



The scope of the project comprises all royal *acta* in the names of King Henry I, Queen Matilda, Queen Adeliza, William *ætheling*; and writs issued by Roger, bishop of Salisbury, when exercising jurisdiction on behalf of the king. Diplomas attested by the king are counted as royal acts. References to documents in these categories are included as evidence of lost acts.

The purpose of the edition is to make reliable texts of documents available in permanent print with sufficient structured guidance to enable the historian or student of history to make use of them. All technical points necessary for the interpretation of documents must be explained. Sufficient background information must be included to enable the user to grasp the shape and significance of a beneficiary's archive. It is desirable to translate all continuous Latin prose so that students and general readers should be able to benefit from the edition; translations must follow a consistent use of language in rendering the technicalities of law and administration into English. It may not be necessary to translate lengthy lists of properties with little continuous syntax.

#### INTRODUCING THE BENEFICIARY ARCHIVE

The documents are organized by beneficiary archive. In most cases this will be an institution in whose interests a document was issued and which preserved the document during the middle ages. Those only preserved centrally will none the less be treated under the beneficiary, since enrolments usually represent copies of documents issued for preservation by the beneficiary. There will be a few cases of documents preserved in a different archive from that of the real beneficiary, and such cases demand a decision that will least confuse the user.

Ecclesiastical beneficiaries form the great majority due to the chances of survival. In dealing with complexities, it is important to assign documents to the heading where users are most likely to find them. Documents relating to dependencies may at a technical level have the mother house as beneficiary but have been preserved locally; in such cases the dependency should have its own heading. Conversely a dependency may have preserved the only copy of a document that relates primarily or even only to the mother house, with whose archive it should be reunited. Documents for the benefit of two parties must be placed carefully with a pointer to the text from the other relevant section. Complex beneficiaries, such as cathedrals, which at this date may be in the process of dividing properties between the bishop and the cathedral chapter or cathedral priory, should have the complexities explained in the headnote to the beneficiary archive.

In dealing with secular beneficiaries it is desirable to avoid creating multiple headings for a single family, even though at this date there may be no inherited surname, and it is anachronistic to think in terms of a stable honour as if it were an institution. Secular beneficiaries may not have preserved their own documents, but texts have survived through ecclesiastical archives. In such cases a judgement is needed on whether there is a coherent secular archive to which they can be referred, or whether, for example, an act whose beneficiary is a tenant and later benefactor of the ecclesiastical archive might not be better treated as part of its eventual archive rather than as a stray in the name of an obscure individual.

The beneficiary archive begins with a heading, short enough to be used in the running headlines and meaningful to the user; for example, Abingdon Abbey, York Minster. For ecclesiastical beneficiaries, this should be followed by a more detailed heading without repeating the place-name, Benedictine abbey of St Mary, Cathedral church of St Peter; it is necessary to include the order of a house, its rank (abbey, priory), and its dedication (since the saint may appear as the recipient of gifts), and, if it is a dependency, this

should be indicated. Next the county and diocese are indicated, County of Berkshire : Diocese of Salisbury, though with cathedral churches the dioceses need not be specified. The purpose of this is to indicate which shire court is likely to be most concerned in the beneficiary's transactions, which sheriff and which bishop are likely to be addressed in writ-charters. The county and diocese indicated should obviously be those relevant to the period in hand, even where the outcome of subsequent change is now more familiar or appears more natural. Change during the period concerned (for example, from the creation of the dioceses of Carlisle and Ely) should be indicated in the heading. Finally the heading will include the date of foundation of a religious house and the dates of any relevant refoundations or institutional transformations.

Where the beneficiary is a person rather than an institution, it is best if a 'surname' can be used that will allow the user to find the text. The Lacy family is a straightforward example, where between the reigns of William II and Stephen, there are acts in favour of three generations of the family. Even families that do not use a surname in this period can be more sensibly brought together than treated under the baptismal names of individuals; a later surname or the name later accepted for an honour or barony may provide a suitable heading.

