

Chapter Title: FORGERIES AND HISTORIES AT CHRIST CHURCH, CANTERBURY

Book Title: Forgeries and Historical Writing in England, France, and Flanders, 900-1200

Book Author(s): Robert F. Berkhofer <suffix>III</suffix>

Published by: Boydell & Brewer, Boydell Press. (2022)

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv24tr8rg.12>

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Boydell & Brewer, Boydell Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Forgeries and Historical Writing in England, France, and Flanders, 900-1200*

## FORGERIES AND HISTORIES AT CHRIST CHURCH, CANTERBURY

### THE LOST ANGLO-NORMAN CARTULARY

In 1067, a fire ravaged the monastery and cathedral of Christ Church, Canterbury. Coming soon after the Norman Conquest of 1066, this fire allegedly destroyed many documents in the archives.<sup>1</sup> In 1070, a Norman abbot, Lanfranc, was installed as archbishop and embarked on an ambitious reform program. Occurring in rapid succession, these three events provoked rethinking the monastic past for new purposes. The rebuilding efforts over the next two decades – including the scriptorium which had been one of the most productive in early medieval England – transformed Canterbury. The change of regime and even changes to the physical structure of the church all influenced the post-Conquest generation. Unfortunately, no manuscript survives from this time comparable to the *Liber Traditionum* of Saint-Peter's, Ghent for the 1030s or the dossier of Saint-Denis for the 1060s. However, an Anglo-Norman cartulary was compiled at Christ Church from the mid-1070s.<sup>2</sup> This cartulary was written in Latin, the language of royal documents after 1070, though it relied on earlier sources in both Latin and Old English.<sup>3</sup> Reconstructing this book alongside surviving charters reveals that the late eleventh century proved a fruitful time for rewriting the past at Christ Church.

<sup>1</sup> ASC-D and E, a. 1067; in 1072 Lanfranc lamented “Other documents from other hands were utterly consumed – both the originals and the copies (*tam authentica quam eorum exemplaria*) – in that destructive fire which our church suffered four years ago.” Trans. Helen Clover and Margaret T. Gibson, eds., *Letters of Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 52–3, no. 4; Eadmer, HN, 16, wrote that “almost all” of the older privileges had been lost.

<sup>2</sup> Davis, 36, no. 162.1.

<sup>3</sup> Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, 28–9 and 210–2.

A post-Conquest “story” of Christ Church can be gleaned from the lost Anglo-Norman cartulary, a book of charter copies arranged in chronological order.<sup>4</sup> However, understanding its implied narrative (it contained few overt narratives so far as can be determined), requires being aware of an important pre-history, which lay outside the text. In particular, Augustine’s mission to England, as related in book one of Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, was crucial. Key events from Bede provided a “back-story” for Christ Church. Such events included Pope Gregory the Great sending the mission headed by Augustine to England directly from Rome (ch. 23); the arrival of Saint Augustine on the Isle of Thanet in 597 and King Æthelberht’s granting the missionaries a dwelling in the city of Durovernon, described as the *metropolis* of his realm (ch. 25); and more missionaries arriving from Rome in 601 with a *pallium* and a letter explaining how the Church in Britain should be organized – in two provinces based at London and York, though all bishops in Britain were to be subject to Augustine’s authority (ch. 29).<sup>5</sup> Even though there was no direct use of Bede in the cartulary, these features of his account were an obvious and necessary prologue for its compilers. Furthermore, events were reinterpreted tendentiously by its compilers in two ways. First, the roman town of Durovernon (medieval *Doruvernum*, often spelled *Dorobernia*) was a city identified as Canterbury (*Cantuariensis*). Second, its archbishop (not just Augustine personally) should be the leader of the whole church in Britain, especially the southern province. That the cartulary’s compilers presumed this history is evident from the outset, as their own story began immediately after the events just rehearsed. As before, I relate their story as a constructed narrative, divided into parts for ease of comprehension.

## THE STORY OF CHRIST CHURCH, CANTERBURY

Here begins a story told in four parts.

### Part 1: From the Earliest Days, 615 to 798<sup>6</sup>

Long ago but not far away, Christianity came to England. In the year 615, Pope Boniface sent a letter addressed to King Æthelberht, Archbishop Laurentius, and all the clerics and English people, in which he praised Æthelberht for his support of the Church. The Pope also lauded the king’s generosity to the monastery established in the city of Canterbury (*monasterio in Dorobernensi*

<sup>4</sup> Robin Fleming reconstructed the contents, CC Cart., 83–135.

<sup>5</sup> Bertram Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors, eds., *Bede’s Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969), 69–70, 73–77, 105–7.

<sup>6</sup> CC Cart., 109–117, nos. 1–13.

*civitate constituto*), consecrated to the Holy Savior by Saint Augustine, disciple of Pope Gregory the Great.<sup>7</sup> The Pope also rejoiced that the monks there lived a regular monastic life. And because of their holiness, the Pope warned that if any subsequent kings, bishops, clerics, or laymen sought to trouble the monks, they would be anathematized by him or his successors.

And so, papal protection was given to the monks of Christ Church, who received numerous donations thereafter. The first of these benefactors was Eadbald, the son of King Æthelberht of Kent and Queen Bertha, who had been personally converted by Saint Augustine and who gave land in 616.<sup>8</sup> Subsequent kings granted various lands in Kent and Sussex. For these early donors, the dates of their gifts were recorded using the year of the incarnation and their deaths by the day of the month, so that the monks could pray for their salvation. Thus, worthy benefactors were commemorated and blessed by the prayers of the brothers.

In 694, an immunity was granted to the churches of Kent by King Wihtred in a council at Clrofesho. In this grant, Wihtred condemned laymen who usurped church property and issued the following command: “We order that all our successors – kings, princes, and all laymen – that none of them ever be permitted to receive the *dominium* of any church or monastic community which has been granted in perpetual inheritance to God and his saints by myself or by my predecessors in former times.”<sup>9</sup> King Wihtred also ordered that no abbot or abbess could be elected without consulting the archbishop of the diocese. Further, the king wrote:

And nothing in this matter pertains to the authority of the king, since it is for him to set up secular counts (*comites*), leaders (*duces*), best men (*optimates*), princes, prefects, and judges; but it is for the metropolitan archbishop to fill and govern the churches of God, and to elect, install, confirm and reprimand the bishops, abbots, abbesses, and other prelates, lest any sheep of Christ stray from the flock of the eternal shepherd.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>7</sup> CC Cart., 109, no. 1 (JL 1998).

<sup>8</sup> CC Cart., 110, no. 2; *Charters of Christ Church Canterbury*, 261–3, no. 1 (S 1609).

<sup>9</sup> Trans. based on Nicholas Brooks, *Early History of the Church of Canterbury* (London: Leicester University Press, 1984), 194 with variants from CC Cart., 112, no. 7: “precipimus omnibus successoribus nostris regibus, principibus et omnibus in laico habitu constitutis, ut nulli unquam liceat alicui ecclesie vel dominium habere monasterii, que a me vel antecessoribus meis priscis temporibus tradita sunt Deo in perpetuum hereditatem et sanctis eius.” *Charters of Christ Church*, 303–13, no. 8 (S 22).

<sup>10</sup> Trans. based on Brooks, *Early History*, 194, with variants from the cartulary, CC Cart., 112, no. 7: “Neque enim de hac re aliquid pertinet ad decretum vel imperium regis. Illius autem est comites, duces, optimates, principes, prefectos, iudices seculares statuere; metropolitani est archiepiscopi ecclesias Dei replere, gubernare, episcopos, abates, abatissas, ceterosque prelatos eligere, statuere, firmare, admonere, ne

Subsequently, another great council was held at Clofesho in 742 to consider the ordering of the English church, presided over by King Æthelbald of Mercia and attended by Archbishop Cuthbert of Canterbury and many other bishops. When the ancient privileges were perused, they found the aforementioned precept of Wiltred concerning the liberty of the churches of Kent. It was found to be pleasing in all ways, and so King Æthelbald confirmed it with his own hand, “so that the liberty, honor, authority, and security of Christ Church could not be denied by any person, but rather that it (and all of the lands pertaining to it) would be free from all secular services, except military expedition, bridge and road work.”<sup>11</sup> In 743, the venerable Archbishop Cuthbert arranged for a church dedicated to Saint John the Baptist to be constructed next to the cathedral to serve as the burial place for him and his successors. Subsequently, many kings granted lands to the monks at Christ Church free of all exactions (except the three common burdens) and anathematized those daring to transgress these arrangements. Thus, the inviolacy of the holdings of the brothers of Christ Church was proclaimed.

Part 2: From 798 to 939/41<sup>12</sup>

Great councils and synods protected the church thereafter. In the year of the lord 798, a council was held at Bapchild, presided over by King Coenwulf of Mercia and attended by Archbishop Æthelheard, and many bishops, abbots, and other holy persons. There, venerable father Æthelheard, primate of all Britain (*primas totius Britanniae*) began the council in the following manner:

I, Æthelheard, by grace of God humble archbishop of the holy church of Canterbury (*Dorobernensis*), of one mind with the council and the whole holy synod, in the name of almighty God and through his dread judgment, order that at this time no layman (*laici seculares*) should presume to take lordship by rash daring over the inheritance of the Lord, that is of churches, just as I received in a mandate from the apostolic lord Pope Leo.<sup>13</sup>

---

quis de ovibus Christi, scilicet eterni pastoris aberret.” “Bishops” (*episcopos*) was a later insertion, see below.

<sup>11</sup> CC Cart., 113–4, no. 9 (S 90): “propria manu mea munifica subscribens confirmo, ut per omnia libertas, honor, auctoritas et securitas Christi ecclesie a nulla persona denegetur, sed sit libera ab omnibus secularibus servitiis et omnis terre ad illam pertinentes, exceptis expeditione, pontis et arcis constructione.” *Charters of Christ Church*, 348–9, no. 12B. Catherine Cubitt, *Anglo-Saxon Church Councils, c. 650–c. 850* (London: Leicester University Press, 1995), 265.

<sup>12</sup> CC Cart., 117–32, nos. 14–44.

<sup>13</sup> CC Cart., 117, no. 14: “Ego Athelardus gratia Dei humilis sancte Dorobernensis ecclesie archiepiscopus in [un]animo concilio totius sancte sinodi in nomine Dei

In this same speech, Æthelheard condemned those despoiling monastic land to be damned on the day of judgment; and all of this was announced in the presence of King Coenwulf.<sup>14</sup> At first, this pronouncement was heeded. So, in 799, King Coenwulf wrote to Æthelheard and restored four estates of the church which had been taken away by King Offa.<sup>15</sup>

Unfortunately, a serious dispute arose in the next generation. In 822, a council of all the Saxon kingdoms was summoned at Clofesho to adjudicate a dispute between Archbishop Wulfred, King Coenwulf, and his daughter Cwenthryth, abbess, concerning the minsters of Reculver and Thanet. After several attempts at reconciliation, it was agreed that the King would respect the authority of the archbishop, return any property seized and make compensation. Sadly, this agreement was never put into force and wrangling continued for three years, especially about the authority of Archbishop Æthelheard as metropolitan. Finally, after the death of Coenwulf, his successor made amends, acknowledged the grants of his father, and order was restored. Furthermore, King Boernulf gave new estates as amends for past wrongs, which were all listed and witnessed by the synod as belonging in perpetuity to the church. And Archbishop Wulfred agreed to the reconciliation, with the condition that all these lands be recognized by the synod and under the sign of the cross, “lest any controversy arise in future about this matter,” as had happened in regard to the estate of Winchcombe, since the names of holdings had been erased from ancient privileges.<sup>16</sup>

Having thus achieved peace, from this time forward various grants (including a flurry in 838–9) were made with the proviso that they were given in perpetuity to Christ Church to support the monks there. Donations continued and Christ Church’s domains increased through the reign of King Æthelstan (924/5–939), who gave the brothers the site of Folkestone

---

omnipotens et per eius tremendum iudicium precipio, sicut ego mandatum a domino apostolico Leone papa percepi, ut hoc tempore nunquam temerario ausu super hereditatum domini, id est ecclesias, laici seculares presumant dominium suscipere.” *Charters of Christ Church*, 432–4, no. 28 (S 1430a).

<sup>14</sup> CC Cart., 117, no. 14: “Sciant se a presenti ecclesia iustorum segregatos, et in die iudicii ante tribunal Christi nisi ante emendaverint rationem reddituros.” Monastic properties are alluded to in the prior sentence, “a propriis possessoribus monasteriorum constitutum est.”

<sup>15</sup> CC Cart., 118, no. 15; *Charters of Christ Church*, 441–2, no. 29A (based on S 155).

