

More battle forgeries

Article

Published Version

Holt, J. C. (1985) More battle forgeries. Reading Medieval Studies, XI. pp. 75-86. ISSN 0950-3129 Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/85105/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

Publisher: University of Reading

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

MORE BATTLE FORGERIES<1>

J.C. Holt

Among the many records of disputes over ecclesiastical lands in the century following the Norman conquest, one is justly famous for an incidental sidelight which it throws on social history. It concerns the possessions of the abbey of Battle in Barnhorn (Bexhill, Sussex). Here Abbot Ralph (1107-24), according to the Battle chronicler:

purchased three wists... from Ingram, surnamed 'beacon-rider', the vassal of Withelard de Bailleul, with Withelard's consent... Moreover Withelard added *gratis*, of his own, a parcel of land in the marsh adjoining the three wists, and granted to the church of Battle both the land bought from his vassal Ingram and his own gift. And so that the land might belong to the same church free from all service and from the claims of all men in perpetuity, it was confirmed by the noble King Henry and by Henry count of Eu, Withelard's lord' <2>.

Despite these precautions the disaster which they were designed to prevent occurred. The monks improved the land. On Abbot Ralph's death the lord of the land, the *dominus fundi*, demanded further charges from the estate and, on the abbot refusing, took it back into his own possession. The monks complained and undertook legal action. King Henry I died, King Stephen came and went, and it was not until they were able to bring the case before King Henry II at Clarendon, probably in 1164 or 1166, that the monks finally obtained justice. There the case was determined on the record. To take up the tale of the chronicler again:

by the King's permission the chirographs of purchase and gift were read before everyone, as were the charters of confirmation. The opposing party had little it could say to these, but Gilbert de Bailleul, lest he seem to be making no rebuttal, argued that he had heard chirographs of his predecessors read, but that he did not see the evidence of their seals appended to them. On hearing this that magnificent and prudent man, Richard de Lucy, the abbot's brother, at that time the lord King's chief justiciar, looking him over, inquired whether he had a seal. He answered that he had. The great man smiled: 'it was not the custom in the past', he said, 'for every petty knight to have a seal, which is appropriate only to kings and great men. Nor in ancient times did malice turn men into special pleaders and doubters, as nowadays' <3>.

The comment is treasured both by social historians and by all good students of diplomatic. Richard de Lucy was one to know, for his own origins were

mediocre<4>. But the sneer came ill from him as Justiciar who was also the brother of the demandant in the action, Abbot Walter de Lucy. Nor does the certainty of the monks' case, as the chronicler presents it, lie at all easily alongside the abbey's known record of forgery<5>. Gilbert de Bailleul raised a fair doubt as to the authenticity of his ancestor's charter and that was dismissed at the time and has been obscured ever since by a snide remark which played on the sense of social superiority. Yet in any matter involving the authenticity of written instruments the monks of Battle stand on weak ground. Those who forged royal and episcopal charters of exemption were not going to balk at lesser tasks. Those who heard Gilbert's arguments turned aside were, in truth, habitual offenders.

The relish of the Justiciar's remark may explain the curious fact that there has been no serious search for, and scrutiny of, the documents in the case<6>. Yet they all survive in one form or another. They are four in number: the concession of Ingram, the confirmation and concession of Withelard, and the confirmations of Count Henry and Henry I. All of them are to be found in the earliest Battle cartulary of c. 1230<7>. The charters of Ingram and Withelard are presented in better texts in the fifteenth-century sacrist's cartulary<8> and the confirmation of the King in a better text in a fourteenth-century general cartulary of the Abbey<9>. Count Henry's grant survives as an original charter<10>. All this material, except the earliest cartulary which is in the Library of Lincoln's Inn, is preserved among the muniments of Battle Abbey at the Huntington Library, San Marino, California. The texts are printed below.

It is therefore possible to put the arguments advanced before Henry II at Clarendon to the test. The results are mixed. There is no real doubt that Ingram Beacon-rider sold three wists of land in Barnhorn and that Withelard de Bailleul granted land in the adjoining marsh to the monks of Battle. To that extent the Abbey chronicle and the record of the charters are sound. But there is also little doubt that the documents were falsified and that the case presented to Henry II was a put-up job. The issue at Clarendon was not whether, but on what terms, the sale and grant of Barnhorn had been made. The documents were aimed to settle this in the monks' favour.

