BERMONDSEY PRIORY

Cluniac priory of St Saviour
Dependency of La-Charité-Sur-Loire

County of Surrey : Diocese of Winchester
Founded ? 1089

There was a minster at Bermondsey in AD 708 × 715, when Pope Constantine (708–715), addressed to Abbot Hædda, ‘presbiter monasteriorum duorum . . . in provincia Westsaxonum in locis qui Vermundesei et VVocchingas uocatur’ i.e. Bermondsey and Woking (Birch 133; JE 2148; printed Kelly, ASCh 14, Peterborough, App. 2, 361–3). The two minsters have long been considered dependencies of the Mercian monastery at Medeshamstede (now Peterborough). The text of Constantine’s privilege comes from the Peterborough archive. A list of the cells of Medeshamstede compiled in the third quarter of the twelfth century by Hugh Candidus, a monk of Peterborough, includes Wermundeseya, but Hugh’s information probably derives from the privilege (The Chronicle of Hugh Candidus, ed. W. T. Mellows (Oxford, 1949), 15; translation at The Peterborough Chronicle of Hugh Candidus, tr. and ed. C. & W. T. Mellows (Peterborough, 1966), 8). P. H. Hase, ‘The mother churches of Hampshire’, Minsters and Parish Churches:

The Local Church in Transition, ed. J. Blair (Oxford, 1988), 45–66, at p. 63 n. 28, deduced that the church at Bermondsey had been founded during the period of Mercian rule in Surrey, i.e. A.D. 641–86. More recently S. Kelly has questioned whether the minsters at Bermondsey and Woking were ever dependent on Medeshamstede (ASCh 14 Peterborough, 72–5, 110, 199–200, 362–3). J. Blair, Early Medieval Surrey: Landholding, Church and Settlement before 1300 (Stroud, 1991), 102–3, writes that Bermondsey ‘may be one genuine case of a minster totally destroyed by the Vikings’. J. H. Haslem, ‘Parishes in eastern London’, ibid. 35–43, at p. 42 n. 32, postulates that Bermondsey was replaced by the minster at Southwark, certainly in existence in 1066, and perhaps founded in the early tenth century. Middle Saxon pottery found at Bermondsey confirms its occupation in the seventh and eighth centuries, but the minster site has not been found. Whether the founders of the post-Conquest monastery were aware of its Anglo-Saxon predecessor is unknown. The Bermondsey annals, a compilation of the 1430s, make no mention of it, so it is unlikely there was any memory of the pre-Conquest church by that time.

Despite the efforts of the fifteenth-century annalist to recover the priory’s history, our understanding of the foundation of the Cluniac house at Bermondsey in the late eleventh century is very limited. Domesday reveals that in 1086 the king held the manor of Bermondsey, answering for 12 hides, reduced from the 13 hides that Earl Harold had before 1066. There was a new and beautiful church, ‘ibi noua et pulchra aecclesia’ (DB, i. 30b; Surrey § 1. 4). The loss of one hide was probably the result of the enfeoffment of Count Robert of Mortain, who had one hide of the king’s land in Bermondsey ‘where his house stands’ (DB, i. 34b; § 17. 2). Whether the ‘new and beautiful church’ can be identified as the new priory church is a matter of conjecture. Several annals report the arrival of the monks in England in 1089, three years after the Domesday survey. The monks came from the monastery of La Charité-sur-Loire, itself founded from Cluny in 1054. The church may have been built for secular priests but later handed over to La Charité.2