<sup>16</sup> CC Cart., 122, no. 19: “Archiepiscopus autem hiis omnibus assensum prebuit, had conditione, ut nomina predictorum agelice sint abrasa de antiquis privilegiis que pertinent ad Wichelcumbe, ne in posterum aliqua controversia excitetur de hoc, quod sinodali auctoritate finitum est et signo crucis firmatum.” *Charters of Christ Church*, 605–7, no. 59A (based on S 1436).

monastery after it had been devastated by pagans, in order to restore the worship of Christ there.<sup>17</sup>

Part 3: From 941 to 1016<sup>18</sup>

Thereafter, the house flourished thanks to the generosity of many benefactors. During the rule of Archbishop Oda (941–58), Christ Church received bountiful royal patronage and protections. King Eadred was especially generous, granting the *villa* of Twickenham in Middlesex with all appurtenances in 948.<sup>19</sup> In 949, he also gave the monastery of Reculver in 949 with its *villa* and all appurtenances, excepting the three common burdens – a notable charter since it was composed and written down at the king's command by the hand of Abbot Dunstan of Glastonbury, who would later become archbishop of Canterbury.<sup>20</sup> Furthermore, Eadred affirmed a charter from 941 of his brother, King Edmund, and his nephew, which restored many lands which had been unjustly taken from Christ Church.<sup>21</sup>

After Oda's rule ended in 958, Edgar became King of the English (*rex Anglorum*) and, thus, ruler of the ancient kingdom of Æthelberht, and so he affirmed the privileges (*privilegia*) of the monasteries of Kent.<sup>22</sup> Additional gifts by kings, queens, and wealthy patrons were given during the rule of Archbishop Dunstan (959–988) and afterwards. During this time, benefactors' names were carefully recorded, so that the brothers might pray for them. So were anathemas to deter despoliation of the estates. In 961, Queen Eadgifu, the mother of Edmund and Eadred, donated estates in seven locations to Christ Church, whose previous holders were listed.<sup>23</sup> In 964, Christ Church received the church of St. Mary in Lyminge, where the bones of Saint Eadburga rested.<sup>24</sup> In 997, Queen Ælfgifu (Emma) granted land at Newington and Britwell Priory, Oxfordshire, along with thirteen marks of gold and precious vestments, specifically for the support of the monks (*ad opus monachorum*).<sup>25</sup> Such patronage supported the monks of Christ Church during the tumultuous reign of King Æthelred II (978–1016).

<sup>17</sup> CC Cart., 131–2, no. 43; *Charters of Christ Church*, 863–6, no. 105 (S 398).

<sup>18</sup> CC Cart., 132–9, nos. 45–63.

<sup>19</sup> CC Cart., 132–3, no. 45; *Charters of Christ Church*, 933, no. 119A (based on S 537).

<sup>20</sup> CC Cart., 133, no. 46: “Et ego Dunstanus indignus abbas cartulam inde imperante domino meo rego Eadredo composui et propriis digitis meis perscripsi.” *Charters of Christ Church*, 948, no. 120A (based on S 546)

<sup>21</sup> CC Cart., 133–4, no. 48; *Charters of Christ Church*, 891–2, no. 111 (S 477).

<sup>22</sup> CC Cart., 134, no. 49; *Charters of Christ Church*, 956–7, no. 23 (S 1632).

<sup>23</sup> CC Cart., 134–6, no. 51–2 (see also remark, 92); *Charters of Christ Church*, 963–7, no. 125 (S 1212).

<sup>24</sup> CC Cart., 139, no. 62; *Charters of Christ Church*, 973, no. 127.

<sup>25</sup> CC Cart., 137, no. 56; *Charters of Christ Church*, 1185–7, no. 175A (S 1638).

Part 4: From 1016 to 1066<sup>26</sup>

After 1016, Cnut became king and the new ruler favored the monks of Christ Church. After hearing about the grants of his predecessors (*beneficia audiens predecessorum meorum*) – especially the royal privileges and liberties of the monasteries of Kent – Cnut confirmed the traditional privileges and customary anathemas upon those who would violate them.<sup>27</sup> Furthermore, in 1018 he confirmed a gift of Archbishop Lyfing to support the monks and also granted the woods of Lower Hazelhurst in Suffolk.<sup>28</sup>

Soon, the monks prospered after electing one of their own as archbishop, Æthelnoth, who ruled from 1020 to 1038. During Æthelnoth's time, King Cnut confirmed many donations given directly to the monks of Christ Church. These included the manor of East Horsley in Surrey, granted by one Thored, to support the works and feeding of the monks (*ad opus et victum monachorum*) in 1036.<sup>29</sup> This same year, Cnut came to Canterbury (*Dorobernia*) and approved a donation by one of his lords, Haldene Searpa, of land at Saltwood, Kent.<sup>30</sup> Also, King Cnut confirmed several grants given by King Æthelred II or his nobles. Most importantly, Cnut confirmed Æthelred's expulsion of clerics from Christ Church and their replacement with monks, which had happened in the year of the Lord 1006. He did this because Saint Augustine had founded a monastery by order of Pope Gregory in the reign of King Æthelberht. In the same act, Cnut reconfirmed Æthelred's privilege and the house's estates by name.<sup>31</sup> In the year of the incarnation 1038, Eadsige, a priest of Cnut's, took up the monastic habit at Christ Church and so Cnut restored the lands at Folkestone, formerly given by King Æthelstan for his salvation and that of his father, with the condition that no archbishop could in future give away or sell the land without license of the king or consent of the monks.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>26</sup> CC Cart., 139–51, nos. 64–86.

<sup>27</sup> CC Cart., 139, no. 64; *Charters of Christ Church*, 1062–4, no. 146a–b (S 952). Missing from earliest cartulary copy.

<sup>28</sup> CC Cart., nos. 65–66; *Charters of Christ Church*, 1052–8, nos. 144 and 144A (S 950).

<sup>29</sup> CC Cart., 140, no. 68; *Charters of Christ Church*, 1135–6, no. 159A (S 1222).

<sup>30</sup> CC Cart., 140–1, no. 69; *Charters of Christ Church*, 1102–4, no. 152A (based on S 1221).

<sup>31</sup> CC Cart., 141–3, no. 70; *Charters of Christ Church*, 1019–34, no. 140 (Latin only) (S 914).

<sup>32</sup> CC Cart., 145, no. 74: “Hac autem conditione prenomatus rex Cnut eandem terram reddidit, ut nullus archiepiscoporum qui ab illo die venturi erant in eandem ecclesiam illam terram videlicet Folchestane nec dare nec vendere posset sine licentia et regis et monachorum consensu Deo in eadem ecclesia servientium.” *Charters of Christ Church*, 1116–7, no. 154A (S 1643).



After Cnut's death, King Edward (1042–1066) continued to favor the monastery. He issued a writ confirming for both Archbishop Stigand and the monks of Christ Church all the lands which they held in the time of his father and all of his predecessors.<sup>33</sup> In addition, these lands were granted with all rights – fully enumerated – for the sake of the king's soul, and anyone who dared to interfere with them would risk losing the king's friendship as well as damnation. But the generosity of King Edward did not end there. Indeed, he gave lands for the feeding (*ad victum*) of the monks at Chartham and Walworth near London. In this same grant, Edward confirmed the holdings of Christ Church by name, in order by county, including Kent (25 were enumerated), Sussex (2), Surrey (4), Essex (7), Suffolk (2), Buckinghamshire (1), and Oxfordshire (2).<sup>34</sup> King Edward the Confessor was a good and true patron and he also gave the estate of Mersham, Kent with all its appurtenances to support the monks (*ad opus monachorum*).<sup>35</sup> He also confirmed previous donations, including a grant by Archbishop Æthelnoth in 1037 of land at Godmersham to support the monks (*ad opus et victum monachorum*), which he had bought from Earl Sired for 72 marks of pure silver.<sup>36</sup>

And let no one forget the generous gifts which had been given by King Cnut to Christ Church, including the arm of Saint Bartholomew, a great pallium, a crown of gold, and exclusive rights to the port of Sandwich and all exits from it on both sides of the river, as well as half of all tolls there.<sup>37</sup>

Thus, many benefactors and patrons – of worthy memory – provided for the monks of Christ Church. And all lands and revenues given to the monks before the Conquest were confirmed and reconfirmed many times by kings, from the time of the monastery's foundation until the present day.

## CONTEXTS FOR THE ANGLO-NORMAN CARTULARY AND ITS STORY

One must beware over-reading the Anglo-Norman cartulary of Christ Church, Canterbury, since no contemporary manuscript survives. Its organization and content must be deduced from three partial copies. These three copies were all written down considerably later (from the late twelfth century to the 1270s), with abbreviations, variations, and re-orderings of

<sup>33</sup> CC Cart., 145, no. 75: "Notum facio vobis me concessisse Stigando archiepiscopo et monachis ecclesiae Christi omnes terras quas habuerunt tempore patris mei et omnium antecessorum meorum..." *Charters of Christ Church*, 1203–4, no. 180A (S 1089).

<sup>34</sup> CC Cart., 145–6, no. 76; *Charters of Christ Church*, 1209–11, no. 181A (S 1047).

<sup>35</sup> CC Cart., 146–7, no. 78; *Charters of Christ Church*, 1196, no. 178A (S 1090).

<sup>36</sup> CC Cart., 148, no. 82; *Charters of Christ Church*, 1138, no. 169A (based on S 1389).

<sup>37</sup> CC Cart., 151, no. 86; *Charters of Christ Church*, 1097–8, no. 151B (based on S 959).

the original.<sup>38</sup> A severe skeptic might dismiss the cartulary; however, dorsal notes on single-sheet charters from Canterbury show that the archives were reorganized in the late eleventh century or early twelfth century, perhaps for compiling the cartulary.<sup>39</sup> In particular, these notes labelled the charters as either useful (*utile*) or not (*inutile*), or occasionally “*latine sed inutile*.” Interestingly, almost all charters labelled “*utile*” appear in some form in the cartulary and those labelled “*inutile*” do not. Mostly Old English documents were labelled “*inutile*” which suggests some sorting might have been based on language, for which the rare phrase “*latine sed inutile*” offers evidence.<sup>40</sup> However, the process of selecting was more complex. Language was certainly an issue: although the Anglo-Norman cartulary was an entirely Latin composition, its entries sometimes offered summaries or imperfect translations of Old English documents. Of course, such “translation” gave its composers leeway to manipulate their sources, since they were even less constrained than if they had been merely copying. Nevertheless, one is still faced with reconstructing a lost manuscript.

Another reason for caution is the difficulty of dating the lost cartulary. Initially, Nicholas Brooks argued the cartulary dated to the 1090s (with later additions) and that its strongly monastic tone and assertions of independence were motivated by royal exploitation during the vacancy after Lanfranc’s death (1089–1093). Margaret Gibson concurred about dating and argued that the cartulary was undertaken at the direction of Prior Henry (c. 1074–1096).<sup>41</sup> However, Robin Fleming, who produced a composite edition of the cartulary from a concordance of the three later manuscripts, convincingly argues for an earlier period of composition, from 1073 to 1083, before the Domesday inquest of 1086, and stresses its liturgical and commemorative functions.<sup>42</sup> Subsequently, Brooks and

<sup>38</sup> Cambridge, Corpus Christ College ms. 189, ff. 195r–201v +1 (Davis, 36, no. 163, late twelfth century on paleographic grounds); CCA-DCC Register P, ff. 11r–28v (Davis, 36, no. 163A, early thirteenth century); Lambeth Palace Library, ms. 1212, pp. 304–39 (Davis, 35, no. 159, 1270s).

<sup>39</sup> Nigel Ramsay, “The Cathedral Archives and Library,” in *A History of Canterbury Cathedral*, ed. Patrick Collison, Nigel Ramsay, and Margaret Sparks (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 350.

<sup>40</sup> Francesca Tinti, “La production de cartulaires dans les cathédrales monastiques anglo-normandes de Worcester et Canterbury,” in *Écrire à l’ombre des cathédrales: actes du colloque de Cerisy, 8–12 juin 2016*, ed. G. Combalbert and Chantal Senseby (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, forthcoming).

<sup>41</sup> Margaret Gibson, “The Normans and Angevins,” in *A History of Canterbury Cathedral*, ed. Patrick Collinson et al. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 38–68 at 49.

<sup>42</sup> CC Cart., 84 and 96–105.

Susan Kelly recognize a broader date range, but still argue for revisions after 1089, likely c. 1100.<sup>43</sup> Certainly, all three surviving versions have additions made through the time of Archbishop Anselm (1093–1109).

All these scholars stress the overtly monastic agenda of the cartulary, its extremely selective copying, and the forgeries and textual manipulations it contained. They also express reservations about using the cartulary as evidence of the pre-Conquest past and emphasized its distinctive Anglo-Norman viewpoint.<sup>44</sup> For my purposes, exact dating is less important, since cartularies could be cumulative works compiled over time. More significant is that the monks of Christ Church decided to compile a cartulary at all. It shows increased interest in rewriting the past during the late eleventh century. The sudden changes of the late 1060s provided an incentive to begin in the 1070s, and both the Domesday Inquest (1086) and the traumatic vacancy between Archbishops Lanfranc and Anselm (1089–1093) probably stimulated later efforts. Threats to property were influential, since older sources about the monks' lands were recast to look like Latin land diplomas regardless of their original format.<sup>45</sup> Furthermore, events related in the "story" of the cartulary did not happen – or at least not as written. Many were inventions of the late-eleventh century monks. It is this rewriting of the past, rather than actual events, on which the cartulary sheds the most light.