It is not possible to date the original transaction exactly. The Battle chronicler placed it in the time of Abbot Ralph 1107-24<11>; the confirmation of Henry I has been dated tentatively to 1114<12>. The date does not matter to a decade, but the fact that it cannot be placed later than 1124 is the first important point in the argument. The second is that the documents stand or fall together. Ingram's charter ends:

And my wife conceded these things and my heirs with me and placed their gift therein upon the altar. And also my lord Withelard and his wife and their heirs, with Henry Count of Eu confirming, conceded this gift in the chapter of St. Martin of Battle when they received the fraternity

and placed the grant of this matter upon the altar.

That precludes any possibility that Ingram's charter came first and was subsequently confirmed by his lord and chief lord. Withelard de Bailleul's *concessio* had been made and Count Henry's confirmation was known when Ingram's charter was drafted. The events described may have occurred in chronological sequence, but the document which records the origination of these events cannot have been drawn up before the conclusion. That in turn affects its authorship. There can be little real doubt that Ingram's charter was drafted by a monk of Battle. Ingram's *donum* was placed on the abbey's altar; Withelard's *concessio* was made in the Chapter and was also placed on the altar. If the witness-list in the cartulary copy of Ingram's charter had been completed it would have been with the names of monks and others attesting on the abbey's behalf.

This in itself is no ground for impugning its validity, for it was common practice for ecclesiastical beneficiaries to draft such charters. But in this case there remains the question of when. Was the charter written when the grant was made, before 1124, or when the case was presented to Henry II at Clarendon, forty years more or later? Or a refinement, was an original authentic document revised to meet the requirement of the legal argument, the surviving cartulary copy being not so much a reproduction as a renovated antique?

That is surprisingly easy to answer. The three charters of Ingram, Withelard and Henry Count of Eu all begin with the general address - *Sciant omnes presentes et futuri*. Several forms of general address were in use in early twelfth-century documents, but not this particular one, which became a very common, almost universal formula from the late twelfth century. Sir Charles Clay dated a charter of Wimar, steward of St. Mary's, York, which opens - *Sciant omnes tam presentes quam futuri legentes vel audientes* 'several years earlier' than 1130 <¹³>, and there are one or two other examples belonging to the 1130s and 1140s <¹⁴>, but such an address was rare at this date and Ingram's charter, if genuine, would be a very early example, perhaps the earliest of all. It is conceivable, of course, that a scribe drafting Ingram's charter might be ahead of his time in devising a new form of address; someone had to be the first to use a new formula. But that there might be three separate scribes alighting on precisely the same formula in three different documents concerned with the same transaction defies the imagination. The reference in Ingram's charter to the confirmation precludes any possibility that the address first appeared there and was subsequently copied in the charters of Withelard and the Count. It establishes beyond reasonable doubt that the three charters were drafted in their present form by the same person, and that later rather than earlier in the twelfth century. The most likely explanation of the address is that the documents were fabricated or tampered with for the action before Henry II.

This is confirmed by the charter of Henry Count of Eu, which, as a pretended original, makes the the strongest claim to authenticity. But it is here more than

anywhere else in the three documents that the fabricator betrayed himself. The charter is written in a nondescript minuscule hand which is by no means convincing in a document purporting to belong to the early twelfth century. It could be that early but more likely not. It bears no seal and there is no indication that it ever did. So by itself it arouses doubts. On top of that it is quite unlike other surviving grants of the Count in formulae, script or general appearance. There are two such recorded in the Battle cartularies, both of them general confirmations of the grants in alms made by his vassals to the abbey<15>. Each begins - *Ego Henricus comes de Ou concedo*. One of these also survives as an apparently authentic original written in twelfth century script and bearing the *signa* of Count Henry, his wife and others <16>. It carries no seal, but is folded across the bottom. If this is an authentic document, which seems beyond doubt<17>, then the supposed original confirming the grant of Barnhorn must be viewed with profound suspicion.