3 For the early English Cluniac houses, the first of which was William de Warenne’s priory at Lewes, see B. Golding, ‘The coming of the Cluniaecs’, ANS 3 (1980), 65–77.
The Annals of Bermondsey, which survive in a single manuscript, now BL MS Harley 231, were probably compiled soon after the appointment of John Bromley as prior in 1432, the last event recorded. Excerpts were printed in 1655 in the first volume of the Monasticon; the entire text was edited by H. R. Luard in 1866 (Annales Monastici, iii. 421–87). Luard pointed out the unusual nature of the annals, commenting that they ‘differ in a marked respect from almost all the other monastick annals, in not being written contemporaneously from year to year, but being apparently compiled from documents and other chronicles existing in the monastery’. He named William of Malmesbury, Henry of Huntingdon, Ralph de Diceto, Sigebert of Gembloux, and ‘the chronicle known by the name of Matthew of Westminster’ as the main sources used by the compiler. As might be expected, the annals contain much on the history of the priory, and include many references to its benefactors, but they must be used with caution. Luard concluded that the annals were ‘though generally accurate . . . not free from errors’, but expressed no reservation about their reports on matters directly related to the priory. Eyton, however, found the chronicle to be ‘a most unsafe guide in matters of date’ (Eyton, Itinerary Hen. II, 38 n. 8) and Rose Graham, ‘The priory of La Charité-sur-Loire and the monastery of Bermondsey’, *JBAA* NS 32 (1926), 157–191, at p. 160, concluded that ‘no statement in the annals about Bermondsey can be accepted without reserve, unless it can be proved from another source’. More recently Martin Brett, ‘The annals of Bermondsey, Southwark and Merton’, *Church and City 1000–1555: essays in honour of Christopher Brooke* (Cambridge, 1992), 279–310, has established the interconnected nature of the three annals named in his title and shown that all are partly derived from a prototype that was also used by Matthew Paris in his additions to Roger of Wendover’s chronicle in the Chronica Maiora and the Flores Historiarum. Some of the elements common to several of these works no doubt derived from the prototype, which appears to be free of the guesswork that is characteristic of the Bermondsey annals. Brett’s paper includes an appendix of such entries pertinent to the history of London between 1089 and 1218 (pp. 296–310).

As will be seen in the notes to the acts of William II and Henry I, there is a close correlation between the descriptions of benefactions in the Bermondsey annals and the details contained in the priory’s charters and deeds. It is plain that the compiler of the annals has made extensive

---

and intelligent use of the priory’s muniments. In many cases we can identify the precise source of his information. An entry under 1329, ‘anno regni regis Edwardi tertii quarto’, for example, stating that the king confirmed ‘omnes chartas et libertates concessas monachis de Bermundesey per reges Anglie’, derives from the inspeximus of 4 Edward III. The enrolments of 1378 and 1400 are also mentioned in the annals (Annales Monastici, iii. 472, 479–80, 483; CalCh, iv. 181–6; CalPar 1377–1381, 261; CalPar 1399–1401, 304; H1/000, Regesta 1990). Undated documents, however, presented the annalist with a problem, as his year-by-year format forced him to assign each gift to a particular year. His solution was to work out the likely date-range for each benefaction, and then to guess a year within the range. Sometimes we can show his chosen date is impossible, for example King Henry’s gift of Rotherhithe and Dulwich and a hide in Southwark, made by writ-charter datable 1103 or 1104, is entered under 1127 in the annals on the basis of his imagined date for the forged general confirmation (H1/000, 000, Regesta 664–5; Annales Monastici, iii. 434). Similarly King Henry’s gift of the churches of Shorne and Cobham, made before 1114, is entered under 1132 (H1/000, Regesta 1021; Annales Monastici, iii. 434). Aside from his guesswork, the annalist makes occasional errors. The gift of Preston is entered under both 1092 and 1126 (Annales Monastici, iii. 428, 434; H1/000, Regesta 763); a charter of Henry I granting warren in Surrey (H1/000, Regesta 1743) has been mistaken for an act of Henry II and so entered in the annals under 1174 (Annales Monastici, iii. 443–4); the donors of St George’s church in Southwark are described as Thomas de Ardene and his son Thomas rather than Ralph de Ardene and his son Thomas (H1/000 § 2, Regesta 1990). Nevertheless, a description of a gift in the annals is almost always good evidence for an underlying charter or deed. The date assigned, however, may wrong by half a century.

