun and 'seo'

⁸⁸ *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle E*, ed. Irvine, p. 115, p. xviii.

⁸⁹ *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle E*, ed. Irvine, p. 138, p. xix.

⁹⁰ Pelteret, *Catalogue*, no. 86 (p. 95).

⁹¹ *A Hand-Book to the Land-Charters, and Other Saxon Documents*, ed. John Earle (Oxford, 1888), p. 270.

⁹² *Writs* 24.

⁹³ *Regesta regum Anglo-Normannorum: The Acta of William I (1066-1087)*, ed. David Bates (Oxford, 1998), no. 38.

⁹⁴ Lowe, 'The Anglo-Saxon Contents', pp. 531-32.

⁹⁵ The National Archives: Public Record Office C 52/15, no. 1, no. 2. The charters have been edited from this manuscript in *The Cartae Antiquae Rolls 1-10*, ed. Lionel Landon, Publications of the Pipe Rolls Society 55, n.s. 17 (London, 1939), nos 443 and 444 (p. 87).

for the nominative singular determiner accompanying grammatically masculine nouns. The roll dates to the end of the twelfth or beginning of the thirteenth century. The appearance of these forms in Rec 5. 6 suggest that the early-looking genitive form ‘heore’ and the otherwise unrecorded subjunctive singular ‘seonde’ may be explained in the same way.⁹⁶ More surprising is the fact that ‘sea’/’seo’ appears twice to represent plural forms ‘sea cnytes hagen’ (< OE *þāra cnihta hagan*), ‘seo preostes’ (< OE *þā prēostas*). Elsewhere in the text the determiner is replaced by indeclinable ‘þe’, thus ‘to þe halegenes bideripe’, ‘þe halegenes corn’, with the generalized genitive *-es* inflexion additionally added onto the oblique *n*-stem ending.

While the language of Rec 5. 6, then, is exceptional, care needs to be taken in rushing to conclusions about the ultimate authenticity of the arrangement it describes. One other charter (S 1608) falls outside the run of pre-Conquest texts preserved in the Sacrist’s Register.⁹⁷ This survives in another thirteenth-century customary (in this case, the prior’s), but in an addition to it of the first half of the fourteenth century.

Her kith and with song wrthe write þat forwarde þat Osulf and Leofroun wrouhte hem bitwen him be þat lond at Dicleburg and at Semere swa ful and swa forth swa it hem on honde stod, on wode and on felde, Crist to loue & sancte Marie and alle Cristes halgen here soules to alesenese. He it willetz þat þer singetz foure prestes: to after Osulf, & to after Leofrounis day, and ilke woke to singen tuelue messes. And we willetz þat qwo so betz abbot at sancte Edmondes bery þat he betz þis minstres mund & her prestes þat he ne mowen neyþer for hem ne for here kin ferren ne forwerken.

Þise sindon þise prestes names: Godric & Alfric, and tweyne þat Leofstan abbot & Leofroun reden hem bytwen qwilke he moun ben.

⁹⁶ The form *sende* is a strange one even if reinterpreted with the expected tonic vowel, though [MED Online](#) reports a singular present subjunctive ‘sunde’ in the London, British Library, Cotton Caligula A.ix version of Laʒamon’s *Brut* (s.v. ‘bēn v.’), perhaps composed before 1200.

⁹⁷ The charter is printed in C. R. Hart, *The Early Charters of Eastern England* (Leicester, 1966), no. 133 (p. 86), but contains some errors. I therefore take the text below from our forthcoming edition.

He hauen gode stoundes þat up schulen holden; and qwo so nouth ne dotz
as oure wille was, *in helle flod mote he drinklen witz þe tretour Iudas. Fiat,
fiat.*

[‘Here is declared in this document the agreement that Oswulf and Leofrun
made between them about the land at Dickleburgh (Nf) and at Semere (Nf) as
fully and completely as it stood in their possession, consisting of woodland
and open country, for the love of God and St Mary and all of Christ’s saints,
for the salvation of their souls. They wish it that four priests sing there, two
after Oswulf’s, and two after Leofrun’s lifetime, and each week sing twelve
masses. And we wish that whoever is abbot at St Edmund’s *burh* that he is the
guardian of these minsters and of their priests so that they cannot alienate them
nor treat them improperly either for themselves or for their kin.

These are the names of these priests: Godric and Ælfric; and two that
Abbot Leofstan and Leofrun are to decide between them who they will be.