The content of the document only deepens this. It is to be compared not only with the charters of Ingram and Withelard, with which it shares material, but also with the Count's two genuine charters covering his vassals' grants in alms. One of these enumerates the gifts and sales already made. They include no reference to Barnhorn and make no mention of either Ingram or Withelard. The fabrication repairs this omission and goes further with the concession, tacked on as if it were an afterthought, of all grants of tithes. But such grants were in any case covered, although not *verbatim*, by both general licences to alienate <18>. Of these, the surviving original could easily have been the source of the witnesses named in the fabrication <19>. The fabrication contains two pieces of information not shared with the charters of Ingram and Withelard. First, Ingram's concession of the tithes of Buckholt now figures as a confirmation of the grant of his predecessors, Ralph and Robert; that most likely came from a Battle source. Secondly, Count Henry concedes scot and hidage in Barnhorn and grants the land free and quit in perpetuity. The charters of Ingram and Withelard reserved the service due to the Count and the King. Both Count and King now conceded all. That was the culminating objective of the forger.

The fourth document, the charter of King Henry I, is plainly a shabby, unconvincing piece of draftmanship which by-passes the charter of the Count of Eu and misemploys the phrases of the charters of Withelard and Ingram, chiefly the latter. Ingram made his grant *domino meo W. concedente et confirmante*, and announced that *Widelardus dominus meus et uxor sua cum hereditibus suis, confirmante Henrico comite de Ou, hoc concesserunt*. King Henry now confirmed the sale made by Ingram and then added *cum toto marisco quem predictus Wihelardus de suo dominio eis ibidem dedit concedente et confirmante hoc H. comite de Ou et ipso Wihelardo cum omnibus suis hereditibus*. The obvious reading of these clumsy phrases would attach them not to Ingram's grant, where they belong, but to Withelard's addition, where they are redundant. It is not impossible to excuse these faults; we may, if we like, imagine a weary royal clerk working hastily from the two charters or from a monastic conflation thrust in front of him. The attestation is satisfactory, although there

would have been no difficulty in concocting either witnesses or place-date. Yet there is one matter in which the King's charter stands alone. Here for the first time in the series Ingram, man of Withelard de Bailleul, becomes *Ingelramus cognomento Begenridere*. That cannot have been taken from any of the preceding documents. Why should it appear for the first time in a charter supposedly emanating from the royal chancery? Or is it that a forger has given the game away yet again? For the source of the nickname is none other than the chronicler of Battle^{<20>} or someone on whom both he and the scribe of the charter depended. The insertion of the nickname Beacon-rider lays the document squarely at the door of Battle Abbey. There are two obvious possibilities. It is either a genuine charter, drafted, and badly drafted, by the beneficiaries, or it is a fabrication. There can be little real doubt which. It is a forgery and a blatant one at that.

The documents seem less convincing, therefore, the further up the social scale. In documentary terms the fabricator's object was to link all four charters tightly together. With this in mind it is possible to suggest what may be genuine and what is likely to be false in the first two.

In Ingram's charter the falsification cannot have been restricted solely to the address. It may be that the whole charter is a fabrication, for a charter coming from such a low feudal level at such an early date is a rare and choice item. But, after the address, the rest of the charter could pass muster as a grant in alms of the early twelfth century. If so, it provides an early example of an assertion of tenure *iure hereditario*. The list of witnesses, admittedly easy enough to concoct at Battle, is satisfactory except perhaps in one respect. It includes Siward son of Sigar, that is Siward of Hastings, who according to the Battle chronicle, supplanted the monks in control of Barnhorn. Siward could have witnessed the original act; on the other hand a forger could have included him in order to pretend that he was committed to it. That is to treat the charter in isolation. If it is compared with the others doubt must fall on the reference to Withelard de Bailleul and the Count of Eu, despite the circumstantial ring of the scene in the Chapter which it evokes. This is the most dubious section of the charter after the address. In all probability it was drafted at Battle. It links this charter to more obvious fabrications.