The Bermondsey cartulary (Davis 45), compiled by a monk named William Preston in 1363 and comprising at least 277 folios, has been lost. It can be deduced that the volume passed with the site of the abbey through the hands of Sir Robert Southwell and of Thomas Pope to Robert Trappes, a London goldsmith, who purchased the estate in 1556. Robert Trappes I died in 1560. The estate descended from father to son through several generations: Robert Trappes II died in 1576; Robert III
died in 1587 when his heir was Robert IV, aged six.\(^5\) From the Trappes family the cartulary passed by means unknown to Robert Cotton’s collection, appearing in an early Cotton catalogue, BL MS Harley 6018, fol. 104r, as MS 231, ‘Registrum prioratus de Bermondsey’, with a later annotation ‘Mr Selden’.\(^6\) John Selden had acquired the volume, probably as a loan, but it did not return to the Cotton library. The list of Selden’s manuscripts made shortly after his death in 1654 includes ‘a chartularie concerning the monasterie of Bermondsey, fol.’ (D. M. Barratt, ‘The library of John Selden and its later history’, Bodleian Library Record 3 (1950–51), 256–74, at p. 267 no. 290).\(^7\) The relevant entry in Dugdale’s list of cartularies, ‘Bermondsey: Tho. Cotton baronet’, has been annotated ‘Mr Selden’ (Bodl. MS Dugdale 48, fol. 61v).\(^8\)

A series of transcripts from the cartulary were made between 1556 and 1654.\(^9\) The limited and overlapping nature of most of these transcripts suggests that they were taken from a lost derivative, perhaps made by the Essex antiquary James Strangman (c. 1555–c. 1596), rather than the cartulary itself.\(^10\) There are three independent abstracts of this primary derivative. Robert Glover’s transcripts, London, College of Arms, MS Glover B, fols. 106r–116v, made in 1586–7, are headed ‘Liber cartarum et monumentorum de omnibus libertatibus maneriis ecclesiis redditiis pens(ionibus) portionibus et de omnibus aliis possessionibus ad domum sancti Saluatoris de Bermundes(ey) iuxta London’ pertinentibus, per fratrem Willelmum de Preston’ editus et

\(^5\) For references, see Maureen Jurkowski, ‘The lost cartulary of Bermondsey abbey and the monastic library of John Selden’, Bodleian Library Record 29 (2016), 73–91. This paragraph and the next owe much to a pre-publication draft of this paper.

\(^6\) The cartulary was in the Cotton library by 1621. Cotton’s ‘note of such books as I have before this 23 April 1621 lent out of my study’ notes ‘The cartuary [sic] of the monastery of Bermonsey a larg book old bound in foll. Lord treasurer’, i.e. Henry Montagu, earl of Manchester (c. 1563–1642), lord treasurer in 1620–21 (Tite, Early Records, 31–2, no. 2.23).

\(^7\) See also PRO E36/101, a list of cartularies of the second quarter of the seventeenth century, where the volume is said to be in the hands of ‘Mr Selden of the Temple’.

\(^8\) Robert Cotton was succeeded by his son Thomas in 1631.

\(^9\) A reconstruction of the lost cartulary, entitled ‘The documents and history of Bermondsey priory, 1089–1399’, was intended as a London University DPhil dissertation by Miss Janet Foster, under the supervision of Christopher Brooke, but was not completed (C. N. L. Brooke, London 800–1216: The Shaping of a City (London, 1975), 313 n. 1; Historical Research for University Degrees in the United Kingdom, List no. 32, part II, Theses in Progress 1975 (May 1975), 12, no. 294; ibid. List no. 44, Part II (May 1983), 10, no. 230).