## REVISITING THE STORY OF CHRIST CHURCH

Revisiting the story of Christ Church as told in the Anglo-Norman cartulary reveals concerns of the post-Conquest monastic community. Their preoccupations included three overriding claims woven throughout the cartulary. These claims built on their tendentious interpretation of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, which assumed a glorious monastic past. The first claim was that the community at Christ Church had been monastic from its foundation. The supposed letter of Pope Boniface of 615 which opened the cartulary emphasized this point. In addition to mentioning King Æthelberht's generosity to the "monastery" Saint Augustine founded in the "city" of Canterbury (*monasterio in Dorobernensi civitate constituto*), the

<sup>43</sup> *Charters of Christ Church*, 58–72, with detailed descriptions of the three manuscripts at 95–101.

<sup>44</sup> Brooks, *Early History*, 100–2, 139–40, 221, 286; CC Cart., 86, 93, 95, 97.

<sup>45</sup> Nicholas Karn suggested that focus on the monks' portion explained the imitation of Latin land diplomas and also the dorsal notes "utile" and "latine sed inutile" rather than just bilingualism, since more nebulous customs and jurisdictions recorded in the Old English documents pertained to the bishop rather than the chapter (pers. comm.).

letter stressed the regular and holy monastic life there. This letter also came with an anathema for those who disturbed the peace of the monks. Yet, the religious community at Canterbury was not monastic – and certainly not a regular Benedictine community – so early. Indeed, it was not until the tenth century that regular Benedictine observance was established at the cathedral priory. Such claims to ancient monastic origins were common in English communities in the eleventh century, partly because Bede had employed the term *monasterium* loosely to refer to any community of religious, thus opening the door for reinterpretation of the missionary past.<sup>46</sup> This pretense of continuous monastic presence at Canterbury was maintained throughout the rest of the cartulary. Of course, this first entry was a forgery – and it was crucial for two reasons. First, it served as a foundational text, by virtue of its position at the start.<sup>47</sup> Second, it could help assert the “primacy” of the archbishops. Consequently, it has been closely scrutinized. Neil Ker first identified the hand of an earlier version of Boniface’s letter found in the “Æthelstan gospels” with a scribe responsible for a brief set of annals down to 1073 in Cotton Caligula A xv.<sup>48</sup> As a result, scholars have concluded that this Boniface letter was forged between sometime 1067 and 1073, which therefore provides the earliest possible date of composition for the cartulary itself.<sup>49</sup>

The second major claim of the Anglo-Norman cartulary was that lands had been given directly to support the monks, either for their works (*ad opus monachorum*) or for feeding them (*ad victus monachorum*). Such phrases were repeated in many donations throughout the work but appeared increasingly frequently in the later parts of the story. These phrases wrote backwards into the past the idea of separate portions for the archbishop and chapter, a practice reminiscent of ninth-century Continental divisions of abbatial and monastic lands. This division was anachronistic for early Christ Church, which was not a monastic priory until the tenth century and may have lacked a formal division before the 1090s.<sup>50</sup> But asserting its antiquity was significant for the monks because their immediate superior

<sup>46</sup> John Blair, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 3–5, 73–8, 350–4.

<sup>47</sup> It begins two of the three manuscripts, CCA-DCc Register P and Lambeth Palace Library, ms. 1212. Fleming, CC Cart., 89 explained why it may have been on a missing first sheet of CCCC, no. 189.

<sup>48</sup> Neil R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1957), 175, no. 185. See also his work on the Coronation Gospels, “*Membra Disiecta*,” *British Museum Quarterly* 12 (1938): 130–1.

<sup>49</sup> Fleming, CC Cart., 89–90, 103; *Charters of Christ Church*, 61–2, 90, 93.

<sup>50</sup> Nicholas Brooks, “The Archbishop of Canterbury and the So-Called Introduction of Knight Service into England,” *ANS* 34 (2012): 51–3.

was an archbishop. Given that the Norman kings came to enjoy the revenues of episcopal lands during vacancies, separating the archbishop's and monks' estates was important to forestall royal rapacity. Thus, the cartulary's composers sought to provide a bulwark against archiepiscopal (and even royal) control of what they deemed the community's property.

The third major claim asserted by the cartulary was that everything donated to the monastic community was given in perpetuity and was to remain inviolate, especially from despoliation by secular lords, including kings. The composers claimed that these sanctions had existed from the earliest years. In part one of the "story," general papal protection was alleged by Boniface's letter to Æthelberht from the foundation. But claims about inviolacy of the monastic lands were made more explicit in the invented Wihtred privilege granting immunity to the churches of Kent in 694. This privilege was extreme and thorough in its protections. Not only were church lands previously granted to remain inviolate and independent of lay control, but all future lay lordship was expressly forbidden, as was lay interference with ecclesiastical appointments, which were said to be under the archbishop's authority. Of course, these details portrayed any lay control of Christ Church's land as usurpation. The supposed Wihtred privilege also shows that monastic and archiepiscopal claims were not always opposed but could be reinforcing. Indeed, this invented royal recognition of ecclesiastical "liberties" was reconfirmed by later kings throughout the rest of the story. These confirmations were reinforced with maledictions, damning any who dared to violate the church's property.

These three major claims infused all four parts of the "story" related in the Anglo-Norman cartulary. The process of selection and invention used to assert them can be sketched by revisiting key documents included in the "story." The survival of many single-sheet charters from Christ Church allows for a reconstruction of Christ Church's pre-Conquest archives in ways rivalled by few other English monasteries. Thus, one can decipher Anglo-Norman monastic fabrications about Christ Church's past.

So, how was the cartulary made? Many pre-existing documents and texts from the archives were recycled; however, considerable rewriting had occurred before, not just after, the Conquest. Patterns of fabrication are evident in various sets of documents. In particular, one should regard acts dated before 798 (in part one of the "story") with skepticism, as early records may have been destroyed in the rising of Eadberht Præn against Mercian supremacy in 796–8.<sup>51</sup> Of the thirteen entries included in part one, the earliest known versions of four are the cartulary copies, making

<sup>51</sup> Brooks, *Early History*, 120–2.

any discussion of their authenticity difficult.<sup>52</sup> Three were copies of papal letters forged after 1070 concerning the primacy of the archbishop.<sup>53</sup> For the other six, single sheets survive, but three derive from pseudo-originals fabricated in the ninth to early-eleventh centuries.<sup>54</sup> The three remaining entries were based on surviving (and largely genuine) originals, all concerning the minsters of Reculver and Lyminge, which arrived at Canterbury after 798.<sup>55</sup>

In addition to diplomatic concerns, there are also historical ones. In 797–8, King Coenwulf of Mercia sought to move the provincial see from Canterbury to London, a direct threat to Canterbury's archbishop. This threat produced a variety of textual responses in the ninth century, materials that could be reused after the Conquest. The descriptions of the church councils, so crucial in part two of the "story," were fabricated in the ninth century, designed to assert diocesan control over monasteries. Crucial among these was the purported privilege of Wihtrud granted at the Council of Clofesho, dated 694 by the cartulary. In this case, the cartulary's account is not the earliest version. An early eleventh-century (c. 1018) version survives.<sup>56</sup> Nicholas Brooks demonstrated a very close relationship between its language and several other texts (both forged and genuine) associated with the efforts of Archbishop Wulfred (805–32) to resist Mercian royal domination.<sup>57</sup> Part of the same series was Æthelbald of Mercia's purported confirmation at the Council of Clofesho in 742. The cartulary's Latin version derived from an Old English text, preserved in a ninth-century copy written by a Christ Church scribe.<sup>58</sup> These early disputes produced some (mostly) genuine documents used in part two for

<sup>52</sup> CC Cart, nos. 2 (S 1609), 5 (S 1610), 12 (S 38), 13 (S 1613); *Charters of Christ Church*, 261–3, 284–6, 396–9, 360–2, nos. 1, 4, 21, 15.

<sup>53</sup> CC Cart, no. 1 (Boniface IV, JL 1998) and two unnumbered by Fleming because they only appear in the Lambeth copy, (Sergius I, JL 2133 and 2132).

<sup>54</sup> CC Cart, nos. 4 (S 230), 9 (S 90), 11 (S 1612); *Charters of Christ Church*, 271–84, 303–19, 339–349, nos. 3/3A, 8/8B, and 12/12B.

<sup>55</sup> BL Cotton Augustus ii 2, CC Cart, no. 3 (S 8); BL Stowe Charter 1, CC Cart., 6 (S 19), BL Cotton Augustus ii 101, CC Cart., 10 (S 1611). *Charters of Christ Church*, 263–70, 283–93, 332–8, nos. 2/2A, 5/5A, 11/11A.

<sup>56</sup> BL Stowe Charter 2; *Charters of Christ Church*, 316–19, no. 8 (S 22). Cubitt, *Anglo-Saxon Church Councils*, 263–4.

<sup>57</sup> Brooks, *Early History*, 191–7 argued that Wulfred (literally) had a hand in producing some of these charters.

<sup>58</sup> CCA-DCc Chart. Ant. M 363; *Charters of Christ Church*, 339–49, no. 12 (S 90). See Brooks, *Early History*, 168 and 191 n53 and Cubitt, *Anglo-Saxon Church Councils*, 265–6.

the councils of Clofesho in 822 and Kingston in 838.<sup>59</sup> However, the Anglo-Norman cartularists recycled these sources in a new framework. Besides translating them into Latin, they imposed a chronological order and added dates *anno domini*, implicitly historicizing them. They also modified them to claim greater monastic independence from archiepiscopal authority.

The ancient materials reused (or invented) for the first two parts of the cartulary's "story" came from a time beyond memory. But as the cartularists approached the near past, they had more sources and house traditions to exploit. Consequently, the compilers could become more specific about patrons and properties in part three of their "story" (941–1016). They used Eadred's donations of Twickenham and Reculver, the latter especially noteworthy because Saint Dunstan claimed to have written it down "with his own fingers." This entry derived from two early charters.<sup>60</sup> Other entries used sources which were not charters but rewrote them in a charter-like format. Robin Fleming discovered many entries were made up from the obituary lists of Christ Church, a tendency which became more pronounced in part three and four of the cartulary's "story." One example was the impossibly dated 997 grant of Queen Aelfifu (Emma) of Newington and Britwell priory, along with precious chattels (never mentioned in land books of the period).<sup>61</sup> Other written records were creatively misread to yield pseudo-charters. The monks produced a Latin charter of Queen Eadgifu (allegedly from 961) from an Old English account of a ninth-century dispute (from which a long list of the previous landholders was borrowed) in combination with a list of Eadgifu's gifts from an obituary.<sup>62</sup> Other noble patrons who appear as benefactors in parts three and four of the cartulary's "story" derive from the obituaries and necrologies of Christ Church.

A key moment in part three of the "story" is Edgar's reconfirmation in 958 of the privileges of the monasteries of Kent. This very brief notice, appearing in its earliest version in the cartulary manuscripts and obviously spurious, asserted an important historical claim: that Edgar, as king of the

<sup>59</sup> BL Cotton Aug. ii 78 and BL Stowe Charter 15; *Charters of Christ Church*, 591–607, no. 59 (S 1436). See Brooks, *Early History*, 197–203, and 322–3 (on subsequent interpolation) and Cubitt, *Anglo-Saxon Councils*, 286–7.

<sup>60</sup> CCA-DCc Chart. Ant. R 14 and Cotton Augustus ii, 57, both in *Charters of Christ Church*, 933–48, no. 120 (S 546).

<sup>61</sup> CC Cart., 92 n49 (S 1638); Robin Fleming, "Christchurch's Sisters and Brothers: An Edition and Discussion of Canterbury Obituary Lists," in *The Culture of Christendom: Essays in Memory of Denis Bethel*, ed. Marc A. Meyer (London: Hambledon, 1993), 115–53.

<sup>62</sup> *Charters of Christ Church*, 963–7, no. 125 (based on 124) and CC Cart., 92 n52 (S 1212).



English, was the successor to earlier kings.<sup>63</sup> This claim was a link back to the papal privilege supposedly acknowledged by Æthelberht in 615 (the first entry in the cartulary) and to the sweeping monastic liberties granted by Wihtried in 694. This chain of royal reconfirmation was carried forward in part four of the “story,” when Cnut confirmed the traditional liberties (with maledictions against despoilers) of Christ Church’s properties.<sup>64</sup> This invention preceded Cnut’s confirmations of specific properties (Lower Hazelhurst, East Horsley, Saltwood, etc.), based on genuine grants but interpolated to insist that they were for the monks’ support. The “story” also related that Cnut confirmed grants from the time of Æthelred II. The point was to show that monastic liberties (and those of the Church generally) had been continuously recognized by the line of “English” kings from the earliest times to the present.