Withelard de Bailleul's charter is more open to criticism. The insertion of the *pro anima* clause in the address, and the awkward phrasing *quicquid Ingelramus ... partim dedit partim vendidit*, both suggest that the opening section down to *vendidit* and possibly as far as *do eis et confirmo* is a hotchpotch. The references to the fraternity of the abbey and to the alb placed on the altar seem genuine enough, as does the matter of participation in spiritual benefits. This last passage, however, with its awkward phrasing *nisi ut ego ...* is shared by one of the charters of Henry Count of Eu licensing his men's benefactions to the abbey^{<21>}, and indeed the opening construction *quicquid Ingelramus*, itself suspect, is shared with the other charter of the Count concerning alienations to Battle^{<22>}. In these borrowings the hand of the monks is once again discernible.

The account in the chronicle of Battle can now be seen as a decorative embellishment of a simple, straightforward story. The chronicler tells us that on acquiring Barnhorn the monks improved the land and built a mill in the marsh, but had to face increasing importuning demands from the *dominus fundi* (whom he does not name) in the time of Abbot Warner 1125-1138. In the end the abbot refused to pay, the *dominus fundi* seized the land and leased or mortgaged it to Siward of Hastings <23>. This tale of woe is immediately prefaced by a summary of the transaction which is accurate enough except for the crucial statement that it was confirmed by King Henry and the Count of Eu 'so that the land might remain the church's, free from all service and from the claims of all men in perpetuity' <24>. The documents demonstrate that this is false. Ingram's charter made the the grant in Barnhorn free and quit in perpetuity *except* for the service of the King and the Count, and Withelard made the same exception. For how could they concede, or how could a forger present them as conceding, the rights of the Count and the King? And there is no evidence that the dues of the Count and the King were ever conceded except that provided by the forged charters and the chronicle of Battle. Once this confusion is removed a reconstruction is easy: Withelard and his descendants continued to demand comital and royal dues, the abbey resisted and then refused, the lord responded by disseizing the monks, the monks responded by doctoring and forging charters which pretended that the due should never have been demanded. One of the forgeries, the charter of the count of Eu, contributes to such a reconstruction for it alone names the dues in question; scot and hidage. The chronicle gives unintentional support for it is both likely and reasonable that these ancient assessments were increased as the land was improved. Indeed, except in the vital matter of the prior concession of royal and comital dues this reconstruction is not far from the story of the chronicler, at least up to the celebrated scene at Clarendon.

That must be now understood differently from in the past. Gilbert de Bailleul was right to question the authenticity of his ancestor's grant. He may not have chosen the best of grounds in asserting that it bore no seal, but in a generation which was making increasingly sophisticated assessments of the authenticity of documents <25> he, a 'petty knight', did better than his King. For de Lucy's famous jest has somehow obscured the fact that Gilbert then also tried to challenge the authenticity of the confirmation of Henry I <26>. The chronicler concentrated on the scene with an attention to detail and a sense of drama all the easier to understand once it is realised that in all probability he knew that the deed was forged. So he has Henry II address Gilbert - 'By God's eyes, if you could prove this charter false, you would make me a profit of £1,000' <27>. If the monks could show a like charter entitling them to Clarendon they should have it, and turning to the abbot he said 'Go, take counsel, and consider together whether there is anything on which you would rather rely than on this charter. But for the present I do not think you will look for further proof'. The monks knew that they had won; the king would take the charter as sufficient proof. The chronicler, so fertile in conjuring up the words of the king, does not report what precisely the abbot and his supporters said to each other when they took counsel together. It is easy to imagine why.