\(^10\) See in particular 000, Regesta 389a below, and H1/000, Regesta 620, which are shortened in near identical fashion in Glover B and Cotton Claudius A. viii.
ordinatus anno domini 1363, tempore uenerabilis et religiosi uiri domini
Iohannis de Caroloco tunc dicte domus prioris’. At the end of the
abstract is the note ‘Huc usque ex registro de Bermondes(ey) in
Suthwerke iuxta London’ in custodia cuiusdam Roberti Trappis de
London’ generosi domini manerii de Barmondesey’. Glover’s are the
only abstracts that mention Trappes. The abstracts at BL MS Cotton
Claudius A. viii, fol. 110r–118v (now fol. 115r–122v), identified by
Tite, *Early Records*, 122, as in the hand of Thomas Talbot (c. 1535–1595 × 1599), antiquary and clerk of records in the Tower of London, have the
same heading as Glover B. Talbot gives folio references, which Glover
does not, so Glover is not his source; nor is Glover B derived from
Talbot, as it contains material not in the latter (e.g. 000, *Regesta* 398
below and the reference to Trappes). Roger Dodsworth’s abstract,
Bodl. MS Dodsworth 102, fol. 97r–101v, is the third independent
transcript. These folios are probably only a part of what Dodsworth
copied. There is nothing from the first 45 folios of the lost cartulary.
Dodsworth would surely have copied the description of the work naming
William Preston as the compiler, but what survives is headed simply ‘Ex
cartulario prioratus sancti Saluatoris de Bermondesey’. Dodsworth’s
abstracts give folio numbers, so are independent of Glover, and are also
independent of Talbot, as Dodsworth reports several deeds in greater
detail.

Several other extracts from the cartulary can be traced back to
Glover, Talbot or Dodsworth. BL MS Harley 4757, pp. 1–28, now folios.
2r–15v, which belonged to Ralph Brooke (c. 1553–1625) and later to
Peter Le Neve (1661–1729), follows Glover B very closely. William
Dugdale’s transcripts from Glover B include seven deeds from the
Bermondsey cartulary (Bodl. MS Dugdale 18, fol. 67r). BL MS Harley
245, fol. 45v, copies a brief chart pedigree of Tany from Glover B but no
charters or deeds. A further series of abstracts by Roger Dodsworth,
Bodl. MS Dodsworth 78, fol. 23v–29r, derive from Cotton Claudius A.
viii, as is clear from the occasional folio numbers that correspond to that
manuscript appended to some documents (see e.g. H1/000, 000; *Regesta*
1350, 1990). A few documents from the cartulary were copied with
others relating to the Maminot and Say families in BL MS Add. 5485, fol. 47r–v (old fol. 64r–v), probably via Cotton Claudius A. viii. The
short abstracts at BL MS Cotton Vitellius F. xii, folios. 150v–153r, which
once belonged to the antiquary Arthur Agarde (1540–1615), are a subset

---

11 See also H1/000, *Regesta* 962, where the Glover and Cotton Claudius abstracts each contain material not in the other.
of those in Cotton Claudius A. viii. The heading a few pages earlier on fol. 142r, ‘Ex collect(aneis) Iacobi Strangman gen(erosi)’, indicates that they have been taken from a manuscript belonging to James Strangman. The abstracts in Bodl. MS Top. Gen. c. 90, fols. 110r–111r, are entitled ‘Collectiones ex libro Iacobi Strangman’ ex libro prioratus de Bermondsey’, and are related to those in Cotton Vitellius F. xii, which they follow closely, but much is omitted. The Bodley abstracts were not copied from Cotton Vitellius, however, as they include folio numbers which Cotton Vitellius does not. The Bodley abstracts also include a note of a single document not in Vitellius, a final concord of 25 Henry II (fol. 111r). Thus it is likely that both are copied from an unknown descendant of Cotton Claudius A. viii. Whether Strangman compiled the primary derivative of the cartulary used by Glover, Talbot, and Dodsworth, or this lost descendant, remains to be established.

Three documents said to be ‘ex registro de Bermonsey penes virum clarissimum Iohannem Seldenum armigerum’ were printed in the first edition of the Monasticon: Regesta 398; HI/000, Regesta 665; and a memorandum including an abstract from Domesday (Dugdale, i. 642–3; repr. Monasticon, v. 100, nos. ii–iv). Each of these is copied more fully than most of the abstracts noticed above. The transcripts from which the entries in the Monasticon were printed have not been found in the surviving manuscripts of Dodsworth or Dugdale. It is possible they were taken directly from the cartulary, but they may equally have been contained in a lost portion of the transcripts from the primary derivative in MS Dodsworth 102.