For part four of the “story,” from 1016 to the Norman Conquest, the compilers could supplement written records with collective memory. The rule of Archbishop Æthelnoth (1020–1038) was clearly significant. Christ Church had become a Benedictine monastery during the reforms of the tenth century, which probably occurred gradually during the reigns of Archbishops Oda and Dunstan, despite the dramatic expulsion of canons recounted by post-Conquest scribes. Subsequent archbishops had been monks, but they had come from outside. Æthelnoth was the first monk elected archbishop from within the community.<sup>65</sup> Æthelnoth’s rule was as regular as possible and, therefore, to eleventh-century monks, as holy as possible. So, it is not surprising that later generations regarded his rule as special, particularly because outsiders were imposed by subsequent kings (the more worldly Eadsige and Stigand). Furthermore, Christ Church’s scriptorium flourished in the 1020s and 1030s, providing ample sources to burnish Æthelnoth’s reputation.

In consequence, Æthelnoth’s rule occupied an important place in part four of the Anglo-Norman cartulary’s “story.” It was a not-so-distant time – before the traumatic events of the 1060s – in which observance had been regular and prosperity greater. Thus, it provided justification for a “restoration” of the monastery, already undertaken through Lanfranc’s reforms. Indeed, both Æthelnoth and Cnut were so significant as to provoke temporal back-tracking in the story. They were first mentioned in chronological sequence, but then invoked a second time, after the immediate pre-Conquest leaders

<sup>63</sup> CC Cart., 134, no. 49: “Ego nempe Eadgarus rex Anglorum divinaque concedente clementia monarcha regum antiquorum Æthelberti...” *Charters of Christ Church*, 956–7, no. 123 (S 1632).

<sup>64</sup> CC Cart., 139, no. 64; *Charters of Christ Church*, 1062–4, no. 146 (S 952).

<sup>65</sup> Brooks, *Early History*, 254–9. Catherine Cubitt, “The Tenth-Century Benedictine Reform in England,” *Early Medieval Europe* 6 (1997): 77–94.



(Archbishop Stigand and Edward the Confessor). The “story” also stressed Æthelnoth’s and Cnut’s exceptional generosity to the monks themselves. Æthelnoth’s expensive acquisition of land at Godmersham from Earl Sired was said to be given specifically to support and feed the monks (*ad opus et victum monachorum*).<sup>66</sup> Cnut’s donation included relics, precious items (including his gold crown), and rights to the port of Sandwich, a focus of later disputes with the monks of Saint Augustine’s.<sup>67</sup> Old English versions of these acts exist, though they are not contemporary.<sup>68</sup> Comparison reveals that the cartularists interpolated specifics favoring the monks. Estates the chapter coveted were retroactively assigned to the nostalgic days of Æthelnoth and Cnut.

The immediate pre-Conquest generation (1038–1066) received a different treatment from the cartularists. The accession in 1038 of Archbishop Eadsige, a former royal priest of Cnut’s who took up the monastic habit belatedly, was a troubling moment. Whatever actually happened, the cartularists connected his elevation with the estate of Folkestone, intended to revert to them upon his death and a focus of later dispute. As a result, the cartularists were keen to emphasize an alleged condition of the ancient bequest of Folkestone by Æthelstan: that it could not be sold or given away in future without both the king’s license and the consent of the monks.<sup>69</sup> A purported charter (in both English and Latin) still exists, but it is hard to tell whether it or the cartulary came first.<sup>70</sup> Eadsige’s rule was troubled, and when Stigand succeeded him in 1052, he was the first non-monk to be archbishop in nearly a hundred years. Political instability in the wake of Cnut’s death in 1035 opened the door for lay domination of estates, a problem worsened by the Conquest.

The cartulary did not mention these pre-Conquest troubles overtly; rather it addressed them indirectly by emphasizing the generosity of Edward the Confessor. Consequently, in the “story” Edward confirmed his predecessors’

<sup>66</sup> CC Cart., 148, no. 82, Brooks and Kelly, eds., *Charters of Christ Church*, 1138, no. 160A.

<sup>67</sup> CC Cart., 151, no. 86, Brooks and Kelly, eds., *Charters of Christ Church*, 1097–8, no. 151B (S 959).

<sup>68</sup> Godmersham: BL Cotton Claudius A iii, f. 6r; *Charters of Christ Church*, 1135–6, no. 161 (S 1389) and see Brooks, *Early History*, 298. There are various Sandwich late copies, BL Add 15350 f. 113r (S 259), BL Add 56488 f. 6r–v (S 261), and BL Stowe Charters 39 (S 959); *Charters of Christ Church*, 1079–1098, nos. 151, 151A, 151B.

<sup>69</sup> CC Cart., 145, no. 74: “Hac autem conditione preminatus rex Cnut eandem terram reddidit, ut nullus archiepiscoporum qui ab illo die venturi erant in eandem ecclesiam illam terram videlicet Folchestane nec dare nec vendere posset sine licentia et regis et monachorum consensu Deo in eadem ecclesia servientium.”

<sup>70</sup> BL Stowe Charter 40; *Charters of Christ Church*, 1115–7, no. 154 (S 981), cartulary version no 154A (S 1643); CC Cart., 144–5, no. 74 and see Fleming’s remark 93, n54.

grants to Canterbury, repeating the usual liberties and anathemas. In the cartulary's version, Edward reconfirmed Canterbury's lands in a writ issued to Archbishop Stigand and the monks of Christ Church collectively.<sup>71</sup> Although no earlier copy of this writ exists, comparison with other royal writs of Christ Church reveals the cartularists' intervention. Fortunately, one single-sheet Old English writ of Edward to Stigand survives, complete with seal. This writ, granting broad fiscal and judicial privileges, provides valuable clues about the fabrication of the cartulary's Latin version.<sup>72</sup> It has long been recognized that the surviving writ was part original (the seal and the first three lines probably issued in 1052) and part modified (the remaining lines were erased and rewritten in the late eleventh century).<sup>73</sup> Nicholas Brooks compared the Stigand writ to a similar Old English writ sent to Archbishop Æthelnoth probably in 1020. The Æthelnoth writ was copied in the MacDurnan gospels at Canterbury circa 1035 and was not rewritten like the Stigand writ.<sup>74</sup> Although the two writs shared similar language, there were small but crucial modifications to pronouns and adjectives.<sup>75</sup> The MacDurnan Old English writ granted privileges to Æthelnoth personally: they were issued to **him**, and **he** was given rights over **his** men, and **over** Christ Church. Whereas the rewritten Stigand writ issued the privileges to the archbishop and community of Christ Church in the third person plural: **they** were entitled to **their** rights over **their** men. (All these changes occur after the first three genuine lines.) Any suggestion of the archbishop having authority **over** the monks was also removed. In the Anglo-Norman cartulary's Latin version, Edward reconfirmed all the lands given by his predecessors to Stigand and the community of Christ Church – the dispositive is phrased in the third-person plural. The point of these changes was simple: the cartulary stressed that lands and privileges were held by both the archbishop and the community, not the archbishop personally.

These changes to royal writs in the Anglo-Norman cartulary were small but crucial. Richard Sharpe observed that such modifications were common in monastic copies of royal writs before the time of Henry I, since

<sup>71</sup> CC Cart., 145, no 75; *Charters of Christ Church*, 1203–4, no. 180A (see also no. 180, a post-Conquest single sheet, CCA-DCc, Chart. Ant. C 3 (S 1089).

<sup>72</sup> BL Campbell Charter xxi 5; *Charters of Christ Church*, 1197–1200, no. 179 (S 1088).

<sup>73</sup> Florence Elizabeth Harmer, *Anglo-Saxon Writs* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1952), 173–5, 451–2 commenting on 186–7, no. 33 (facs. 1) and George Zarnecki et al., eds., *English Romanesque Art 1066–1200* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1984), 301, no. 328 on the seal.

<sup>74</sup> London, Lambeth Palace Library, ms. 1370, f. 114v; *Charters of Christ Church*, 1074–8, no. 150/150A (S 1386). Harmer, *Anglo-Saxon Writs*, 183–4, no. 28, translated correctly but did not realize the significance of the differences.

<sup>75</sup> *Charters of Christ Church*, 50, 146–7.

prior royal writs were issued to a person who enjoyed any rights only for his (or the king's) lifetime.<sup>76</sup> Brooks discovered that no genuine pre-Conquest writ for Christ Church had such plural privileges, though a writ of William I was similarly modified.<sup>77</sup> He attributed such changes to the disruptive vacancy between Lanfranc and Anselm (1089–93), when William Rufus exploited the domains (for whom there is no such writ), and noted that twelfth-century kings issued writs as plural grants.<sup>78</sup> The purpose of such fabrications was two-fold. First, to insist that the chapter's lands were separate from the archbishop's to prevent royal control during vacancies. Second, by including the chapter, a corporate body, they suggested grants in perpetuity. Post-Conquest monastic communities began to claim continuing privileges, whereas beforehand expiration and renewal of personal grants was the norm. Such claims were written backward into single-sheet writs and grants and, thus, fabrication of the cartulary and its "sources" occurred in tandem.

Unsurprisingly, part four of the "story" reflected the post-Conquest troubles of Christ Church and was strongly shaped by the community's experiences in the 1070s and 1080s. It is clear that particularly persistent disputes were also anticipated by the cartulary's story. An ongoing dispute with Saint Augustine's over port rights at Sandwich (first granted in 1023 and highly contested through the early twelfth century) generated a series of forgeries, of which the cartulary provides a snapshot *in medias res*.<sup>79</sup> Likewise, there were continuing problems at Folkestone, for which the monastery possessed no genuine pre-conquest charters but which the monks remembered as theirs in the Anglo-Norman period.<sup>80</sup> The monks revised pre-existing texts, but also had their own ideas. Content analysis reveals close links between the cartulary and various texts composed at Christ Church around the same time. Indeed, the "story" of Christ Church's pre-Conquest past was much more a product of its Anglo-Norman *scriptorium* than its earlier archives. Thus, it is important to consider how the cartulary was composed, including both texts and events from the 1070s and 1080s.

<sup>76</sup> Richard Sharpe, "The Use of Writs in the Eleventh Century," *Anglo-Saxon England* 32 (2003): 247–91.

<sup>77</sup> CCA-DCc Chart. Ant. C4, ed. Bates, *The Acta of William I*, 303–6, no. 66.

<sup>78</sup> Brooks, "The Archbishop of Canterbury," 50–53 and *Charters of Christ Church*, 146–7.

<sup>79</sup> Bruce O'Brien, "Forgery and Literacy in the Early Common Law," *Albion* 27 (1995): 1–18 at 5–9 and Brooks, *Early History*, 293–4.

<sup>80</sup> Brooks, *Early History*, 300–1.

In her composite edition, Robin Fleming highlighted consistent patterns of modification to the format and content of pre-Conquest charters in the three surviving copies of the cartulary, which demonstrated the preoccupations of its Anglo-Norman compilers. The changes in format were two-fold. First, earlier charters were streamlined, which meant removing many early English diplomatic elements (especially the introductory clauses and subscriptions) in addition to translating them into Latin.<sup>81</sup> But the cartularists also rearranged the order of older charters for new purposes: “After gutting each charter, the author then turned it on its head, placing the dating clause at the beginning of the text, and producing, in effect, not only a cartulary, but an annal and a book of benefactors.”<sup>82</sup> Indeed, the cartularists were so determined to insist on these features that they recast all written sources this same way, and so implied that all entries of the cartulary were based on pre-existing charters. Then, these “charters” of Christ Church were placed in a chronological series, highlighting particular incidents and patrons. The cartularists interpolated key words and phrases to insist on their message. One set of interpolations already mentioned concerned the work or feeding of the monks (*ad opus* or *ad victus monachorum*). There were four other types. First, about half the charters (forty-two) feature the three common burdens of wall-work, bridge-work, and military expedition.<sup>83</sup> These were telltale signs of English bookland; however, the vast majority of the source “charters” lacked them, and so they were anachronistically inserted. Second, anathema clauses were enhanced or just added to many entries – forty-one end with curses.<sup>84</sup> These maledictions were a way to insist on the inviolacy of the monks’ land. Third, twenty-three interpolations were added to fifteen separate entries referring to the archbishop of Canterbury or his church as “metropolitan” or “primate.”<sup>85</sup> These were designed to inflate the status of the archbishop. Finally, one can add the pluralizing of royal writs to pretend grants were made to both the archbishop and the chapter.

Fleming drew a number of conclusions about the motives and concerns of the compilers based on these changes in content and format. She argued that they reflected monastic preoccupations particular to the Anglo-Norman period, and more specifically after 1070 and before Domesday in

<sup>81</sup> CC Cart., 94: “The author of the cartulary was, on the most basic level, determined to streamline the charters, stripping them of many of the traditional components of Anglo-Saxon diplomatic protocol – their invocations, proems, boundary clauses and witness lists.”

<sup>82</sup> CC Cart., 94.