Each beneficiary archive has an introductory essay. This should aim to discuss the following topics (though in dealing with very small archives, a disproportionate introduction should be avoided): background history (usually no more than one short paragraph unless the reign is significant in the history of the beneficiary, for example, in the case of newly founded religious houses), extent of landed interests and rights (for William II's reign this usually meant Domesday extent), the manuscript sources for this beneficiary's archive, the extent of its 'Anglo-Norman' content (it is usually advisable to include reference to documents issued by Henry II), an overview of the material from Henry I's reign, with particular reference to the means of putting it into chronological sequence, and more detailed discussion of issues represented in

this archive that cannot be better treated in the comment on a single document. Source references should be included in the body of the text, not as footnotes, with preference always for the primary sources of information; secondary references are generally only included for points of interpretation, not as sources of information, though exception is made for a handful of standard works of reference (such as *Fasti* or *Heads*). Footnotes should not be used except in very exceptional circumstances; it is absolutely necessary to avoid footnotes on pages that include documents, since the layout of continuous text and footnotes is incompatible with the structured layout of text, translation, apparatus, and commentary.

## INTRODUCING THE DOCUMENT

*Title:* Each document is introduced by a number and title, which should indicate the class of document and its function in accordance with a consistent formula.

The formula begins with a categorization of the document (writ, writ-charter, charter, diploma, letter; in the case of lost documents one must usually use the vaguer 'lost act'). The second element is usually a participle indicating what the act does, 'Writ-charter confirming the gift by Someone to the Beneficiary of Something', 'Writ ordering Someone to reissue the Beneficiary of Something'. In simple cases the title can compress a good deal into one interpretative formula. In more complex cases, for example, where more than one shire court or sheriff is addressed, it may be necessary to include more procedural information in the title.

*Source notes:* Between title and text, notes are given to identify the sources from which the document is derived. The hierarchy of headings (printed in small capitals) that are commonly included in source notes is ORIGINAL, FACSIMILE (one or both of which may be repeated in cases of multiple originals), CHANCERY ENROLMENT, CARTULARY COPY, ANTIQUARIAN TRANSCRIPT, PRINTED, and CALENDAR (use singular or plural as appropriate). This common hierarchy may be complicated by the survival of other forms of copy, such as the CHANCERY ENGROSSMENT of a charter of inspeximus. Enrolments in

other contexts, especially the less formal and less reliable *Cartae Antiquae* Rolls, are not unusual; the recitation of a text in the context of a legal record is also found. Such cases may need to be fitted into the hierarchy on the basis of a judgement of the quality of text they provide. Other categories may be needed in special circumstances (for example, ANTIQUARIAN FACSIMILE). In some cases it is common to have texts preserved as CHRONICLE COPIES; in such circumstances, it is desirable to identify the chronicle source first and then to specify for editorial purposes how many manuscript copies there are, though it is our policy not to redo the work of editors of narrative sources unless there is a pressing reason so to do.

Where the attestation of a lost document is treated in lieu of a document, the equivalent heading is SOURCE, which also may require the initial statement as to what the source is and then some comment on its manuscript transmission.

The sequence of different categories of manuscript source is based on the principle that, with charters of *inspeximus*, Charter Rolls were conscientiously copied from original documents and often preserve contemporary features even in spelling and abbreviation. The sequence of subsequent inspection follows, but there is rarely any purpose in collating enrolments that witness only to the degradation of the copy; so it will be usual to assign a letter only to the oldest attested enrolment. The other categories are equally likely to represent textual families, and successive copies are given in chronological order. In complex cases the preservation of a document through different local channels may be worth indicating in the way references are grouped, for example, CARTULARY COPIES FROM LINCOLN, CARTULARY COPIES FROM YORK. Where copies are made independently from the same exemplar (whether that was original or not), it is likely to be necessary to assign letters to all independent witnesses. The sequence of letters should provide a guide to the authority of witnesses but it is convenient if it can also serve to show the relationship between copies and the sources from which printed texts were derived. For this reason an inferior copy that bears no independent witness to the text may be

assigned a letter in order to add reference to it as the source of a printed text.

The descriptive information about manuscript sources is included at the appropriate level in the structure of the edition. Charter rolls, for example, will be discussed in the introduction to the edition as a whole; an inspeximus that includes several documents, or a cartulary, will be discussed in the beneficiary headnote. Where an act survives as an original, the manuscript needs to be briefly described in the source notes on the document in question.