Our revised understanding of the Bermondsey annalist’s modus operandi helps us to improve our interpretation of his entries concerning the foundation of the priory. As well as the early charters and deeds and the Domesday entry for Bermondsey contained in the cartulary, he had access to the prototype London annals described by Brett. Three events critical for the foundation of Bermondsey priory were contained in the prototype. We can be confident there were no others: if there had been, they would have been preserved in other of its descendants. Under 1089, the prototype noted that ‘xj kal. augusti monachi Bermund(esey) uenerunt in Angliam’; under 1106, ‘Obiit Alwinus fundator Bermund(esey)’; and under 1119, ‘iiij id. ianuarii obiit Petreius primus prior Bermund(esey). Successit Herebrannus’ (Brett, ‘Annals’, 297).

12 Brett prints Petrus, as in Matthew Paris, Chron. Majora, ed. Luard, ii. 144, but Petreius is preferable, as in the annals of Bermondsey and of Southwark (Annales
We cannot be certain that the annalists had no other sources for his account of the priory's foundation, but it seems rather that he extrapolated from the prototype annals and the forged 'foundation' charter of William II printed below. Ailwin, the so-called founder, appears in the abstracts from the cartulary only in that act, handing over the church of Bermondsey to the monks of La Charité. In the prototype annals Ailwin appears only in 1094, when his death was reported. Perhaps guided by tradition, the Bermondsey annalist gives Ailwin a surname, 'Child', and a description, 'citizen of London', and tells us that his foundation gift comprised unspecified rents in the city of London ('diuersos redditus in ciuitate Londonie'). The annalist has placed the foundation under the year 1082, a date that does not appear elsewhere. He was perhaps again guided by tradition, but more likely by Domesday, which he believed had been written in 1083, and which notes the 'new and beautiful church' at Bermondsey. Under 1082 he writes (Annales Monastici, iii. 425–6):

Hoc anno Alwinus Child, ciuis Londonie, fundator monasterii monachorum sancti Saluatoris de Bermondesey ex licentia regia dedit eisdem monachis qui uenerunt in Angliam in anno secundo Willelmi regis ruphi secundi, diuersos redditus in ciuitate Londoniae antequam idem rex Willelmus secundus dedit manerium de Bermundeseye. Et insuper excitauit diuersos dominos tam temporales quam spirituales ut darent predia, ecclesias et maneria prout patet inferius tempore regis Willelmi secundi

In this year Alwin Child, citizen of London, founder of the house of monks of St Saviour at Bermondsey by royal licence gave the same monks (who came to England in the second year of King William II Rufus) various rents in the city of London, before the same King William II gave the manor of Bermondsey. And moreover he encouraged various lords, both spiritual and temporal, to give estates, churches, and manors, as appears below in the time of King William II.

We again glimpse the annalist's methods under 1089, where he has expanded the brief entry in the prototype annals to report that 'Petreus, Ricardus, Osbertus et Vmbaldus, monachi de Caritate, uenerunt

---

13 The printed text has Umbaldus. The text at BL MS Harley 231, fol. 5r, could be read as either Vmbaldus or Vinbaldus, as the scribe only sometimes dots the letter 'i'. The name Umbald or Humbald occurs several times in the cartulary of La Charité
Bermundeseye. Et Petreus factus est prior ex ordinatione prioris de Caritate’. He knew that Petreius was the first prior from the report of his death in 1119 in his prototype: the names of the three other monks he took from the same forged ‘foundation’ charter in the name of William II.