<sup>83</sup> CC Cart., 95 n60.

<sup>84</sup> CC Cart., 95 n63.

<sup>85</sup> CC Cart., 95 n64.

1086–7. She viewed the obsession with bookland as stemming from the tenurial instability in Kent during the immediate post-Conquest period (1067–70), and argued it was unlikely to have been so compelling after the Domesday inquest had confirmed most of Canterbury's properties.<sup>86</sup> Another obvious Anglo-Norman concern was the status of the archbishop as primate, an idea brought by Lanfranc in 1070. Although disputes would persist for many years and result in a sustained campaign of forgery, as explained in chapter six, they began in the early 1070s. Finally, there was the issue of the monks' endowment. Fleming argued that although disputes over lands between archbishop and monks/chapter had occurred in earlier times, they were a renewed concern after the Norman ascendancy and became a "special obsession."<sup>87</sup> The inclusion of anathema clauses was one sign of this obsession.<sup>88</sup> Fleming argued that these concerns were largely put to rest by the results of Domesday in 1086, which confirmed the monks' portion in her view.<sup>89</sup>

The structure and content of the cartulary were heavily determined by its commemorative function. Obituary lists were the sources for names of donors.<sup>90</sup> Other important benefactors, known to modern historians from documents but not in the obituaries, were left out of the cartulary. Martyrologies were also influential. The cartularists emphasized saints whose cults were important at Christ Church, notably Dunstan and Elphege, but also Wilfred.<sup>91</sup> There was also an unusual tract in the cartulary (otherwise unknown) explaining how Archbishop Cuthbert (740–60) had arranged for himself and his successors to be buried near the cathedral. This long entry stressed many key details: that Cuthbert had papal permission and royal sanction, that his predecessors (including Saint Augustine) were buried there, and that a later abbot of nearby Saint Augustine's subsequently changed these arrangements to take the earliest archbishops' bodies to his

<sup>86</sup> CC Cart., 96: "The cartulary's habitual reference to bookland marks it, to my mind, as a product of the 1070s or early 1080s, a period in which the community was constantly litigating over lost estates. After the Domesday inquest, such blanket interpolations were unnecessary. Both the Domesday inquest and Domesday Book confirmed the vast majority of Canterbury's holdings."

<sup>87</sup> CC Cart., 97.

<sup>88</sup> A common way to defend monastic property, Lester Little, *Benedictine Maledictions; Liturgical Cursing in Romanesque France* (Cornell University Press, 1993), 218–29.

<sup>89</sup> CC Cart., 98: "It seems to me unnecessary to make this point via a determined interpolation campaign after 1086."

<sup>90</sup> CC Cart., 105: "Only three people who lived and died in the tenth and eleventh centuries, and whose names and gifts were in the obituaries, do not have charters in the cartulary."

<sup>91</sup> Fleming, CC Cart., 105 n121 gave six instances.

own monastery.<sup>92</sup> Fleming argued that this text betrayed the anxieties of the 1070s and early 1080s about the saint archbishops, Dunstan and Elphege, whose remains were disinterred in 1070 when Lanfranc began the rebuilding of the fire-gutted cathedral and eventually (after several moves) placed in chests in the north transept in 1077, after which their veneration was curtailed until about 1080, when their cults were fully reinstituted.<sup>93</sup> Certainly, the burial of the archbishops of Canterbury was a sensitive subject in these years, since Augustine and his first six successors (to 764) were buried at the nearby monastery of Saint Augustine's.<sup>94</sup> Other early saints (Eadburg and Eanswith) also received some treatment. Overall, these features led Fleming to describe the cartulary as a reference work for the commemorative liturgy of Christ Church.<sup>95</sup>

While Fleming's view is broadly persuasive, the three copies of the cartulary also have materials from the 1090s and the early twelfth century. Of course, continuations of cartularies were common. But since we lack a contemporary manuscript doubt will always remain about when it was written. Certainly, fear of losing control of lands in the immediate post-Conquest period explains the cartularists' insistence that all lands should appear "booked" and the obsession with the chapter's endowment. But did Domesday completely end such concerns? Of course, the Inquest in 1086 provided a strong motive to claim lands held *tempore Edwardi regis*. Nicholas Brooks argued that such concerns also arose at the turn of the twelfth century, when the monks' holdings were enumerated in the *Domesday Monachorum*.<sup>96</sup> The years from 1087 to 1093 were tumultuous at Canterbury. The death of Abbot Scolland in 1087 led Lanfranc to impose his own Norman candidate, Guy/Wido, on the monks of Saint Augustine's, who rebelled to such a degree in 1088–1089 that the archbishop dispersed nearly all the brothers and replaced them with Christ Church monks. The death of Lanfranc in 1089 led to a long vacancy until 1093, during which

<sup>92</sup> CC Cart, 114–5, no. 10.

<sup>93</sup> CC Cart., 101: "The inclusion of the burial document, therefore, suggests that the cartulary was written before c. 1080–1085, and probably before 1077, the date the new cathedral was completed."

<sup>94</sup> Richard Sharpe, "The Setting of St. Augustine's Translation," in *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest: Churches, Saints, and Scholars, 1066–1109*, ed. Richard Eales and Richard Sharpe (London: Hambledon, 1995), 1–13. Sharpe emphasized the inaccessibility of the relics of Dunstan and Elphege once placed in chests.

<sup>95</sup> CC Cart., 106: "In this way, the monks of Christ Church would not only have available an accounting of their gifts and patrons in the form of an annual calendar, but they would have an annal of benefactions that was cross-referenced with the martyrology."

<sup>96</sup> *Charters of Christ Church*, 1199: "The context suddenly at the turn of the eleventh and twelfth centuries is clear."

time William Rufus heavily exploited Christ Church's domains, which could have motivated the monks to sharpen descriptions of "their" estates. There were also challenges to Christ Church's religious prestige in Canterbury from their monastic neighbors. In 1091, Abbot Wido translated the relics of Saint Augustine and his successors to a new abbey church, an event which set the style for translations in England for a generation.<sup>97</sup> The cartulary's tract on the archbishops' burials reads as an attempt to invent an earlier precedent. Saint Augustine's also tried a claim for exemption from ordinary diocesan jurisdiction via forgery in the late eleventh century.<sup>98</sup> All this was serious competition for local spiritual resources.

It is no stretch to see the events of 1087 to 1093 inspiring revisions of the cartulary, even if compilation began earlier. For example, two of the three surviving manuscripts contain a description of the *consuetudines* of the church of Newington, which was a Domesday satellite.<sup>99</sup> The ninth-century forgery of Wihtrred's privilege of liberty dated 694, so crucial in part one of the "story," may also have been modified after 1087. Because a single sheet copy from the early eleventh century survives, we can detect alterations by the cartularists.<sup>100</sup> In particular, it added "bishops" (*episcopis*) to the list of church offices controlled by the archbishops.<sup>101</sup> This modification relates to the investiture dispute between Archbishop Anselm and King Henry I, which arose after 1099. This more robust, twice-forged version was also copied into the F version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* produced at Christ Church just after the turn of the twelfth century.<sup>102</sup> So, although the cartulary was initially composed before 1086, it was probably adjusted to respond to changing needs later on.

The tumultuous events at Canterbury from the later 1060s to the early 1090s meant that the "story" of the Anglo-Norman cartulary offered a partisan view of the pre-Conquest past. Although the cartulary was not a historical narrative, it was a chronological ordering of charter entries and used *anno domini* dating. So, its organization displays a historicizing tendency, even though its purposes were strongly liturgical and commemorative. It emphasized a particular story, even if it was not narrated overtly.

<sup>97</sup> Sharpe, "The Setting of St Augustine's Translation, 1091," 13.

<sup>98</sup> Susan E. Kelly, "Some Forgeries in the Archive of St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury," *FiM* 4(2): 347–69 and ed. *Charters of St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury and Minster-in-Thanel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), lxiv–lxv.

<sup>99</sup> CC Cart., 151–2, no. 87.

<sup>100</sup> BL Stowe Charter 2; CC Cart., 111–12, no. 9; *Charters of Christ Church*, 316–19, no. 8 (S 22).

<sup>101</sup> CC Cart., 111–12, no. 9. Brooks, *Early History*, 193–7.

<sup>102</sup> ASC-F, lvii–viii, no. 70.



Perhaps one should not have expected the Anglo-Norman monks to produce narrative history. So far as scholars can determine, there had been few historical narratives of any kind in the pre-Conquest library of Christ Church – no universal history, no copy of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* – and perhaps not even copies of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*.<sup>103</sup> But after the Conquest and the fire, the monks took a greater interest in finding and fabricating texts about the past. The drive to historicize would become fiercer after Domesday (1086) and Lanfranc's death (1089), when new challenges stimulated the creation of new historical works and new forgeries.

### TRANSLATING THE PRE-CONQUEST ARCHIVES

Although the Anglo-Norman cartulary is lost, it is easy to understand why fabricating a more usable pre-Conquest past became desirable at post-Conquest Canterbury. The physical structure of the church had to be rebuilt after the fire of 1067. The new archbishop, Lanfranc, also restructured monastic life there – he imported personnel from Bec and instituted new routines of life and prayer. The yearly cycle of worship, the cults of saints, the commemoration of benefactors, and prayers for the dead were all transformed. Likewise, Lanfranc saw to the restoration of the library and archives. The estates were also reorganized, partly by Norman (especially Lanfranc's) plans and partly by local disputes, which were later recorded in the Domesday Book. All of these efforts were connected, and the Anglo-Norman cartulary was a product of these "reforms." Looking backwards to the early eleventh century (1000–1066), however, reveals that the Anglo-Norman cartulary was not an isolated effort of fabrication.

Of course, the Anglo-Norman cartulary relied on previous attempts to organize or preserve documents before 1066. One significant practice was copying documents into gospel books. These deluxe books were often kept in the treasury (a location separate from the ordinary library or coffers of documents) or near the altar (as at Christ Church) and, thus, were specially revered and protected.<sup>104</sup> Furthermore, these books would have been the first to be rescued in the event of a disaster, such as a fire. For Christ Church, four pre-Conquest gospel books survive which contain copies of documents written on the leaves between or around the gospels: the St. John's Gospels (end of ninth century), the MacDurnan Gospels (late ninth/early tenth century), the Æthelstan Gospels (first half of tenth century), and a gospel

<sup>103</sup> Brooks, *Early History*, 275–6. Of course, manuscripts or monks could travel.

<sup>104</sup> *Charters of Christ Church*, 53–4.



book associated with Cnut (early eleventh century).<sup>105</sup> These gospels had remained at Christ Church for years (sometimes many years) before copies of charters were added to their leaves. So, one must scrutinize the copies closely, since dating them is difficult, especially when obvious fabrication was involved. Fortunately, as these codices are manifestly important to art historians and paleographers, they have received extensive study. All four of these books were present at Christ Church before and immediately after the Conquest and, thus, whatever texts they contained by the early 1070s were available to the cartularists as sources, which could be copied, modified, or used for inspiration.

The Anglo-Norman cartularists were quite selective in their reuse of the pre-Conquest documents in their gospel books. Strikingly, all the entries in the Æthelstan gospels (twelve documents in Latin and English about the newly founded monastery, 1002–1066) found their way into the cartulary in some form. Meanwhile, the documents contained in the MacDurnan and Cnut and Saint-John's gospels were little used (except about Sandwich). Surprisingly, some Cnut writs were omitted despite the important role that Cnut played in part four of the cartulary's "story." It is even more puzzling when one considers that these writs have been accorded a higher degree of authenticity by diplomatists than the material in the Æthelstan gospels. For instance, two MacDurnan writs, both from the final year of Cnut's life (1035), seek to confirm Archbishop Æthelnoth's right to land once held by a certain Ælfmær and to protect his estates from the depredations of the local sheriff.<sup>106</sup> Perhaps they were omitted because they pertained only to the archbishops – this gospel book was closely associated with Æthelnoth.<sup>107</sup> Cnut was remembered for many things by the cartularists, but not these acts.

An entry in the gospel associated with Cnut is an even more puzzling omission: a writ allegedly issued by Cnut to Archbishop Lyfing on the occasion of a visit to Canterbury (1017 x 1020), which confirmed the privileges of the cathedral priory.<sup>108</sup> It seems at first glance to be precisely the sort of text that would appeal to the Anglo-Norman cartularists. So,

<sup>105</sup> "St. John's Gospel" (Oxford, St. John's College ms. 194); MacDurnan Gospels, Lambeth Palace Library ms. 771 plus detached leaf BL Cotton Tiberius B iv, f. 87 (Davis, 38–9, no. 177); Æthelstan's Gospels, BL Cotton Tiberius A ii plus detached leaves BL Cotton Faustina B iv, ff. 95, 98–100 and BL Cotton Claudius A iii ff. 2–7, 9\* (formerly 7\*) (Davis, 39, no. 178); and Cnut's gospel, BL Royal 1 D ix (Davis, 39, no. 179). See *Charters of Christ Church*, 53–8 and 85–95 for detailed analysis.