ORIGINAL: DCM 1. 1. Reg. 7, a small rectangle of parchment, 000 x 00 mm, with trace of a detached sealing tag. Bishop and Chaplais judged the hand to be the same as that of four writs in the name of Henry I, all in the interest of Durham; it is certainly the same as the hand that wrote a writ of Henry I for Durham, dated at Westminster at Christmas and datable to the year 1100 (H1/0000; *Regesta* 505), which bears the authentic 'second' seal. The most distinctive feature of the hand appears to be the foot of the l in 'Angl' which is not the usual curve but an added stroke rising from the foot of the ascender at an angle, resembling a capital L. The other three writs attributed by Bishop & Chaplais to the same hand are forged and bear impressions of the forged 'first' seal of Henry I; the details of the script do not provide compelling evidence of identity.

ENDORSEMENT: 'Carta Willelmi primi de Bellingaham cum omnibus suis appendiciis dat' monachis Dunelm' (late 14th cent.).

FACSIMILE: Bishop & Chaplais, pl. 7a.

In detail, the components of a manuscript source-reference are themselves complex. In a reference to copies in the chancery rolls the elements to include are document class, reign and year, PRO class number and roll or item, membrane or equivalent, number (where present), status (usually inspeximus in Chancery rolls), date (of the inspeximus), calendar-reference, and siglum or indication of relationship to previous items. For example:

CHANCERY ENROLMENTS Charter Roll 54 Henry III, C53/59, mem. 14, inspeximus dated 15 November 1269 (*CalCh*, ii. 132) [C]; Charter Roll 8 Edward II, C53/101, mem. 3, no. 5, inspeximus dated 3 June 1314 (*CalCh*, iii. 275).

References to manuscript books will often have fewer elements, though in some cases this level of complexity will be found. The possible elements are location (place and repository), shelfmark or equivalent, name of manuscript (various categories), date in figures

or estimated dating in roman numerals, primary (or other early and consistent) foliation, modern foliation, numbering within the manuscript context where it exists, rubric where appropriate, and siglum or indication of relationship to previous items. For example:

CARTULARY COPIES: York Minster Library, MS Add. 1 (York Gospels) (s. xi), fol. 7v (on leaves added s. xiii) ('Carta conquestoris') [D]; York, D&C, Magnum Registrum Album, pt 1 (s. xiv), fol. 62r (now fol. 90r) [E]; York, D&C, Doomsday Book (s. xiv) (Davis no. 1088), fol. 26r ('Carta Willelmi conquestoris dicti Bastard de collacione hospitalis sancti Leonardi Ebor.') [F]; BL MS Cotton Vitellius A. II (s. xiv<sup>ex</sup>) (Liber Statutorum, Davis no. 1089), fol. 28r [G]; BL MS Cotton Nero D. III (s. xv<sup>in</sup>) (Cartulary of St Leonard's Hospital), fol. 69r, copied from an exemplification by the deans of Lincoln and York and members of their chapters datable to c. 1214 [H].

Where citing transcripts by antiquaries of the sixteenth century and later, the form of manuscript references will be similar, though the date of the manuscript is only included if the copy is expressly dated or if the copyist is unknown. Where possible the copyist's name and dates should be indicated and any indication of the source copied. For example:

ANTIQUARIAN TRANSCRIPTS: BL MS Lansdowne 863, fol. 95r (copied by Richard St George (d. 1635) from 13th-cent. exemplification).

In citing the previous printed tradition of a document, chronological order should be followed. Abbreviations are used only for commonly cited works. References to collections of documents will normally give volume, pages, and document number in brackets. After each reference it should be possible to indicate (by one or more letters) from which manuscript an edition printed the text or (by short title or editor's name) from which preceding edition it reprinted it. Where the text has been printed in translation or summarized in discussion, the reference is still given here but with the words (in English) or (abstract) added in round brackets.

PRINTED: Dugdale, i. 397 ['ex collectionibus Augustini Vincent e Registro de Wederhale'; in fact from Dodsworth's extracts]; *Monasticon*, iii. 582 (no. i) [from Dugdale]; J. E. Prescott, *The Register of Wetherhal*, Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society (1897), 391 (no. 250) [from C].