Several of the questions that the fifteenth-century annalist attempted to answer remain unresolved. Who was Ailwin? His name tells us he was an Englishman. There are several references to men of that name in the Middlesex and Surrey sections of Domesday, but none can be identified as the founder of Bermondsey. What was Ailwin’s role in the foundation? He must surely have been responsible for funding the building of the new church mentioned in Domesday, but why should he have chosen the royal manor of Bermondsey on which to build it? Christopher Brooke suggested that William II may have sold the manor of Bermondsey to Ailwin in order for him to endow the monastery (C. N. L. Brooke, London 800–1216: the Shaping of a City (London, 1975), 313). It is suggested below that the gift of the manor of Charlton may have been made by Count Robert of Mortain, rather than the bishop of Lincoln Robert Bloet, whose name appears as the donor in several forgeries. It is perhaps possible that the apparent role of William II in the foundation similarly hides the identity of the true donor of the manor of Bermondsey.

Five acts in the name of William II are found in the transcripts of the lost cartulary. Two have been much abbreviated in copying: a full text of one of these (000, Regesta 398) is found in collections of monastic foundation charters that originate in the Prise-Say collection, Winchester Cathedral, MS XXB. Only two acts are free from suspicion. 000, Regesta 362 grants land in Somerset given by Walter fitz Ansger; 000, Regesta 389a has lost its tenor but preserves an intriguing address and witness list. 000, Regesta 340, confirming Robert Bloet’s gift of Charlton in Kent, may have been altered to conceal the true identity of the donor of that estate. There is a supposed ‘foundation diploma’, 000,
Regesta 398, and a confirmation of several gifts to the priory, 000, not in Regesta. Neither of these can be accepted as authentic.

Writ-charter confirming the gift of two hides in Stone (Somerset). 1087 × 1097, perhaps 1095 or 1097

ANTiquary TRANscripts: BL MS Cotton Claudius A. viii (s. xvi), fol. 115v (now fol. 119v) [B, from lost cartulary, ‘fo. 186’]; BL MS Cotton Vitellius F. xii (s. xvi/xvii), fol. 152r (abbreviated) [indirectly from B]; Bodl. MS Top. Gen. c. 90 (s. xvi/xvii), fol. 110r (as in Vitellius) [‘foll. 186’, indirectly from B].

Printed: J. Batten, Historical and Topographical Collections Relating to the Early History of Parts of South Somerset (Yeovil, 1894), p. 90, reprinted as Batten’s South Somerset villages (Tiverton, 1994) (English abstract) [from B]; Regesta, i. 133 (no. lviii) [from B].

Calendar: Regesta 362.

Willelmus rex Anglorum a W(illelmo) Capre et fidelibus suis francis et anglis de Sumerseta salutem. Sciatis me concessisse deo et monachis de Bermundesey duas hidas terre de Estanes quas Walterus filius Ansgeri eis dedit. Test(ibus) Ans’ello de Parentin et W(illelmo) Peuerel Doure. Apud Wind(resoram) in pentecosten.

a Anglie B

William king of the English to William Capre and his sworn men French and English of Somerset greeting. Know that I have granted to God and to the monks of Bermondsey two hides of land at Stone that Walter fitz Ansger gave to them. Witness Anserel de Parentin and William Peverel of Dover. At Windsor at Whitsun.

Date: William II is known to have kept Whitsun at Windsor twice, 13 May 1095 and 24 May 1097. His whereabouts at Whitsun in 1089–90, 1092–3 and 1096 are unknown; in 1088 he was in Sussex or Kent; in 1091, 1094 and 1098 in Normandy; in 1099 and 1100 at Westminster. The Bermondsey annals assign Walter fitz Ansger’s gift to 1095 (see Context). The chronology of the early sheriffs of Somerset is obscure, and it is only our (possibly mistaken) understanding that Bermondsey priory was founded in the reign of William II that precludes a date before 1087.

Address: To the shire court of Somerset, omitting the bishop. William Capre was explicitly addressed as sheriff of Somerset in 000, Regesta 386a, for Winchester.

Witness: Anserel de Parentin, who does not otherwise appear in royal acts and has not been identified, and William Peverel of Dover.