May those who uphold [this] have good times, and whosoever does not do
what our will was, may they drown in the river of hell with the traitor Judas.
Let it be, let it be. ’]

This text, outlining an arrangement between a couple and the abbey concerning land in
Norfolk, has also been substantially updated. The verb *drinklen*, ‘drown’, is recorded
nowhere else in Old English, and is otherwise first recorded in manuscripts dating to the
fourteenth century, although in copies of texts with an earlier (thirteenth-century) date of
composition. The Anglo-Norman loan *traitour* appears in Old English only here and in the
spectacular S 391, a vernacular version of a diploma of King Æthelstan from a lost
manuscript, surviving only in a seventeenth-century transcript. The noun is otherwise earliest
recorded in the second quarter of the thirteenth century. The verb-form ‘moun’ derives from
Old Norse *munu*, and is first recorded in the late-twelfth-century *Ormulum*. Conversely, ME
alesednesse (< OE *alysednes*), common in Old English, is last recorded in 1225. Other forms
are also best regarded as representing an earlier stage in the text’s transmission, such as
‘sindon’, which is recorded in *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English* only in Bury copies
of Old English charters, and is not in *The Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English*

(covering the period c.1350-1450) at all.⁹⁸ It is noteworthy that the scribe glosses this verb as ‘sunt’, suggesting that the form was unfamiliar to him. The opening ‘Her kith and with song wrthe’ write seems to be, as Cyril Hart noted, a garbling of the standard opening ‘Her cyð on þissum gewrite’.⁹⁹ Despite these features, there is no particular reason to doubt the authenticity of the grant itself: according to the finding-list to the charters contained in the late fourteenth-century Lakenheath Register, this charter survived as a single sheet with the pressmark F.23,¹⁰⁰ and Oswulf and Leofroun are remembered in copies of the benefactors’ list surviving from the abbey for their gift of Bressingham.¹⁰¹ Rec 5. 6 cannot therefore be rejected as a forgery on the basis of its language alone given the uncertainties surrounding when, and how, it was transmitted.

Conclusion

This set of records from Bury St Edmunds are varied in terms both of their form and their function, and are testament to the continued use of the vernacular at the abbey after the Conquest. The preservation of some appears the result of chance, while others are carefully planned. Two of the texts considered here (Rec 5. 3, Rec 5. 5), are certainly accidental survivals, owing their preservation solely to their redeployment as endleaves. Nevertheless, they manifest signs of continued utility after the moment of their original creation: one, Rec 5. 5, appears to be a working document, updated so as to remain of use for some time; the other (Rec 5. 3) is itself a copy of a text that had obviously been considered worth transmitting. Another text (Rec 5. 6), with charter-like qualities, has linguistic features that indicate production later than its avowed pre-Conquest date, though attention to the archival context of this text shows that such qualities may result from its unusual transmission history. A further set of records (Rec 5. 4) is copied into a quire designed to be bound with an important book explicitly to increase chances of preservation: these records seem, in part at

⁹⁸ Margaret Laing, *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English, 1150–1325* Version 3.2 [<http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme2/laeme2.html>] (Edinburgh, 2013–); M. Benskin et al., *An Electronic Version of A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English* [<http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/elalme/elalme.html>] (Edinburgh, 2013–).

⁹⁹ Hart, *The Early Charters*, p. 88.

¹⁰⁰ London, British Library, Harley 743, fol. 12v.

¹⁰¹ For example, Cambridge, University Library, Ee. 3. 60, fol. 324v.

least, to have an explicitly commemorative function. A text (Rec 5. 2) which appears similarly inserted into a book for the purpose of safe-keeping reveals itself through its contents to be an outlier, the one record from the archive copied without apparent purpose.

The title of this essay, ‘From memorandum to written record’ is of course a play on that of M. T. Clanchy’s monograph, *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066–1307*, first published in 1979, and now in its third edition.¹⁰² Chapter 3 of this ground-breaking book is entitled ‘Types of Record’¹⁰³ and attempts a ‘general view over the whole area of writing activity’¹⁰⁴ during the period in question. It is both significant and instructive that Clanchy defines ‘record’ in a very broad sense. His headings under the section ‘Statements issued by individuals’ are as follows: Charters; Chirographs; Certificates (a term Clanchy uses to describe charter-like texts that ‘do not exclusively concern gifts of property’); Letters; Writs. Under ‘Memoranda kept by institutions’ are the following: Financial accounts; Surveys and rentals; Legal records; Year books; Chronicles; Cartularies; Registers. Under ‘Learned and literary works’ are Learned works; Literary works; Liturgical books. There is little here that do not have equivalents in the Anglo-Saxon period; the difference is one of volume, not of kind.