So Henry's charter was accepted as genuine and that settled the case in the abbot's favour. Henry II at once authorised writs putting the abbey in seisin^{<28>} and also issued at least two confirmations of the charters of Henry I^{<29>}. It is pleasant to record that this did not end the matter. In his account the chronicler experienced some difficulty in pinning down the monks' true opponent. He described the *exactor* who demanded more and more from, and ultimately seized, the estate as *dominus fundi*^{<30>}. He still betrayed some confusion in the beginning of the tale of the legal action by stating that the case was brought against Gibert de Bailleul *qui tunc temporis dominus fundi videbatur*^{<31>}. So who was responsible for the disseising of the monks is not clear, and perhaps the circumstances did not allow for clarity since part of the endowment, the three wists, came from Ingram, and part, the demesne marsh, from Withelard. An action brought before the justices at Westminster in Hilary term 1203 helps to explain this. John of Northeye, who was none other than Ingram's grandson, then sought against the abbot of Battle, three virgates in Barnhorn, the three wists of Ingram's grant, as descending to him from Ingram his grandfather 'who was seized as of right and inheritance in the time of King Henry the grandfather.' Abbot John retorted with his charters, now reinforced by the confirmation of Henry II, which referred not only to the confirmation of Henry I but also to the successful action which Walter, abbot of Battle, had brought before the King and his barons at Clarendon against Gilbert de Bailleul and his man Reinger. To this John of Northeye had a simple answer, but one more fitting to the law of the thirteenth century than the mid-twelfth century. He argued that Abbot Ralph ought not to have brought his claim against Gilbert because he was the chief lord of the fee and held nothing in demesne there, but rather against Reinger (that is his own father) who was then under age and in the custody of Alfred of St. Martin, his uncle. Of this John of Northeye proffered 40 shillings for a jury whether it was so or not^{<32>}. No conclusion is recorded. However, it seems certain that the lawful tenant in fee in Barnhorn at the time of the action at Clarendon was a minor in his uncle's custody. His family nursed the claim. His son, the grandson of the donor, was still ready for legal battle in 1203. There was still a case to be argued and perhaps a claim to be bought off. Not even the forgers of Battle could make everything secure.

DOCUMENTS

Fabricated or suspect passages are printed in italics.

1. Grant by Ingram, man of Withelard de Bailleul, to Battle Abbey of the tithes of Buckholt and sale to the abbey of three wists of land in Barnhorn (par. Bexhill) except for the service due to the king and count of Eu.

B 1. Lincoln's Inn, Hale MS 87 fol. 66. 2. Huntington Library, MS BA 30, fol. 103. Printed from B2.

Sciant omnes presente(s) et futuri quod ego Ingelrannus homo Widelardi de Bailol, ipso domino meo W. concedente et confirmante, dedi et concessi monachis ecclesie sancti Martini de Bello omnem decimam de terra mea de Bocholt de annona videlicet et omni pecunia pro salute anime mee et omnium parentum meorum vivorum et mortuorum. Insuper vendidi eis propter. lviij solidos tres wistas terre quas iure hereditario tenebam in Bernehorne cum omnibus que ad ipsas pertinent liberas et quietas in perpetuum possidendas praeter servicium regis et comitis de Ou quantum ad ipsam terram pertinet, et hec concessit uxor mea et heredes mci mecum et donum inde super altare posuerunt. Sed et Widelardus dominus meus et uxor sua cum heredibus suis, confirmante Henrico comite de Ou, hoc donum concesserunt in capitulo sancti Martini de Bello quando societatem receperunt et concessum huius rei super altare posuerunt. T. Widelardo domino meo et uxore cum filiis suis, Roberto filio Widonis, Siwardo filio Sigari, Siredo presbytero, Eilredo clerico, Benedicto, Reib(aldo), Bartholomeo, Willelmo de Sumerie, Gerardo de Sumeri, et ceteri multi ex una parte et. ...

2. Confirmation by Withelard de Bailleul of the gift by Ingram his man to Battle Abbey of the tithes of Buckholt and of the sale by him of three wists of land in Barnhorn, and gift of his demesne marsh there, except for the service due to the king and the count of Eu.

B 1. Lincoln's Inn, Hale MS 87 fol. 66. 2. Huntington Library, MS BA 30, fol. 103. Printed from B2.