The note for CALENDAR references is reserved for the two attempts to catalogue large numbers of Henry I's documents, Farrer and *Regesta*, which are cited concisely by short-title and number. Where there exists, e.g., a calendar of a manuscript source in a report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, this is cited under PRINTED and qualified as (abstract).

#### THE EDITED TEXT OF THE DOCUMENT

The edited text should represent as nearly as possible an accurate text of the original. It is more important to establish a reliable text than it is to exhibit the readings of each copy, and it is desirable to avoid cluttering the text with unnecessary suprascript cues and the page with large bodies of readings that serve no purpose in establishing the text.

Where an original survives, the edition must provide the text in almost every detail. Its abbreviations will be marked in places that are significant, i.e. in the royal style, in the address, in names, and in the witnesses and dating clause, but not in conventional Latin contractions. It is not appropriate to follow the capitalization of the original, though in originals in what we may call 'diploma' form, the occasional use of capitals not just the initial letters but for the whole names of significant persons should be retained. While it is desirable to represent the punctuation of an original, this may not be practical without adopting special conventions.

In the absence of an original, it is necessary to determine which of the witnesses most nearly represents it. A Charter Roll should usually be given precedence over a cartulary copy, provided that it is clear that the original document was inspected and not just an earlier inspeximus. All independent copies should be considered as potential witnesses. The reporting of variants need not be exhaustive, especially where copies are numerous. Selection of variants should include any departure from the primary witness, substantive variations between other independent witnesses, substantive variations attesting the relationship between copies, variations that illustrate the copyist's understanding of the

diplomatic conventions of the period (e.g. *rex Anglie* in the style, *iusticiariis* in the address where the original had *iustic(ie)*, &c.). Place-names often generate numerous variants, which it is not our business to collect: place-name specialists will want to use unambiguously dated evidence such as Feet of Fines, where a place-name was written down at a known date, rather than documents where the spelling of an exemplar interacts with the contemporary usage of the scribe.

It is not desirable to print a text that exactly follows the manuscript evidence where this bears no true witness to the original text. So, for example, a single cartulary copy of an authentic act may read 'Henr(icus) rex Anglie', but the original must have read 'H(enricus) rex Angl(or)um'; in these circumstances we should print 'Henricus rex Angl<orum>' (using <> to show conjecture rather than () to show the expansion of an abbreviation). The treatment of the king's initial can be significant in revealing forgery, but it does not benefit the edition to devote space to indicating that five copies vary between H(enricus), Henr(icus), and Henricus.

The abbreviation of forenames is important. Originals frequently use only an initial, but for some names more than one letter is also common, 'Os(bernus)'. Expansion of initials was widespread among later copyists, and it was not always correct; editors too have sometimes introduced error in this way. Consistency in the use of abbreviations may have been one means whereby the clerks could tell one person from another: 'W. episcopo' in William II's charters will almost always identify Walkelin of Winchester after William of Durham had died; while both were frequent witnesses, they were referred to by diocese, not by initial. Henry I's original acts differentiate 'Will(elmo) canc(ellario)' and 'Wald(rico) cancellario', leaving 'W. cancellario' as a problem. In such contexts, we need to rely on knowing where a manuscript has written the name in full.

There will be occasions when one is tempted to correct the transmitted text in trivial ways. Fluctuation between contemporary usage 'Lincolia' and later 'Lincolnia', contemporary 'Gloec(estre)'

and later 'Gloucestria', can appear as mere inconsistency to the reader; knowledge derived from originals should guide choice between variants, but where only late witnesses exist we must resist the temptation to improve the text. This applies even in minutiae: apart for the word Kal. in dates, the letter *k* is almost never used in originals of the period, either in the Latin text or in English personal and place-names; *ch* is preferred. In this knowledge, we may expand 'W(alchelinus)', but we should not emend where the only witnesses have 'Walkelinus'; 'Kent' is not found in an original until 1141; before that it was always 'Chent', but in later copies the two spellings are equally common.