The richness of the Anglo-Saxon written record as it pertains to Clanchy’s first two categories is obscured by the terminology we continue to use. While the texts considered in this article are disparate, they share a host archive, and I hope to have shown that they are best assessed, discussed, and explained within that context. As the publication schedule for the Anglo-Saxon Charters Series progresses, texts such as these from other archives are likely to slip further from view as the old editions of collections containing them, apparently superseded by the new, are less frequently consulted. While this article has demonstrated throughout that the definition of ‘charter’ is a porous one, its association in an English context with land grants will always remain a barrier to inclusion under that heading. It would be better to ditch this problematic term altogether, and use instead ‘record’ as the umbrella term for the impressive range of vernacular non-literary texts produced during the pre-Conquest and transitional periods.

¹⁰² M. T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066–1307*, 3rd ed. (Oxford, 2013).

¹⁰³ Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, pp. 83-115.

¹⁰⁴ Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, p. 83.

APPENDIX 1: ADDITIONS TO THE SAWYER CATALOGUE¹⁰⁵

Sawyer number	Date	Archive	British Academy Charter volume reference	Text type	Language
65a	c.693×709	Barking		Diploma	Latin
65b	c.693×706	Barking		Diploma	Latin
103a	716×745	London, St Paul's	<i>LondStP</i> 7	Diploma	Latin
103b	716×745	London, St Paul's	<i>LondStP</i> 8	Diploma	Latin
136a	793	St Albans	<i>StAlb</i> 2	Grant of land	English with bounds
270a	801	Glastonbury	<i>Glast</i> 16	Diploma	Latin, English bounds
286a ¹⁰⁶	838 for 7839	Canterbury St Augustine's	<i>CantStA</i> 19	Diploma	Latin with bounds
294a ¹⁰⁷ 294b ¹⁰⁸	844	Malmesbury	<i>Malm</i> 16	Grant of fiscal privileges	Latin with English
338a ¹⁰⁹	948 for 868	Abingdon	<i>Abing</i> 16	Diploma	Latin
342a	'835' for 871×899	Athelney		Diploma	Latin
343a	'872'	Athelney		Grant of privileges	Latin
367a	903	London, St Paul's	<i>LondStP</i> 10	Grant renewal	Latin
418a	932	Barking		Diploma	Latin
517a	946	Barking		Diploma	Latin
522a	947	Barking		Diploma	Latin
552a	950	Barking		Diploma	Latin
662a	955×959	Evesham		Diploma	Latin, English bounds
676a	958	Coventry		Diploma	Latin, English bounds
705a	962	Athelney		Diploma	Latin,

¹⁰⁵ To December 2018. It should be observed that additional vernacular summaries found of existing Latin texts since 1968 remain hidden under their original Sawyer number. Of particular note here is the

¹⁰⁶ *Olim* S 1649.

¹⁰⁷ *Olim* S 314.

¹⁰⁸ *Olim* S 322.

¹⁰⁹ *Olim* S 539.

					English bounds
712a	963	unclear		Diploma	Latin, English bounds
794a	974	Westminster		Diploma	Latin, English bounds
832a	964 for ?994	Athelney		Grant of tithes	Latin
931a	1013	Barking		Diploma	Latin
997a	1006 for 1016	Ghent, St Peter's		Undertaking to restore land	Latin
1037a	1065	York	<i>North 11</i>	Grant of see	Latin
1186a	799×801	Canterbury, Christ Church	<i>CantCC 16</i>	Confirmation of purchase of land	Latin
1204a	s.ix ²	Canterbury, Christ Church	<i>CantCC 97</i>	Book donation	English
1205a	?904	Malmesbury	<i>Malm 23</i>	Private grant	Latin
1205b	918	Ghent, St Peter's		Private grant	Latin
1218a	s.x ²	Ely		Record of grant	English
1243a	1042×1066	London, St Paul's	<i>LondStP 31</i>	Private grant	Latin
1251a	705	Malmesbury	<i>Malm 11</i>	Declaration	Latin
1428a	680	Winchester, Old Minster		Decree	Latin
1428b	704×705	Canterbury, Christ Church	not included	Letter concerning dispute	Latin
1430a	798	Canterbury, Christ Church	<i>CantCC 28</i>	Council decree	Latin
1431a	803	Canterbury, Christ Church	<i>CantCC 32</i>	Council decree	Latin
1431b	803	Canterbury, Christ Church	<i>CantCC 33</i>	Council decree	Latin
1448a	983×985	Peterborough	<i>Pet 30</i>	List of sureties	English
1451a	s.x ²	Canterbury, Christ Church; Winchester, Old Minster; Exeter		Account of consecration	Latin
1458a	c.1000	London, St Paul's	<i>LondStP 25</i>	List of estate contributions	English
1461a	c.1020	York, St Mary's	<i>North 7</i>	Survey of estates	English
1462a	1017×1027	Lichfield		Declaration regarding accusation	English
1481a	c.1055	Ramsey, Thorney		Settlement of dispute	English