Sciant omnes presentes et futuri quod (ego) Wielardus de Baliol pro anima mea et uxoris mee et patris mei et omnium parentum meorum vivorum et mortuorum salute(m). Quicquid Ingelramnus homo meus monachis ecclesie sancti Martini de Bello partim dedit partim vendidit videlicet decimam de Bocolte et tres wistas terre quas habuit in Bernehorn et totum mariscum de dominio meo ibidem<> do eis et confirmo perpetualiter absque omni calumnia possidere praeter servicium regis et comitis de Ou. Et in die concessionis huius effectus sum frater eiusdem loci et uxor mea cum hac confirmatione in testimonium huius rei unam albam super altare posuit. Sed et pro hac concessione et confirmatione nichil aliud exigo vel aliquando exigam nisi ut ego et*

anime parentum meorum participes sumus eternaliter omnium beneficiorum que in ipsa ecclesia fient in missis et orationibus et elemosinis. Huius rei testes sunt hii. Walterius presbyter, Bartholomeus de Cruil, Willelmus de Sumerie, Helias filius eius, Robertus filius Guidonis, Rodbertus Nosse at Alanus frater eius et alii multi.

* The text of B2 is corrupt here. B1 presents other difficulties:

Quicquid Ingelramus homo meus monachis ecclesie sancti Martini partim dedit partem vendidit videlicet decimam de Bocholte et tres wistas terre quas habuit in Bernone. Insuper ibidem de dominio meo totum mariscum do eis et concedo ac perpetualiter libere absque omni calumpnia possidere confirmo.

3. Confirmation by Henry count of Eu of the grant and sale by Ingram and the grant by Withelard de Bailleul to Battle Abbey of land in Barnhorn except for scot and hidage due to him, now granted by the count so that the land is to be free and quit in perpetuity, along with confirmation of the grant by Ingram of the tithes of Buckholt and of the tithes granted to the abbey by his men throughout his *comitatum* in England.

A. Huntington Library, BA 42/1132

B. Lincoln's Inn, Hale MS, fol. 66-66v.

Printed from A.

Sciant omnes presentes & futuri quod ego Henricus comes de Ou confirmo ecclesie sancti Martini de Bello tres wistas in Bernehorne cum omnibus appendiciis suis quod me concedente Ingelerannus homo Widelardi de Bailol concessu ipsius domini sui & uxoris sue & filiorum suorum monachis Belli vendidit propter lvi solidos praeter scotum & hidagium quod mihi debebat, quod eis pro anima patris mei & omnium parentum meorum eternaliter concedo & volo firmiter ut omnino ipsa terra libera eis & quieta permaneat in perpetuum. Decimam vero de Boccolt quam ipse eis concessit sicut predecesores eius Radulphus videlicet & Rotbertus eis concesserunt ego eis confirmo. Similiter omnes decimas que date sunt eis per comitatum meum in Anglia concedo. Testes. Ingelrannus vicecomes, Anselmus de Fraelvilla, Aelredus dapifer abbatis, Reimba(ldus), Radulfus filius Benedicti, & alii plures.

4. Confirmation by King Henry I of the grants of Ingram and Withelard to Battle Abbey of land in Barnhorn, and of the confirmation by Henry count of Eu, and precept that the monks are to hold the land free from all custom of earthly service.

B 1. Lincoln's Inn, Hale MS 87, fol. 14v. 2. Huntington Library, BA29, fol. 26-26v. Printed from B2.

Cal. *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum*, II, no. 1061.

Henricus dei gratia rex Anglorum omnibus baronibus suis Francis et Anglis per Angliam constitutis salutem. Sciatis me concessisse et confirmasse deo et sancto Martino et monachis de Bello terram in Bernehorn' quam Ingelramnus cognomento Begenridere homo Wihelardi de Bailol eis vendidit cum toto marisco quem predictus Wihelardus de suo dominio eis ibidem dedit concedente et confirmante hoc H. comite de Ou et ipso Wihelardo cum omnibus suis heredibus. Precipio itaque quod bene et quiete et libere hec cum pertinenciis suis teneant et possideant libera ab omni consuetudine terrene servitutis. Et ut nullus eis super hoc molestus sit super forisfacturam meam. Testibus. Rogero episcopo Saresb' et Willelmo de Pontearch'. Apud Burn'.