Place: Windsor, at Whitsun.
CONTEXT: H. R. Luard, the editor of the Bermondsey annals, identified the place as Stone, near Mudford (Som). In 1086 Stone, assessed at two hides, had been added to the manor of Mudford: both places were held of Serlo de Burcy by one Reginald (DB, i. 98a; Som § 37. 12). Walter’s deed was copied in the lost cartulary and Glover made a brief abstract: ‘Ego Walterius filius Ansgerii Britonis confirmo monachis de Ber mondese(ey) duas hidas terre de la Stane quas ibidem habeo &c.’ (MS Glover B, fol. 111v). How the manor passed to Walter fitz Ansger is unknown. The annals record the gift under the year 1095: ‘et hoc anno Walterus filius Ansgeri Britonis dedit duas hidas terre de la Stane monachis de Bermundeseie, quam donationem confirmauerunt Willelmus rex secundus et Henrici primus rex’ (Annales Monastici, iii. 429). The gift is included in William II’s ‘foundation’ charter and Henry I’s general confirmation (000 § 5, Regesta 398; H1/000 § 8, Regesta 665). The annals record that in 1417 there was a plaint ‘de maneriis Prestone Bermundesey et Stone in comitatu Somersetie, et recuperatum fuit per dictum abbatem’ (Annales Monastici, iii. 484–5). For the gift to Bermondsey of two hides at Preston Plucknett, near Stone, by Walter’s father Ansger the Breton, see H1/000, Regesta 763.

AUTHENTICITY: Apparently authentic.

00 Writ addressed to royal officials. 1093 × 1098

ANTIOQUARY TRANSCRIPTS: London, College of Arms, MS Glover B (1586–7), fol. 106r (address and witnesses only) [B, from lost cartulary]; BL MS Harley 4757 (s. xvii1/4), p. 1 (now fol. 2r) [from Glover B]; BL MS Cotton Claudius A. viii (s. xvi4/4), fol. 110r, now fol. 115r (address and witnesses only) [C, from lost cartulary ‘fo. 2’]; BL MS Cotton Vitellius F. xii (s. xvi/xvii), fol. 150v (address only) [indirectly from C]; Bodl. MS Top. Gen. c. 90 (s. xvi/xvii), fol. 110v (as in Vitellius) [‘foll. 4’ (presumably in error), indirectly from C].

PRINTED: Regesta, ii. 411 (no. 1xi. e).

CALENDAR: Regesta 389a.

Willelmus rex Angl(orum) W. episcopo et R(annulfo) capellano et Radulfo de Marceio et R(annulfo) fratri Ilgeri et Roberto filio Nigelli et omnibus uicecomitibus suis et ministris salutem [&c.] < * * * >. Testibus Roberto episcopo Lincolniensi, R(oberto) comite de Mellent, Willelmo Bainardo. Apud Londoniam.

The text is printed from C.


William king of the English to W. the bishop and Ranulf the chaplain and Ralph de Marcy and Ranulf brother of Ilger and Robert fitz Nigel and all his sheriffs and officials
greeting [etc.] < * * * >. Witness Robert bishop of Lincoln, Robert count of Meulan, William Bainard. At London.

DATE: After the nomination of Robert Bloet as bishop of Lincoln in Lent 1093; before the death of Bishop Walkelin of Winchester on 3 January 1098. Bishop William of Durham, the only other English bishop with initial W. during the reign of William II, died 2 January 1096.

ADDRESS: Bishop W., Ranulf Flambard, and all sheriffs, some named. The bishop was most likely Bishop Walkelin of Winchester, who was associated in government with Ranulf, later bishop of Durham, as for example during the king’s absence from 1097–9 when the pair were left in charge of the kingdom (Annales Monastici, ii. 39). Ralph de Marcy was probably sheriff of London; Ranulf brother of Ilger was sheriff of Huntingdon. Robert fitz Nigel is obscure: his position in the address suggests that he was a sheriff, but there are no other references to him in that capacity. He was perhaps the Robert fitz Nigel who held of Ranulf brother of Ilger in Pavenham in 1086 (DB, i. 215b; Beds § 29. 1), or the Robert fitz Nigel, tenant of the bishop of Worcester, required to pay £5 in 1095 (000, Regesta 387). A man of the same name was a benefactor of Tewkesbury abbey and witnessed a diploma in its favour (H1/000, Regesta 847).