1481b	s.xi ²	London, St Paul's	<i>LondStP</i> App 3A	Agreement	English
1481c	s.xi ²	London, St Paul's	<i>LondStP</i> App 3B	Agreement	English
1481d	?s.xi ¹	Rochester	not included	List of estates liable for work	English
1481e	c.1000	Probably Ely		List of slaves; see Rec 9. 2	English
1481f	s.xi ^{med}	Rochester	not included	List of slaves; see Rec 16.1	English
1503a	?986	Ramsey		Will	Latin
1525a	s.x ² -s.xi	Bury St Edmunds		Will	English
1546a		St Albans	<i>StAlb</i> 2	Bounds	English
1546b		Exeter (ex Crediton)		Bounds	English
1552a		Malmesbury	<i>Malm</i> 47	Bounds	Latin
1561a		St Albans	<i>StAlb</i> 7A	Bounds	English
1569a		Bath	<i>Bath</i> 26	Bounds	English
1572a ¹¹⁰		Abingdon	<i>Abing</i> 140A	Bounds	English
1590a		Worcester		Bounds	English
1591a		Evesham		Bounds	English

¹¹⁰ Short version of bounds in S 967.

APPENDIX 2: THE REC SERIES IN THE *DICTIONARY OF OLD ENGLISH*

Almost all of these records are contemporaneous with their copying into their host manuscript. There are a few clear exceptions: Rec 5.6, and Rec. 28.1–28.4, each of which claim, with varying degrees of credibility, to be pre-Conquest. Additionally, Rec 16.1–16.3 appear to be of the mid-eleventh century. Note also that in the following table, the number of words in each text, as provided by the *Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus*, has been rounded up or down to the nearest 25 (or to 5 up to 20).

Rec	Manuscript	Scragg/Pelteret ¹¹¹	Archive	Edited	Text type	Words	Date of manuscript
1	Oxford, Bodleian, Bodley 155, fol. 196v	Scragg 839	Barking	Hart, no. 106 ¹¹²	List of lands	50	s.xi ^{ex}
2.1	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 140, fol. 1v	Pelteret 86	Bath	Earle, p. 270 ¹¹³	Agreement of prior	175	s.xii ¹
2.2	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 111, pp. 55-6	Pelteret 78	Bath	Hunt, pp. 3-4 ¹¹⁴	Confraternity with other houses	475	s.xi ²
2.3	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 111, p. 8 (s.xi ²); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 140, fol. 1rv (s.xi ² -s.xi/s.xii)	Scragg 45-51 Pelteret 73-77; 79-85	Bath	Earle, pp. 269-71	Twelve manumissions	525	s.xi ² -s.xi/s.xii
2.4	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 111, p. 7	Pelteret 70	Bath	Hunt, pp. lxxv-lxxvi	Relics	300	s.xi ²

¹¹¹ Scragg = Donald Scragg, *A Conspectus of Scribal Hands Writing English, 960-1100* (Cambridge, 2012); Pelteret = David A. E. Pelteret, *Catalogue of English Post-Conquest Vernacular Documents* (Woodbridge, 1990).

¹¹² Cyril Hart, *The Early Charters of Essex*, rev. ed. (Leicester, 1971).

¹¹³ Earle = *A Hand-Book to the Land-Charters, and Other Saxon Documents*, ed. John Earle (Oxford, 1888).

¹¹⁴ Hunt = *Two Chartularies of the Priory of St. Peter at Bath*, ed. William Hunt (London, 1893).