NOTES

1. I am grateful to the members of the Medieval History Seminar in the University of Cambridge, in particular to Dr. Martin Brett and Mrs. Mary Cheney, for their discussion of an earlier version of this paper, and to Professor Eleanor Searle for kindly supplying xerox copies of some of the documents. Texts are printed below by the kind permission of the Librarian and the Trustees of the Huntington Library, San Marino, California.
2. *The Chronicle of Battle Abbey*, ed. E. Searle, Oxford 1980, pp.210-11. Here and elsewhere I have largely used Professor Searle's translation.
3. *Ibid.*, p.214.
4. F. West, *The Justiciarship in England 1066-1232*, Cambridge 1966, pp.37-39.
5. E. Searle, 'Battle Abbey and exemption: the forged charters', *English Historical Review*, 83, 1968, 449-480.
6. The charters of the Count of Eu and King Henry are noted by Professor Searle in *Chronicle of Battle*, p.211, n.2. She discusses the case in *Lordship and Community: Battle Abbey and its Banlieu 1066-1538*, Toronto 1974, pp.40-43 and in 'The abbey of the conquerors: defensive enfeoffment and economic development in Anglo-Norman England', *Proceedings of the Battle Conference of Anglo-Norman Studies*, 2, 1979, 154-164 (160-162). See also W.L. Warren, *Henry II*, London 1973, pp.325-7.
7. Lincoln's Inn, Hale MS 87, fols.14v, 66, 66v.
8. Huntington Library, MS BA 30, fol.103.
9. Huntington Library, MS BA 29, fols. 26-26v.
10. Huntington Library, BA 42/1132.

11. *Chronicle of Battle*, p.210.
12. *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum*, II, no.1061, ed. C. Johnson and H.A. Cronne, Oxford 1956.
13. *Early Yorkshire Charters*, V, 38-9, ed. C.T. Clay, Yorkshire Archaeological Society Record Series, Extra Series II, 1936.
14. *Sir Christopher Hatton's Book of Seals*, nos. 222,284,291, ed. L.C. Lloyd and D.M. Stenton, Oxford 1950.
15. Lincoln's Inn, Hale MS 87, fols. 52v-53; Huntington Library, BA 29, fols. 127-127v.
16. Huntington Library, BA 42/1526.
17. A peculiar feature of the document is that the *signa* do not all coincide with the named witnesses. This may be explained by the final clause - *& alii plures ex utraque parte adhuc testes sunt*.
18. Both charters cover whatever the tenants convey in alms.
19. The attestation of this original charter is - 'De hac re ex parte mea testes sunt. Girolodus de Normanvilla dapifer meus, Aegelnannus vicecomes, Anselmus de Fraelvilla, Hugo de Fulcarmonte. Ex parte monachorum Giredus dapifer abbas, Raimbertus filius Bristuuini, Radulfus filius Benedicti & alii plures ex utraque parte adhuc testes sunt de hac mea concessione, (Huntington Library, BA 42/1526).
20. *Chronicle of Battle*, p.210.
21. This charter of the count runs - 'Et pro hac concessione et confirmatione nichil aliud exigo aut aliquando faciam nisi ut ego et heredes mei participes sumus ...' (Lincoln's Inn, Hale MS 87, fol. 52v-53).
22. 'Quicquid mei homines & in Anglia & in Normannia dederunt vel dabunt ...' (Huntington Library, BA 42/1526.).
23. *Chronicle of Battle*, pp.210-212.
24. *Ibid*, p.210.
25. See, for example, the interesting examples in M. Cheney, *Roger, Bishop of Worcester 1164-1179*, Oxford 1980, pp.340-1, 356-7, and at a later date the doubts of William of Diss in *The Chronicle of Jocelin of Brakelond*, ed. H.E. Butler, London 1949, p.139.
26. *The Chronicle of Battle*, p.214.
27. *Ibid*, p.216.
28. Huntington Library, MS BA 29, fols. 35v-36.

29. *Ibid.*, fols. 35-35v, 36. See also *Calendar of Patent Rolls 1429-36*, p. 364, which is an *inspeximus* of the second of these charters.

30. *Chronicle of Battle*, p.210.

31. *Ibid.*, p.212.

32. *Curia Regis Rolls*, ii, 178-9.