<sup>106</sup> Both on a detached leaf, BL Cotton Tiberius B iv, f. 87r (S 988) and 87v (S 987); *Charters of Christ Church*, 1124–7, nos. 156–7. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, 346–7, no. 284 and Brooks, *Early History*, 296 and 387 n120.

<sup>107</sup> *Charters of Christ Church*, 85–7.

<sup>108</sup> *Charters of Christ Church*, 94–5.

how can its absence be explained? The Latin gospels associated with Cnut (now BL Royal 1 D ix) were produced in the first decades of the eleventh century (probably at Christ Church, though perhaps at Peterborough), but were present at Christ Church before the additions were made.<sup>109</sup> It is one of two entries in Old English between the end of the gospel of Matthew and the deluxe illuminated golden border heading the gospel of Mark (ff. 43v–44v). The first (and earlier) entry is a notice of persons admitted to the confraternity of the monks, including Cnut and his brother Harold.<sup>110</sup> Cnut may have issued the writ on this occasion at Christ Church, and clearly the two entries were joined for commemorative purposes.<sup>111</sup> The writ itself (no other copy exists) tells its own interesting story. It relates the following justification in Cnut's voice:

And I inform you that the archbishop spoke to me about the freedom (*freols*) of Christ Church – that it now has less *mund* than it once had. Then I gave him permission to draw up a new charter of freedom (*freols*) in my name. Then he told me that he had charters of freedom (*freolsas*) in plenty if only they were good for anything. Then I myself took the charters of freedom (*freolsas*) and laid them on Christ's own altar, with the cognisance of the archbishop and of Earl Thurkill and of many good men who were with me – in the same terms as King Æthelberht freed it and all my predecessors: that no man, be he ecclesiastic or be he layman, shall ever be so presumptuous as to diminish any of the things that stand in that charter of freedom. And if anyone do so, may his life here be shortened and his dwelling in the abyss of hell, unless before his end he make reparation for it as stringently as possible, as the archbishop shall direct him.<sup>112</sup>

The unusual content of this “proto-writ” has occasioned extended commentary, especially about authenticity and whether Cnut made it as an oral declaration, subsequently recorded by the beneficiaries.<sup>113</sup> It seems to confirm Æthelberht's privilege (a ninth-century forgery) and mentioned other “*freolsas*” (presumably charters) placed on the altar. Brooks argued that the Cnut writ from the gospels and the only pre-conquest copy of the

<sup>109</sup> The provenance of the manuscript at Christ Church before 1019 depends on the dating of the writ; David Dumville, *English Caroline Script and Studies in English Monasticism, A.D. 950–1030* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1993), 116–20.

<sup>110</sup> Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, 317, no. 247.

<sup>111</sup> Brooks, *Early History*, 288–9, reconstructed what might have happened in 1017–18 using a contemporaneous act of 1018, BL Stowe Charter 38 (S 950); he argued for two separate visits. My main concern is the memory of what had happened, not the actuality.

<sup>112</sup> BL Royal 1 D ix, f. 44v (S 985), trans. Harmer, *Anglo-Saxon Writs*, 181–2, no. 26.

<sup>113</sup> Pierre Chaplais, “The Anglo-Saxon Chancery: From the Diploma to the Writ,” *Journal of Society of Archivists* 3 (1966): 166–76.

Wihtried privilege of 694 were written down by the same scribe (Eadwig Basan) and shared close verbal parallels, even though one was English and the other was Latin.<sup>114</sup> Overall, this text contained many themes dear to the Anglo-Norman cartularists: liberty, royal reconfirmation of ancient privileges, and the anathematizing of violators.

So why didn't the cartularists use Cnut's writ, since it was available to them and contained useful material? There are two possible answers to this question. First, Richard Sharpe observed that this unusual document was part of a series of writ-charters between kings and archbishops confirming the archbishops' (not the chapter's) privileges. He argued that such writ-charters in the eleventh century were personal, lifetime grants and not grants in perpetuity, and so needed to be renewed upon the death of either party.<sup>115</sup> They were not guarantees of the chapter's privileges at all but rather of an archbishop's, which may explain why they were passed over by the cartularists. In addition, the archiepiscopal charters may have been stored in separate bundles from those of the community.<sup>116</sup> Perhaps separate physical storage resulted in separate mental boxes. Second, the Anglo-Norman cartularists had a great deal of Cnut material to use and were willing to "translate" Old English texts into a more useful Latin, charter-like form. This seems to have been what happened to Cnut's writ about *freolsas*. In the cartulary's "story," one finds Cnut issuing a reconfirmation of traditional privileges of Christ Church, but in a Latin charter.<sup>117</sup> In it, Cnut confirmed for all time the traditional liberty of the monks upon the advice of Archbishop Lyfing, having heard (*audiens*) about the *beneficia* of his predecessors, that is, their royal privileges (*regalia privilegia*), and having perceived the liberty (*libertatem*) of the monasteries of Kent.<sup>118</sup> It also contained the usual curses for violators. From the cartularists' perspective, this was an improvement – it was in Latin (not English), and so could use the appropriate key words (*libertas* not *freolsas*), as well as guaranteeing the monks'

<sup>114</sup> BL Stowe Charter 2 (S 22). Brooks, *Early History*, 289–90; Dumville, *English Caroline Script*, 122 n59, 131, 139, concurred the English writ was Eadwig's but not the Latin charter.

<sup>115</sup> Richard Sharpe, "The Use of Writs," 287. He also notes the tampering with later writ-charters in the series.

<sup>116</sup> *Charters of Christ Church*, 50–3.

<sup>117</sup> Harmer, *Anglo-Saxon Writs*, 169, wrote that this entry "can scarcely be independent King Cnut's writ."

<sup>118</sup> CC Cart., 139, no. 64 (S 952): "Ego denique imperator Cnuth...beneficia audiens predecessorum meorum, scilicet regum regalia privilegia, similiter cernens libertatem monasteriorum intra Cantia positorum, archipresulisque piissimi Livingi admonitione, placuit cordi amborum presentem cartulam corroborare..." The cartulary version is the oldest extant.

(not the archbishop's) liberties in perpetuity (not for a lifetime). In this case, a creative "translation" was more useful than the genuine source itself.

Of course, if sources proved convenient, the monastic cartularists were certainly willing to copy them with the necessary modifications. One such source was the "Æthelstan Gospels" (BL Cotton Tiberius A ii), which contained copies of acts between its gospels. A contemporary inscription indicates that these deluxe gospels were created for Emperor Otto II (936–73) and his mother Matilda (d. 968). They were most likely given to Æthelstan around 929, when Otto married Æthelstan's daughter. The first inscription and two others indicating it was given to Christ Church seem to have been added by royal scribes between Otto's accession in 936 and before Æthelstan's own death in 939.<sup>119</sup> Later house tradition held that these gospels were used in the coronations of English kings. They were a treasure of the community and kept on the altar of Christ for a long time before additions were made on eleven blank leaves (seven originally part of the manuscript), starting in the mid-eleventh century and continuing until the early twelfth century.<sup>120</sup> Reconstructing what was available to the Anglo-Norman cartularists is hampered by the later treatment of the gospels. The additions were on leaves subsequently removed by Sir Robert Cotton and bound into two other manuscripts (BL Cotton Faustina B vi and Cotton Claudius A iii). In 1731, the main manuscript was damaged in the Cotton fire and its sheets then divided and remounted. However, in 1937, Neil Ker discovered the removed leaves and identified their original locations precisely using ruling lines and wormholes.<sup>121</sup> Collectively, these leaves contain copies of pre-Conquest documents (in English and Latin) as well as post-Conquest Latin charters. Here I will consider the early eleventh-century copies in what is now BL Cotton Claudius A iii, ff. 2–6, reserving later additions for chapter six.

I would argue that these pre-Conquest charters form a separate "booklet," for codicological, paleographic, and diplomatic reasons and also because of their content. These copies were made on leaves originally residing

<sup>119</sup> BL Cotton Tiberius A ii, f. 24r has an inscription "+ODDA REX +MIHT HILD MATER REGIS." The manuscript was probably made for Otto at Lobbes, Belgium, near Liège. See Andrew G. Watson, *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c. 700–1600* (London: British Library, 1979) 1:105 and Helmut Gneuss, *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts* (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2001), no. 362, who noted that all the folios were written in the same script, except ff. 13v–15v, 167–72, which were "insular additions." Francis Wormald, *English Drawings of the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries* (Faber: London, 1952), 22–3, plate 40a.

<sup>120</sup> *Charters of Christ Church*, 88–95 and 1204–9, no. 181b.

<sup>121</sup> Ker, "Membra Disiecta," 130–1.

between the gospels of Luke and John; moreover, ink bleeds indicate all five leaves were adjacent. These five leaves (out of the seven in the original manuscript), would have provided the largest and most obvious space for copies, since the other two were single isolated leaves.<sup>122</sup> The hand(s) in which they were written appear to date from the first and second quarters of the eleventh century (there is room for interpretation here), but were definitely pre-Conquest.<sup>123</sup> Furthermore, from a diplomatic perspective, the copies contained in this “booklet” are all suspicious. But perhaps the most compelling reason to consider them a set is their content. Collectively, the ten acts in the “booklet” concern the refoundation of Christ Church as a monastery and the granting or confirmation of the chapter’s properties. So, this “booklet” seems to have been a pre-Conquest attempt by the monks to organize key documents about their holdings. Such an attempt makes sense given the troubles of early eleventh-century Canterbury. The monastic chapter was established by 1002, but disastrous Viking attacks in 1011–1012 resulted in the capture (and later martyrdom) of the Archbishop Ælfheah and many other clerics.<sup>124</sup> The subsequent takeover by Cnut in late 1016 resulted in considerable disruption. The ascent of Æthelnoth (1020–1035), one of the chapter’s own, to the archiepiscopal seat was an opportunity to put the house in order.<sup>125</sup>

Whatever the pre-Conquest brothers intended, the Anglo-Norman cartularists made extensive use of the charters copied in the Æthelstan gospels. Indeed, given the obvious pro-monastic bent of the entries, this reuse is not surprising. In all, there were ten entries in the “booklet” which is now in BL Cotton Claudius A iii, as follows: a Latin version of Æthelred II’s 1006 charter refounding the monastic community after expelling clerks and confirming their estates (ff. 2r–3v); three Latin notices of lands given specifically to the monks by Archbishops Ælfheah and Lyfing and King Æthelstan’s will (f. 3v); an Old English version of the 1006 refoundation charter (ff. 4r–5v, 6r); an Old English writ of Edward the Confessor to Archbishop Stigand confirming possessions of the monks in Mersham (ff. 5v–6r); three English notices of lands given to the monks by Queen Ælfgifu (Newington), Archbishop Æthelnoth (Godmersham), and Thored (East Horsley) (f. 6r); and an English charter of Edward the Confessor giving Chartham, which also forbade any alienation of the monastery’s

<sup>122</sup> BL Cotton Faustina B iv, f. 95 and BL Cotton Claudius A iii, ff. 7, respectively.

<sup>123</sup> *Charters of Christ Church*, 89–91, items 1–10. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, 239–40, no. 185.

<sup>124</sup> ASC-CDEF, a. 1110.

<sup>125</sup> Brooks, *Early History*, 256–8.

land (f. 6v).<sup>126</sup> Every one of these entries, in whole or in part, was written into part four of the Anglo-Norman cartulary's "story."<sup>127</sup> The Latin entries were copied and English entries were "translated" into Latin, with the usual modifications and sometimes heavy abbreviation. The refoundation charter is an excellent example. Though possibly based on a genuine single sheet (now lost), the bilingual copies in the Æthelstan Gospels (the earliest extant) contain numerous modifications: the date is impossible (1006 for 1002), the English version has five witnesses incorrectly appended in a different hand, and various properties allegedly belonging to the chapter were not received until much later, and so on.<sup>128</sup> These alterations, along with the tale of the expulsion of wicked clerks for pious monks, suggest that the "refoundation charter" was forged in the 1020s to 1040s.<sup>129</sup> These Æthelstan gospel copies were doubly convenient: they were already collected in a single "booklet" and had a pro-monastic bent. So, the Anglo-Norman cartularists turned some of their predecessors' work to their own purposes. Indeed, one would like to know more about how the cartulary recycled the archives and what was lost in the fire of 1067.<sup>130</sup>

Clearly, the cartulary's composers used materials from various sources. The Æthelstan gospel's version of the Boniface letter of 615 also links to a second, quasi-historical project. Neil Ker identified the hand of this entry (different from all the others) as the same one writing English annals at Christ Church down to the year 1073.<sup>131</sup> It seems the cartulary may have been preceded by the annals, a project with historical or at least temporal dimensions. These English annals were very modest in their construction, like brief

<sup>126</sup> *Charters of Christ Church*, 1019–22, 1035–6, 1051–2, 1065–6, 1022–34, 1194–5, 1184–5, 1136–7, 1134–5, 1209–11, nos. 140(i), 141, 143, 147, 140(ii), 178, 175, 160, 159, 181A.