3	Bern, Stadtbibliothek, 671, fols 75v-76v		Bedwyn	Förster 1941, pp. 791-95 ¹¹⁵	Guild regulations; tithing instructions; manumissions	250	s.xi ⁱⁿ
4	London, British Library, Add. 9381, fols 1r, 7v, 8rv, 133v, 141v	Scragg 356-61 Pelteret 87-89	Bodmin	Förster 1930 ¹¹⁶	Manumissions	500	s.xi ⁱⁿ -s.xii ⁱⁿ
5.2	Cambridge, Pembroke College 88, fol. 167v	Scragg 188	Bury St Edmunds	See above, pp. xxx	List of farm goods	25	s.xi ^{ex}
5.3	Cambridge, Pembroke College 83, front flyleaf	Scragg 187	Bury St Edmunds	See above, pp. xxx	Payments at a burial	125	s.xii ¹
5.4	Oxford, Corpus Christi College 197, fols 106v-109r	Scragg 953-58	Bury St Edmunds	<i>ASChart</i> 104	Possessions, rents, and grants	925	s.xi ^{med} -s.xii ^{med}
5.5	Oxford, Bodleian, Auct. D.2.14, fol. 173r	Scragg 805-6	Bury St Edmunds	See above, pp. xxx	Booklist	75	s.xi ²
5.6	Cambridge, University Library, Add. 6006, fol. 51r ¹¹⁷		Bury St Edmunds	See above, pp. xxx	Agreement with Ordric the Cellarer	100	s.xiii ²
6.3	London, Lambeth Palace 1370, 114r	Scragg 780	Canterbury, Christ Church	<i>CantCC</i> 184	Boundaries	50	s.xi ^{med}
6.4	BL, Royal 1 D. ix, fol. 43v	Scragg 670	Canterbury, Christ Church	Ker, p. 317 ¹¹⁸	Confraternity	50	s.xi ¹
6.5	Stockholm Royal		Canterbury, Christ	See above, pp.	<i>Codex Aureus</i>	175	s.ix ²

115 Förster 1941 = Max Förster, *Der Flussname Themse und seine Sippe. Studien zur Anglisierung keltischer Eigennamen und zur Lautchronologie des Altbritischen* (Munich, 1941).

116 Förster 1930 = Max Förster, 'Die Freilassungsurkunden des Bodmin-Evangeliars', in *A Grammatical Miscellany Offered to Otto Jespersen on his Seventieth Birthday* (Copenhagen, 1930), pp. 77-99.

117 And other copies.

118 Ker = N. R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957).

	Library, A. 135, fol. 111r		Church	xxx (now S 1204a)	inscription		
6.6	BL, Royal 1. B. vii, fol. 15v		Canterbury, Christ Church	<i>SEHD</i> 19 ¹¹⁹	Manumission	75	s.x ^{2/4}
6.10	Canterbury, Cathedral Library, Chart. Ant. C. 4 ¹¹⁷	Scragg 285 Pelteret 22	Canterbury, Christ Church	Bates, no. 66 ¹²⁰	Writ of William I	200	s.xii ⁱⁿ
7.1	BL, Cotton Domitian i, fol. 55v	Scragg 470	Canterbury, St Augustine's	<i>ASChart</i> , App. II, no. 6	Booklist	15	s.x ²
7.2	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 286, fol. 74v		Canterbury, St Augustine's	<i>CantStA</i> 24 (S 1198)	Grant of food-rent	175	s.x ¹
8.1	[BL, Cotton Otho B. ix]		Durham	<i>ASChart</i> 24	Gifts of King Æthelstan	75	MS destroyed
8.2	BL, Cotton Domitian A. vii, fol. 47v	Scragg 472	Durham	<i>North</i> 19, 20	Grants	100	s.xi ^{1/4}
8.3.1	BL, Cotton Domitian A. vii, fol. 47r	Scragg 471	Durham	BCS 1254	Manumissions	125	s.x ^{4/4}
8.3.2	[BL, Cotton Otho B. ix]		Durham	Craster, p. 190 ¹²¹	Manumissions	25	MS destroyed, manumissions s.x ^{ex} or s.xi ⁱⁿ
8.3.3	[BL, Cotton Otho B. ix]		Durham	Craster, p. 190	Manumissions	75	MS destroyed, manumissions s.x ^{ex} or s.xi ⁱⁿ
8.3.4	[BL, Cotton Otho B. ix]		Durham	Craster, p. 191	Manumissions	25	MS destroyed, manumissions s.x ^{ex} or s.xi ⁱⁿ

¹¹⁹ *SEHD* = *Select English Historical Documents of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, ed. and trans. Florence E. Harmer (Cambridge, 1914).

¹²⁰ Bates = *Regesta regum Anglo-Normannorum: The acta of William I (1066–1087)*, ed. David Bates (Oxford, 1998).