In editing King Stephen's acta, Cronne and Davis selected a preferred witness as the source of accidentals; this copy, usually the earliest, is asterisked in their edition. This policy is not followed here. While the best copy may provide the positive text, it is perverse not to accept that other copies may have better preserved the accidental details of orthography and abbreviation.

The layout of textual variants on the page will almost certainly require intervention from the typesetter to achieve a visually harmonious layout on the page.

#### COMMENTARY ON THE DOCUMENT

This is arranged under six headings, DATE, ADDRESS, WITNESS, PLACE, CONTEXT, and AUTHENTICITY.

*Date*: Where a document is dated, the note should begin, 'Dated . . .', and express the date contained in simple terms, giving day, date, month, and year where possible. Whether the day of the week will turn out to be significant, we do not yet know. If the date is expressed by reference to a feast day, this can be repeated in English in the note with explanation. With feasts such as Christmas and especially the moveable feasts, Easter, Whitsun, Ascension, it is necessary to give *both* liturgical *and* calendar date; in such cases conversion assumes the precise date of the feast rather than the period of holiday.

Where a document is not dated, the usual formula is to indicate 'After' the terminus post quem, and 'before' the terminus ante quem. In a simple case, these may be separated by a semi-colon; if both terms relate to the same person, the formula is, 'While Roger was chancellor, from Easter 1101 to Michaelmas 1102'. Often, however, more explanation is needed, and each term then requires a sentence. The dating process is perceived in two stages. 'Formally datable . . .' indicates the range within whose terms the date *must* lie, determined from the dates of life or office of persons mentioned or other indisputable indexes of date. Within that, one may indicate reasons (inferred from context, or from comparison with other documents, or from inferred principles such as the formulae by which a witness is named) to narrow the date-range. Surmise may be allowed to lead towards a dating qualified as 'probably' or even 'possibly', provided that the reasons for such speculation are clearly stated.

*Address:* The address clause shows where a document was expected to be delivered except in cases where a general address is used. The main aim of this note, therefore, is to categorize the type of the address as it may be appropriate to a class of document. Where possible, therefore, interpretation (e.g. the shire court of Yorkshire) has precedence over description (e.g. the archbishop of York, the sheriff of Yorkshire, and the sworn men of the shire). It was often the case that persons were addressed without reference to their office or with their names abbreviated to initials. Any necessary explanation should be given to identify who is addressed and in what capacity, e.g. 'William de Cahaignes, as sheriff of Northampton'.

*Witness:* The witness list is usually important in dating, and witnesses should be identified so that the user can find them in the index of persons. Where a witness's presence can be explained, this should be done in few words. The grouping even of a small number of witnesses may be significant for fixing the circumstances of a transaction. In longer lists of witnesses, the translation may serve to identify many witnesses, but such

significance as their aggregation may convey should be expressly noted. Even the form in which witnesses' names are written may be revealing.

*Place:* Where a document is place-dated, the place should be expressed in modern terms where possible, usually including the English county (though this is not necessary for Westminster, or for many county towns) or an appropriate equivalent in Normandy. This serves as a cross-reference to the appendix of place-dates. Unusual place-dates may be interpretable, and the evidence of place may contribute to the dating of a document. In some circumstances it may be possible to infer more about the circumstances of the transaction from the place than would otherwise be apparent.

*Context* The first need is to indicate, if possible, what can be inferred from the text as to the circumstances in which it was obtained. There are many examples of writs that presuppose a dispute but hide this behind a notification restating the background circumstances. The context note serves as the peg on which detailed discussion of any point, internal to the document or contextual, may be hung. Specific factual background to help understand the text, including mention of associated documents that are not royal acts (e.g. the private deed behind a gift confirmed by the king or an episcopal confirmation of the same transaction), should be included here.

*Authenticity:* This note is needed only where there is reason to discuss the authenticity, that is where there is any doubt as to a document's authenticity. Where there is no reason to doubt, this heading is deleted. Where authenticity is questioned, our judgement is not simply a legal one, in which any deviation from authenticity vitiates the document. It is sometimes possible, for example, to demonstrate tampering with an otherwise authentic act, and in such cases detailed reasons should be given; the text may even use square brackets and 12pt type to mark off interpolation or substitution.