<sup>127</sup> CC Cart, nos. 70, 63, 54, 65, 70, 78, 56, 82, 68, 76.

<sup>128</sup> *Charters of Christ Church*, 1019–34, no. 140(i) and (ii). Simon Keynes, *The Diplomas of King Æthelred 'The Unready,' 978–1016: A Study in Their Use as Historical Evidence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 260.

<sup>129</sup> Brooks, *Early History*, 257–9, dated the forgery to the 1030s, but see qualifications in Dumville, *English Caroline Script*, 126 n75 and Rebecca Rushforth, "The Prodigal Fragment: Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 734/782a," *Anglo-Saxon England* 30 (2001): 139 n14. Brooks and Kelly, eds., *Charters of Christ Church*, 1026–7 argued that the scribe wrote in the second, third or fourth decade of the eleventh century.

<sup>130</sup> Brooks and Kelly, eds., *Charters of Christ Church*, 60 emphasize loss of sealed charters especially.

<sup>131</sup> BL Cotton Caligula A xv, ff. 133–7, ed. Felix Liebermann, *Ungedruckte Anglo-Normannische Geschichtsquellen* (London: Trübner, 1879), 3–8. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, 175. A surviving Alexander II bull from 1072 confirmed another fraudulent Boniface letter (employing the same language) for Saint Augustine's, see Kelly, "Some Forgeries," *FiM* 4(2): 349.



annotations of Easter tables rather than lengthy chronicle-style entries. Still, they were precursors to more ambitious historical projects.<sup>132</sup> One can also see the cartulary as a potential transition to historical writing. It took archival documents (individual single-sheet charters or bundles), copies from books, and various liturgical or commemorative sources and assembled them in chronological order. This ordering told an implicit “story” even if it was not a narrative. It may not have been “history,” but it did fabricate a usable early medieval past. It was a major part of the profound archival transformation at Christ Church in the generation following the Conquest.

#### SEQUELS AND RELATED TEXTS, 1089–1109

During the second generation after the conquest (1089 to 1109), the Christ Church scriptorium undertook and completed significant new works. The flourishing production of liturgical manuscripts is well known, as is the output of hagiographic narratives.<sup>133</sup> In addition, there was historical writing: the bilingual Latin–English version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (the “F” version). As a narrative, it went far beyond the Anglo-Norman cartulary in historicizing the past. I view the two projects as related; indeed, the cartulary may have been revised as the F-Chronicle was being written (1100–7) and there are textual links between them. Another project was the *Domesday Monachorum*, which gathered information about the church’s estates around 1089–1096, including records (and testimony) from the Domesday Inquest, and was completed around 1100.<sup>134</sup> The result was a monumental list of the monastic chapter’s landholdings and it, too, had ties to the Anglo-Norman cartulary.

It became much easier to produce such works at Christ Church from 1089 to 1109 because of ongoing archival reorganization. Older single-sheet charters were being endorsed and stored for future reference, usually with notes about their date, content, donors, recipients, estates, the language of the charter, and if it was useful (*utile*) or not (*inutile*).<sup>135</sup> Organization of

<sup>132</sup> CC Cart., 107: “Such transformations of historical sources clearly mark this text as an important and necessary transition between the writing of annals and the making of *bone fide* history, and suggest that in the late eleventh century, at least at Christ Church, the writing of history and the writing of cartularies were inseparable enterprises.”

<sup>133</sup> Teresa Webber, “Script and Manuscript Production at Christ Church, Canterbury, after the Norman Conquest” in *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest*, ed. Eales and Sharpe, 145–58 and Richard Gameson, “English Manuscript Art and Canterbury in the Late Eleventh Century: Canterbury and its Context,” 95–144 in the same volume.

<sup>134</sup> CCA-DCc ms. E. 28. Fac. and ed. in David C. Douglas, *The ‘Domesday Monachorum’ of Christ Church, Canterbury* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1944); see 3–4 for dating.

<sup>135</sup> *Charters of Christ Church*, 40.

the library had begun earlier. Around 1077 (at latest by 1083), Lanfranc's *Monastic Constitutions* assigned the care and custody of all books in the house to the cantor, though in practice the precentor was often the librarian.<sup>136</sup> This arrangement had become normal in monastic customaries, which often merged the duties of the cantor, precentor, and *armarius* (librarian), such that the cantor kept various books, including martyrologies, obituaries, and also sometimes supervised the scriptorium.<sup>137</sup> In any event, authority over books had been determined early in the rebuilding process and subsequently there was a succession of talented precentors such as Osbern (c. 1080–1093) and Eadmer (especially towards the end of his career, 1121–1130). As archival organization proceeded, so did writing. These writing projects help illustrate the ongoing and close relationship between forgery and history-writing at Christ Church during the second generation after the Conquest.

Many cartularies had additions or continuations. Some evidence indicates that monks in the second generation after the Conquest tried to bring the “story” of Christ Church up to date. The Anglo-Norman cartulary was chronologically organized, and so breaks or reversals of chronological order might be clues to revisions. More significantly, variations in the three later copies of the cartulary suggest it was continued during the second generation after the Conquest. Nicholas Brooks and Susan Kelly (who argued the cartulary dated to the 1090s) stressed the differences between the copy in Lambeth ms. 1212 and the other two earlier copies of the cartulary. In particular, they highlight the greater care used in this version (a product of the 1270s), as well as the inclusion of material from the time of King William I and Archbishop Lanfranc.<sup>138</sup> Furthermore, these entries were of particular importance to the monastic community. The additional entries (pp. 332–37) were divided into three groups. Group one was summaries of grants relating to monastic estates. These included Bishop

<sup>136</sup> David Knowles and C. N. L. Brooke, eds., *The Monastic Constitutions of Lanfranc*, rev. ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 2002), 118–23, no. 86 at 122 n312. For dating, xxviii and xxxiv.

<sup>137</sup> Knowles and Brooke, eds., *Monastic Constitutions*, 118 n308, note that Lanfranc's passage on the cantor is related to the Cluniac customary concerning the *armarius*, see Bernard of Cluny, *Ordo Cluniacensis per Bernardum saeculi XI scriptorem*, ed. M. Herrgott, *Vetus Disciplina Monastica* (Paris, 1726, rep. ed. P. Engelbert, Siegburg, 1999), 161–4; Margot E. Fassler, “The Office of the Cantor in Early Western Monastic Rules and Customaries: A Preliminary Investigation,” *Early Music History* 5 (1985): 29–51, esp. 43–8; Teresa Webber, “Cantor, Sacrist, or Prior? The Provision of Books in Anglo-Norman England,” in *Medieval Cantors and Their Craft: Music, Liturgy, and the Shaping of History, 800–1500*, ed. Katie Ann-Marie Bugyis et al. (York: York Medieval Press, 2017), 172–89.

<sup>138</sup> *Charters of Christ Church*, 59–60.



Odo of Bayeux's grant of land at Sandwich, and three acts of William I (all between 1070 and 1083) concerning the estates of Newington and Saltwood, and a fourth insisting all episcopal or demesne lands improperly alienated be returned.<sup>139</sup> Group two consisted of three forged papal privileges of Gregory I, Boniface IV, and Alexander II.<sup>140</sup> The Alexander bull, recognizing Christ Church as a monastic house rather than one of secular clerks, was native to Canterbury, as we shall see in chapter six. The Gregory and Boniface bulls were forgeries about how monks could perform priestly duties and had travelled together since the mid-eleventh century among monks in Normandy and Italy.<sup>141</sup> The third group contained a brief description of customs of Newington (also found in the second cartulary copy) and an Inquest memorandum of c. 1087–9.<sup>142</sup>

All of the estates mentioned in this added section were subject to disputes in the 1070s or 1080s and eventually appear as the monks' property in *Domesday Monachorum*. Moreover, these groups preceded two early twelfth-century entries, an act of Henry I restoring Slindon (Sussex) in 1101/2 and Anselm's restoration of Stisted (Essex) to the monks (c. 1106), also present at the end of the other two cartulary versions.<sup>143</sup> Were these additions an attempted sequel to the "story"? Brooks and Kelly speculated that the Lambeth manuscript copied an extended version of the Anglo-Norman cartulary made in the early twelfth century. Fleming agreed that some texts were additions after the cartulary's initial composition.<sup>144</sup> This sequel would have treated the time of William I and Lanfranc (to 1089). Its theme might have been a group of estates belonging to the "chapter," separate from the archbishop, allegedly existing from before the Conquest. Such claims would have been particularly useful after William Rufus exploited the domains heavily during the vacancy of 1089–1093. Similar concerns

<sup>139</sup> David Bates, *The Acta of William I*, 327, 330–1, 335, 443–4, nos. 70, 73, 75 and 129 and 328, no. 71 (Odo).

<sup>140</sup> Lambeth ms. 1212, 334–5; Gregory I *Sunt nonnulli* (JL 1951); Alexander II *Accepimus a quibusdam* (JL 4761); Boniface IV *Sunt nonnulli* (JL 1996).

<sup>141</sup> John Gilchrist, "The Influence of the Monastic Forgeries Attributed to Pope Gregory I (JE +1951) and Boniface IV (JE +1996)," *FiM* 2:265–87.

<sup>142</sup> Lambeth ms. 1212, 335–7 and CCA-DCc Register P, f. 27; CC Cart, 151–2, no. 87.

<sup>143</sup> Lambeth ms. 1212, 333. Henry I for Slindon: H. W. C. Davis et al., eds., *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum: 1066–1154*, 4 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913–69) 2: no. 756. Anselm for Stisted: Martin Brett and Joseph A. Gribbin, eds., *English Episcopal Acta 28: Canterbury 1070–1136* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 17–18, no. 16 and F. S. Schmitt, ed. *S. Anselmi...Opera Omnia*, 6 vols. (Edinburgh: Nelson, 1946–61) 5:422, ep. 474. Both in CC Cart., 132–3, nos. 88–9.

<sup>144</sup> Fleming's stemma, CC Cart., 90 n39 (she omits some "later accretions" and deems the third group later additions, 85 n13); *Charters of Christ Church*, 99.

can be found in the *Domesday Monachorum*, around 1100, and the F-version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, c. 1100–1107. Also, the threat posed by Saint-Augustine's attempt to escape the archbishops' control (especially during the 1089–93 vacancy) meant that the monks of Christ Church had increasingly serious spiritual competition. The difficulties of this period made creating a more robust "story" urgent.

The *Domesday Monachorum* was a forthrightly monastic document, outlining estates dedicated to the monks' support. Because such arrangements existed on the Continent by the mid-eleventh century, some scholars presume that a division between archiepiscopal and chapter lands pre-existed this text. Such an interpretation was exactly what its composers wanted to be believed. However, there are no genuine (or un-interpolated) royal grants which acknowledged such a separation before Henry I.<sup>145</sup> Indeed, there is no evidence (in writing) that such a separation existed prior to the Domesday Inquest. For Brooks and Kelly, this lack explained the monastic motives behind both the cartulary and *Domesday Monachorum*: the perceived need to describe the chapter's estates (in Latin) to prevent encroachment, by the king or anyone else. They stressed that the second and third manuscript copies of the cartulary had continuations drawn from *Domesday Monachorum* with no obvious scribal breaks.<sup>146</sup> Furthermore, they argued that scribal echoes of the Anglo-Norman cartulary's layout in three columns suggest that it was written in the form of a *Textus* and designed specifically as a companion text to *Domesday Monachorum*.<sup>147</sup> Their argument is alluring and having a grand codex on the altar summarizing the chapter's holdings would have been a very powerful presentation of the "story" the monks had fabricated about their past. The physical dimensions of *Domesday Monachorum* were more than twice that of Great Domesday Book, which itself was (deliberately) one of the largest books in England.<sup>148</sup> Even if they were separate projects, what is abundantly clear is that the monastic community was increasingly assertive about its collective identity, lands, and history.

<sup>145</sup> Brooks, "Archbishop of Canterbury," 52.

<sup>146</sup> *Charters of Christ Church*, 60: "In fact they both continued in the same ink and without any new heading or rubric, with a series of texts derived from the *Domesday Monachorum*..."

<sup>147</sup> *Charters of Christ Church*, 60: "In other words it may (like other cartularies of the Anglo-Norman period) have been written in the format of a *Textus*, with the intention that it should be kept on the altar; it may even have been written by the main scribe of *Domesday Monachorum* and incorporated within the binding of a major gospel-book."

<sup>148</sup> Christopher P. Lewis, "Audacity and Ambition in Early Norman England and the Big Stuff of the Conquest," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 40 (2017): 25–51 at 38.