¹²¹ Craster = H. H. E. Craster, 'Some Anglo-Saxon Records of the See of Durham', *Archaeologia Aeliana*, fourth series, 1 (1925), 189-98.

8.4	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 183, fol. 96v		Durham	<i>ASChart</i> , App. II no. 4	List of plate	50	s.xii ^{med}
9.1	BL, Add. 61735, fol. 1rv	Scragg 370-73	Ely	<i>ASChart</i> , App. II, no. 9	Farm accounts	65	s.xi ^{1/4}
9.2	BL, Cotton Tiberius. B.v, vol I, fol. 76v	Scragg 271	Ely	Pelteret 1986, pp. 472-73 (now S 1481e) ¹²²	List of freeholders	300	s.x/xi
9.3	BL, Cotton Tiberius. B.v, vol I, fol. 74v	Scragg 270	Ely	<i>ASChart</i> 71	Grant of land	75	s.x ²
9.4	BL, Cotton Tiberius B.v, vol I, fol. 74v	Scragg 269	Ely	Thorpe, pp. 610-13 ¹²³	Guild regulations	450	s.x ²
10.1	Oxford, Bodleian, Auct. D 2.16, fols 1r-2v	Scragg 808 Pelteret 91	Exeter	<i>ASChart</i> , App. I, no. 1	List of books given by Bishop Leofric	725	s.xi ²
10.2	Exeter Cathedral 3501, fol. 7rv	Scragg 264 Pelteret 120-22, 124-34	Exeter	Earle, pp. 264-6 (incomplete)	Lists of guild members	500	s.xi ^{ex} or s.xi/xii
10.3	BL, Cotton Tiberius B.v, vol. I, fol. 75r		Exeter	Conner, pp. 168-69 ¹²⁴	Notice of guild assembly	225	s.x ¹
10.4	Oxford, Bodleian, Bodley 311, fol. 1r	Scragg 843 Pelteret 92	Exeter	Ker, p. 360	Inscription of donation	5	s.x/xi
10.5.1	Cambridge, University Library, Ii.2.11, fol. 1r	Scragg 246 Pelteret 92	Exeter	Chambers et al., pp. 11-12 ¹²⁵	Leofric inscriptions	20	s.xi ²

¹²² Pelteret 1986 = David A. E. Pelteret, 'Two Old English Lists of Serfs', *Mediaeval Studies* 48 (1986), 470-513.

¹²³ Thorpe = *Diplomatarium Anglicum ævi Saxonici*, ed. Benjamin Thorpe (London, 1865).

¹²⁴ Conner = Patrick W. Conner, *Anglo-Saxon Exeter: A Tenth-Century Cultural History* (Woodbridge, 1993).

10.5.2	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41, fol. 244v	Scragg 32 Pelteret 92	Exeter	Chambers et al., pp. 11-12	Leofric inscriptions	25	s.xi ²
10.5.3	Cambridge, Trinity College B.II.2, fol. 121v	Scragg 202 Pelteret 92	Exeter	Chambers et al., pp. 11-12	Leofric inscriptions	25	s.xi ²
10.5.5	Oxford, Bodleian, Auct D.2.16, fol. 6v	Scragg 810 Pelteret 92	Exeter	Chambers et al., pp. 11-12	Leofric inscriptions	25	s.xi ²
10.5.6.1	Oxford, Bodleian, Auct F.1.15, fol. 77v	Scragg 106 Pelteret 92	Exeter	Chambers et al., pp. 11-12	Leofric inscriptions	25	s.xi ²
10.5.6.2	Oxford, Bodleian, Auct F.1.15, fol. 78r	Scragg 815 Pelteret 92	Exeter	Chambers et al., pp. 11-12	Leofric inscriptions	25	s.xi ²
10.5.7	Oxford, Bodleian, Auct. F.3.6, iii v	Scragg 335 Pelteret 92	Exeter	Chambers et al., pp. 11-12	Leofric inscriptions	25	s.xi ²
10.5.8	Oxford, Bodleian, Bodley 579, fol. 1r	Scragg 859 Pelteret 92	Exeter	Chambers et al., pp. 11-12	Leofric inscriptions	25	s.xi ²
10.5.9	Oxford, Bodleian, Bodley 708, fol. 113r	Scragg 872 Pelteret 92	Exeter	Chambers et al., pp. 11-12	Leofric inscriptions	25	s.xi ²
10.6.1	Exeter Cathedral 3501, fol. 7r	Pelteret 123	Exeter	Thorpe, p. 634	Manumissions	75	s.xii ¹
10.6.2	Exeter Cathedral 3501, 4rv-6v + Cambridge, University Library, Ii.2.11, fol. 202v	Pelteret 93-100, 102-14	Exeter	Earle, pp. 257-64; Dickins, p. 366 ¹²⁶	Manumissions	1825	s.xi/s.xii-s.xii ¹
10.6.3.1	BL, Cotton Tiberius B.v vol. I, fol. 75v	Scragg 582	Exeter	Conner, p. 170	Manumissions	50	s.xi ¹
10.6.3.2	BL, Cotton Tiberius B.v		Exeter	Conner, p. 170	Manumissions	25	s.x ^{med}

¹²⁵ Chambers et al. = *The Exeter Book of Old English Poetry, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile*, eds R. W. Chambers, M. Förster, and R. Flower (London, 1933).

¹²⁶ Dickins = Bruce Dickins, 'The Beheaded Manumission in the Exeter Book', in *The Early Cultures of North-West Europe*, eds Cyril Fox and Bruce Dickins (Cambridge, 1950), pp. 363-67.

	vol. I, fol. 75r						
10.6.4	Oxford, Bodleian, Bodley 579, fols 1rv, 377v	Scragg 860-61; 864 Pelteret 135-40	Exeter	Earle, pp. 253-54	Manumissions	425	s.xi ^{ex} -s.xi/xi
10.7	Exeter Cathedral 3501, fol. 5r ¹¹⁷	253 Pelteret 101	Exeter	Earle, p. 260	Permission to ring bells	125	s.xi/s.xii
10.8	Oxford, Bodleian Auct D.2.16, fols 8r-14r	Scragg 811	Exeter	Conner, pp. 176-86	List of relics	1775	s.xi ^{med}
10.10	Exeter Cathedral 3501, fol. 6v	Pelteret 115-19	Exeter	unprinted	Witnesses to sales of land	175	s.xii
11.1	Cambridge, Pembroke College 302, fol. 8r	Scragg 194	Hereford	Förster 1941, p. 769	Boundaries of see	50	s.xi ¹
12	El Escorial, Real Bibliotheca, E. II.1, fol. 1r	Scragg 332	Horton	Ker, p. 152	Inscription recording gift of volume	5	s.xi ²
13	Lichfield, Cathedral 1	Scragg 353	Lichfield	Earle, pp. 236-37	Record of lawsuit	25	s.xi ¹
14	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 383, fol. 107r		London, St Paul's	See above, pp. xxx (now S 1458a)	List of <u>scipmen</u>	100	s.xii
15	BL, Cotton Otho, C.i, vol. I, fols 68r-69v	Scragg 531-32	Malmesbury	BCS 106	Bull of pope Sergius	925	s.xi ^{med}
16.1	Rochester, Cathedral Library A. 3. 5, fol. 162rv		Rochester	Pelteret 1986, p. 493 (now S 1481f)	List of serfs	95	s.xii ^{2/4}
16.2	Rochester, Cathedral Library A. 3. 5, fol. 162rv		Rochester	Pelteret 1986, p. 493	Land transaction	30	s.xii ^{2/4}
16.3	Rochester, Cathedral Library A. 3. 5, fol. 162rv		Rochester	Pelteret 1986, p. 493	Quittance	45	s.xii ^{2/4}
17	Sens, trésor de la			Ker, p. 455	Label inscriptions	15	s.ix ¹ ?