The monastic concerns of 1089 to 1109 can also be found in the bilingual, F-version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. The F-Chronicle was produced after the initial compilation of the Anglo-Norman cartulary and reflects important aspects of its “story” of Christ Church. Although the Anglo-Norman cartulary presumed events derived from Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica*, it did not make direct use of Bede. On the other hand, the F-version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, especially its Latin translation, made extensive use of Bede. Yet Bede was translated by the F-scribe with a monastic bias; for example, the annal describing Augustine’s mission to the English was modified to indicate that Pope Gregory sent monks specifically, rather than just clerics.<sup>149</sup> Several of the F-Chronicle’s Latin annals derive also either from the Anglo-Norman Cartulary itself or common sources. Furthermore, these borrowings were key fabrications in the cartulary: the 694 privilege of Wihtred about the liberty of Kentish monasteries; Æthelbald of Mercia’s confirmation in 742; the synodal decree dated 798; and even the favorable version of Cnut’s privilege for the port of Sandwich, reported under Latin annals for 1029 and 1031.<sup>150</sup> Thus, some of the cartulary’s most tendentious interpretations were imported into the Latin Chronicle to rewrite the past.

In some cases, the interaction may have been more dynamic. One can detect how the Wihtred privilege was used, because an early eleventh-century pseudo-original survives.<sup>151</sup> Although the pseudo-original stressed bishops’ ability to choose and confirm abbots, abbesses, priests and deacons, both the cartulary and the F-Chronicle inflate phrases to insist that the metropolitan archbishop (*metropolitani...archiepiscopi* = Canterbury) elected and confirmed bishops (*episcopos*).<sup>152</sup> In the F-Chronicle manuscript, BL Cotton Domitian viii, the Wihtred privilege is begun at the end of a quaternion (ff. 38–45) and continued on a quire of 12 folios (ff. 46–57) and shows considerable erasure and correction. In particular, the Latin version begins on 45r and the break of quires occurs (conveniently) before the use of the word “*metropolitani*.”<sup>153</sup> The editor of the F-Chronicle argued these interpolations were made (in both works) in response to the

<sup>149</sup> ASC-F, lv–lvi, no. 65.

<sup>150</sup> ASC-F, lvii–lviii, no. 70. Two in the main text and two later insertions, see ASC-F, lviii, no. 71.

<sup>151</sup> Stowe Charter 2 (S 22); *Charters of Christ Church*, 316–9, no. 8 (pseudo-original), 8A (ASC-F version), 8B (cartulary version).

<sup>152</sup> ASC-F, 43, a. 694.

<sup>153</sup> The break is marked in ASC-F, 43. Also, f. 45v was originally ruled in 21 lines and was re-ruled to match f. 46r in the new quire. In general, the layout and spacing of the manuscript becomes less neat in the final two quires, suggesting considerable revision, see ASC-F, lxix–lxxi, nos. 85–88.

investiture disputes after 1099.<sup>154</sup> The pseudo-original had focused on the liberties of Kentish monasteries (in the 1030s when the nascent monastic community was asserting itself), whereas the two later works stressed the privileges of the archbishops. Like the cartulary, the F-Chronicle also drew on archival documents or copies in gospel books. These may have included the account of the expulsion of clerics for monks in the Æthelstan gospels contained in the “refoundation charter” of Æthelred, though this had only an indirect influence if used.<sup>155</sup>

It is obvious that the F-Chronicle was a more direct attempt to historicize than the cartulary was. Indeed, the main purpose of the F-Chronicle was to create a usable Latin history of the past, whereas the cartulary stressed commemorative or liturgical functions.<sup>156</sup> Yet major themes (of monastic origin, ecclesiastical liberty, even preserving monastic properties) appeared in both, since they drew on shared Christ Church traditions. Of course, the F-scribe had new concerns, such as the dispute over investiture between Henry I and Anselm.<sup>157</sup> These troubles may also explain letters of King Henry I and Anselm added to the cartulary in the early twelfth century.<sup>158</sup>

Fabrication and historicization were closely linked. The well-known hand of the F-scribe forged at least two documents, both of which feature in the Anglo-Norman cartulary. One was the forged writ of Edward the Confessor, discussed above, rewritten except for three lines.<sup>159</sup> Its rewriting, including the crucial pluralizing of privileges to the archbishop and chapter, was carried out by the F-scribe. Another document in the hand of the F-scribe was the pseudo-original grant of land at Saltwood, Kent, written over an erased charter on a fragment of parchment.<sup>160</sup> This was the basis for

<sup>154</sup> ASC-F, lxxvi–viii.

<sup>155</sup> ASC-F, lviii, no. 72.

<sup>156</sup> Baker, ed. ASC-F, xxviii–xxix, no. 39: “F has yet a further claim on our attention: if we want to know what the Anglo-Saxon past looked like from early twelfth-century Canterbury, there is no more valuable source.”

<sup>157</sup> ASC-F, lxxvi, no. 100.

<sup>158</sup> CC Cart, 152, nos. 88–89 (present in two versions).

<sup>159</sup> BL Campbell Charter xxi 5 (S 1088), ed. Harmer, *Anglo-Saxon Writs*, no. 33, fac. pl. 1; T. A. M. Bishop and Pierre Chaplais, eds., *Facsimiles of English Royal Writs to A.D. 1100* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1957), no. 3, pl. 3; *Charters of Christ Church, 1197–1200*, no. 179. ASC-F, xxiii, no. 26.

<sup>160</sup> BL Cotton Charter x.11; *Charters of Christ Church, 1098–1102*, no. 152 (S 1221), dates the copy to the early twelfth century, written onto a parchment which had twelve ninth-century subscriptions running down the right-hand side which were erased and replaced.

the summary grant given in the cartulary by “Haldene” (perhaps for hall-thegn) Scaerpa to support the monks, though lands in the growing town of Hythe were added by the cartularists.<sup>161</sup> Importantly, the land at Saltwood was one of the properties subject to dispute at the famous trial of Penenden Heath in 1072, when Lanfranc attempted to recover/acquire lands granted to laymen after the Conquest (in this case, Hugh de Montfort).<sup>162</sup> In 1088, Hugh held Saltwood of the archbishop, but retired as a monk to Bec and it is later recorded in *Domesday Monachorum*.<sup>163</sup> The estate came into Archbishop Anselm’s possession after the banishment of Hugh’s second son (the heir of his English lands) in 1107, and the archbishop subsequently gave it to the monks (with the church in Hythe).<sup>164</sup> Thus, the F-scribe, like the compilers of the Anglo-Norman cartulary, was willing to “tailor the past to fit the requirements of the present.”<sup>165</sup> These mutual borrowings point to concerted, inter-related activities from the 1090s through the first decade of the twelfth century. Of course, as new concerns arose, additions, interpolations, and even inventions adjusted the “story” as needed.

#### A COLLECTIVE STORY?

Who were the creators of these Christ Church writing projects from the 1070s to 1109? Answering this question is difficult in an age of anonymous scribes and especially forgers, who disguised their handiwork. We also need to distinguish the composers from the scribes who wrote the text. Peter Baker, the editor of the F-Chronicle, uses “F-Scribe” as shorthand for a combination of three roles: “the editor (of the Old English text),” “the translator (of the Latin text),” and “the compiler (of the whole).”<sup>166</sup> Such distinctions are helpful when analyzing texts as sources. And while it is customary to speak of a unitary composer or scribe, most works under consideration here were collective projects and, so, care must be taken to emphasize the plural. Hence, I refer to Anglo-Norman “cartularists” because various people probably helped compose and write the cartulary, about whom nothing is known. Such distinctions are even more important when considering forgery. In seeking to explain the actions of medieval forgers, modern historians and their readers

<sup>161</sup> CC Cart., 140–1, no. 69, Brooks and Kelly, eds., *Charters of Christ Church*, 1102–4, no. 152A.

<sup>162</sup> Alan Cooper, “Extraordinary Privilege: The Trial of Penenden Heath and the Domesday Inquest,” *English Historical Review* 116 (2001): 1167–92.

<sup>163</sup> Douglas, ed., *Domesday Monachorum*, 93 (text) and 69–70 (analysis).

<sup>164</sup> ASC-F, xxiii, no. 26 esp. n47 and *Charters of Christ Church*, 1102.

<sup>165</sup> Baker, ed., ASC-F, lxxix, no. 103.

<sup>166</sup> ASC-F, lxiii, no. 76.

tend to want to find a single culprit (to facilitate their own stories). Despite the allure of what I call the “lone forger theory,” this is often not the best explanation for the multiple layers of fabrication in works like the Anglo-Norman cartulary of Christ Church.

Yet even so, only a limited number of people possessed the requisite skills. The monastic officers, who were leaders of the community, would be the most likely suspects. Of course, the cantor, who was charged with music and liturgy and also with the keeping of books in the *Monastic Constitutions*, would have been at the center of any writing project. He was often also hagiographer or historian.<sup>167</sup> Job skills and access to texts would have made any cantor (or precentor) an ideal fabricator. Scholars have suggested other important officers in their search for culprits. In an attempt to de-emphasize the role of Lanfranc and Anselm, Margaret Gibson strongly emphasized the role of Prior Henry (c. 1074–1096), a Norman monk and Lanfranc’s choice to lead the reformed monastic community, in various writing projects. She argued that the *Monastic Constitutions* may have been written to guide Henry and that he may have been the driving force behind both the cartulary and *Domesday Monachorum*. She also highlighted the influence of Ernulf of Beauvais, first the school master (from the 1070s), then prior (1096–1107), before becoming abbot of Battle.<sup>168</sup>

One should also consider Osbern, the precentor after 1080. A precentor could be an ideal cartularist (given the job’s commemorative and liturgical tasks). Osbern was raised from boyhood at Christ Church and then was sent away by Lanfranc to Bec in the late 1070s for disciplinary reasons, where he first met Anselm as prior. Thus, he was familiar with both the older and reformed community. He wrote a *Vita* of Elphege in the 1080s and a *Vita* of Dunstan probably in the late 1080s or early 1090s before Anselm arrived.<sup>169</sup> Further, he seems to have been reprimanded for disobedience to Prior Henry on several occasions.<sup>170</sup> Another suspect is Eadmer, who had been raised as a child oblate in Christ Church, was present for the entire period under consideration, and was an active scribe from the mid-1080s through the

<sup>167</sup> Baker, ed., ASC-F, lxxx, no. 105: “The scribe seems likely to have held a position of some responsibility in Christ Church. At this time, the cathedral official who was the likeliest to be engaged in writing history was the cantor, whose duties typically went beyond the musical and liturgical... This keeper of books and records was often a historian, hagiographer, or both.”

<sup>168</sup> Margaret Gibson, “The Normans and Angevins,” 48–53.

<sup>169</sup> Jay Rubenstein, “The Life and Writings of Osbern of Canterbury,” in *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest*, eds. Eales and Sharpe, 27–40, esp. 35–9 on Osbern’s hagiographic writings.

<sup>170</sup> Rubenstein, “The Life and Writings of Osbern,” 33–4, deduced possible incidents in 1076 (when Osbern was sent to Bec) and after Lanfranc died in 1089.

1120s.<sup>171</sup> Before Anselm's death in 1109, he had been a constant companion and had begun a narrative history which the archbishop ordered him to destroy (though he first made a secret copy).<sup>172</sup> However, there is no proof that Henry, Osbern, Eadmer, or anyone else was the cartulary's "author" or that there was a "lone forger" of documents. Furthermore, there are limits to the explanatory value of attributing fabrications to particular individuals.

Of course, just because a small or elite group (one imagines) composed the various post-Conquest Christ Church writing projects, this does not mean that their influence was limited. Indeed, regardless of intentions (pious or deceptive), fabrications woven into the cartulary supported a "story" about the pre-Conquest past which favored the monks. Once incorporated into historical narratives, such as the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* F version, they could be crafted even more directly to persuade a reader or listener. For such stories to be useful, they had to be disseminated widely – first within the house, where they became part of its traditions, and later outside to deal with local rivals (the monks of Saint Augustine's) or in the service of greater goals (asserting primacy). As others challenged Christ Church's story, adjustments and refinements were needed. The "story" could be given sequels or modified to fit with changing circumstances. Such changes could be as subtle as a single word or require whole "booklets" or new "translations." We may not ever fully reconstruct forging and historical writing at Christ Church from 1067 to 1109, but we should not doubt they were closely related in conception, compilation, and dissemination. Despite the temptation to identify an "author," it is better to consider the cartulary and related texts produced from 1089–1109 as communal responses to challenges and threats faced in those turbulent years. Such trials would have sharpened the group identity of those living through them and helped inspire a collective story.

<sup>171</sup> Andrew J. Turner and Bernard J. Muir, eds., *Eadmer of Canterbury: Lives and Miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan, and Oswald* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2006), xxiii–xxvii. For his early scribal work, Michael Gullick, "The Scribal Work of Eadmer of Canterbury to 1109," *Archaeologia Cantiana* 118 (1998): 173–90.

<sup>172</sup> R. W. Southern, *Anselm and his Biographer* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 150–1 and *Saint Anselm: A Portrait in a Landscape* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 412–13; Gullick, "The Scribal Work," 186 argued the destruction occurred "almost certainly" in 1100.