	cathédrale, 'authentique'						
19	Oxford, Bodleian, Bodley 579, fol. 8v	Scragg 865-70	Tavistock?	Earle, pp. 255-56	Manumissions	300	s.xi ¹
20.1	BL, Add. 40000, fol. 4r	Scragg 366	Thorney	Ker, p. 163	Inscription recording gift	25	s.xi ²
20.2	BL, Add. 40000, fol. 10rv	Scragg 366.5	Thorney	unpublished	Names in <i>Liber vitae</i>	50	s.xi/s.xii
21.2	BL, Stowe 944, fols 28v, 29r	Scragg 737-40	New Minster Winchester	Birch 1892, pp. 64-72 ¹²⁷	Names in <i>Liber vitae</i>	25	s.xi ¹ -s.xi ²
21.3.1	BL, Stowe 944, fol. 58r	Scragg 741	New Minster Winchester	Birch 1892, pp. 159-60	List of relics	25	s.xi ^{med}
21.3.2	BL, Stowe 944, fol. 58rv	Scragg 742	New Minster Winchester	Birch 1892, pp. 161-62	List of relics	175	s.xi ^{med}
21.3.3	BL, Stowe 944, fol. 58v	Scragg 743	New Minster Winchester	Birch 1892, pp. 162-63	List of relics	100	s.xi ^{med}
22	BL, Harley 2965, fol. 40v		Nunnaminster	BCS 630 (S 1560)	Estate boundaries	100	s.ix/x
23.1	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 367 Part II, fol. 48v	Scragg 166	Worcester?	<i>ASChart</i> , App. II, no. 5	List of books	25	s.xi ^{med}
23.2	Oxford, Bodleian, Hatton 20, fol. 1r		Worcester	Ker, p. 385	Inscription on Pastoral Care	5	s.ix ^{ex}
23.3	BL, Cotton Tiberius A.xiii, fol. 177r	Scragg 557 Pelteret 146	Worcester	<i>ASChart</i> , App I, no. 6	Payment to William I	100	s.xi ²
23.4	BL, Cotton Tiberius A.xiii, fol. 109r	Scragg 552	Worcester	Ker 1985, p. 58 ¹²⁸	Dues	50	s.xi ¹
23.5	BL, Cotton Nero E.i, pt	Scragg 367	Worcester	BCS 1320	Calendar of lands	225	s.xi ²

¹²⁷ Birch 1892 = *Liber vitae of New Minster and Hyde Abbey*, ed. Walter de Gray Birch (London, 1892).

¹²⁸ Ker 1985 = N. R. Ker, 'Hemming's Cartulary: A Description of the Two Worcester Cartularies in Cotton Tiberius A.XIII', in N. R. Ker, *Books, Collectors and Libraries: Studies in the Medieval Heritage*, ed. Andrew G. Watson (London, 1985), pp. 31-60.

	ii, fol. 184v						
23.6	BL, Cotton Tiberius. A.xiii, fol. 181v	Scragg 556	Worcester	BCS 273 (= S 146 MS 3)	List of foods	50	s.xi ²
24.1	York, Minster Library, Add. 1, fols 156v-57r	Scragg 1045-48	York	See above, pp. xxx (now S 1461a)	Survey of estates	450	s.xi ⁱⁿ
24.3	York, Minster Library, Add. 1, fol. 161r	Scragg 1050	York	<i>North</i> , App. 1	Inventory of church treasures	50	s.xi ^{med}
24.4	York, Minster Library, Add. 1, fol. 161v	Scragg 1052	York	<i>North</i> , App. 2	List of <i>festermen</i>	125	s.xi ^{ex}
26.1	BL, Add. 43703 (early-modern transcript of BL, Cotton Otho B. xi) ¹¹⁷			<i>ASChart</i> , App. II, no. 1	Burghal hidage	250	s.xi ¹
26.2	BL, Harley 3271, fol. 6v	Scragg 645		BCS 297	Tribal hidage	200	s.xi ¹
26.3	BL, Add. 43703 (early-modern transcript of BL, Cotton Otho B. xi) ¹¹⁷			<i>ASChart</i> , App. II, no. 1	Hidage for defence	200	s.xi ¹
26.4	London, Soc. Ant. 60, fols. 52r-54v	Pelteret 142	Northamptonshire	<i>ASChart</i> , App. I, no. 3	Northants geld roll	1300	s.xii ¹
27.1	OS Facs ii. Ilchester 4		Abbotsbury	Thorpe, pp. 605-8	Abbotsbury guild statutes	575	s.xi ^{med}
28.1	BL, Cotton Roll, ii. 11		Crediton	Morsbach, p. 119 ¹²⁹	Declaration of indulgences	300	s.xiii ²
28.2	BL, Cotton Roll, ii. 11		Crediton	Morsbach, p. 117	Grants of indulgences	75	s.xiii ²
28.3	BL, Cotton Roll, ii. 11		Crediton	Morsbach, p. 117	Indulgence of Lifing	125	s.xiii ²
28.4	BL, Cotton Roll, ii. 11		Crediton	Morsbach, p.	Pledge of	200	s.xiii ²

¹²⁹ Morsbach = L. Morsbach, 'Umschriften ags. Urkunden in einer Pergamentrolle des Späten 13. Jahrhunderts: Texte und Erläuterungen', in *Britannica: Max Förster zum sechzigsten Geburtstag 1869 8. März 1929* (Leipzig, 1929), pp. 106-254.

				119	Eadnoth		
--	--	--	--	-----	---------	--	--