WITNESS: Robert Bloet bishop of Lincoln, Robert count of Meulan, and William Bainard. The first two attest often for William II; William Bainard otherwise attests only the Bermondsey forgery 000, not in Regesta, and H1/000, Regesta 620, another Bermondsey forgery.

PLACE: London.

CONTEXT: The loss of the tenor has obscured the purpose of the writ: the address suggests it was a grant of rights without geographic limitation, perhaps freedom from geld or some other exaction. The position of the charter in the cartulary, alongside the spurious grants of liberties in the names of Henry I (H1/000, Regesta 962) and Henry II (H2/214), suggest it may have been a similar document; perhaps it served as precedent for part of the charter in Henry I’s name.

AUTHENTICITY: Apparently authentic.

000 (Authentic ?) writ-charter confirming Robert Bloet’s gift of the manor of Charlton (Kent). 1093 × 1095, perhaps March × September 1093

ANTIQUARY TRANSCRIPTS: London, College of Arms, MS Glover B (1586–7), fol. 114v (abbreviated) [from lost cartulary] [B]; BL MS Harley 4757 (s. xvii1/4), fol. 12v [from B]; BL MS Cotton Claudius A. viii (s. xvi4/4), fol. 116r (now fol. 120r) [C, from lost cartulary, ‘fo. 238’] [C]; Bodl. MS Dodsworth 78 (s. xvii2/4), fol. 26v (copied by Roger Dodsworth) [from C]; Bodl. MS Dodsworth 102 (s. xvii2/4), fol. 97v (noted only) [from lost cartulary, ‘fo. 338’, recte ‘fo. 238’].

PRINTED: J. Thorpe, Registrum Roffense (London, 1769), 207 [from C]; L. M. May, Charlton: Near Woolwich, Kent. (London, 1908), 2–3 (with English translation) [from C]; Regesta, i. 132 (no. liii) [from C].
Willelmus rex Anglorum [ blank ] a archiepiscopo et G(undulfo) episcopo Roue’si et H(amon) dapifero et omnibus fidelibus suis francigenis et anglicis salutem. Sciatis me concessisse donum quod fecit Robertus cancellarius meus uidelicet episcopus Lincoln’ de manerio suo de Cherletona quod dedit pro salute anime nostre ecclesie sancti Saluatoris de Bermundesey. Et uolo ut monachi predicte ecclesie ita honorifice et pacifice teneant sicut Baiocensis episcopus et Robertus predictus melius tenuerunt tempore patris mei et meo tempore. Teste episcopo Willelmo Dunelmensi.

The text is printed from C. The gap is apparent in C only. Anselmo in error May

William king of the English to Archbishop [ blank ] and Gundulf bishop of Rochester and Haimo Dapifer and all his sworn men French and English greeting. Know that I have granted the gift that Robert my chancellor (that is, the bishop of Lincoln) made of his manor of Charlton, which he gave for the salvation of our soul to the church of St Saviour at Bermondsey. And I will that the monks of the said church shall hold as honourably and peacefully as the bishop of Bayeux and the said Robert ever held in the time of my father and of me. Witness William bishop of Durham.

DATE: Apparently after Robert Bloet was nominated as bishop of Lincoln, Lent 1093; before the death of Bishop William on 2 January 1096 after his collapse on Christmas day 1095. The statement that the gift was made by Robert ‘my chancellor, that is the bishop of Lincoln’ may indicate that the gift had been made by Robert as chancellor and confirmed only after his nomination as bishop, so need not necessarily imply that Bloet was then both chancellor and bishop. The Bermondsey annals note the gift under 1093 (see Context). The gap where the archbishop’s name would be expected may represent a gap in the original or a transcriber’s (or perhaps a forger’s ?) uncertainty. It would be incautious to infer a date during the Canterbury vacancy from the death of Lanfranc in 1089 until the appointment of Anselm on 3 March 1093 and his receiving the temporalities on 25 September.

ADDRESS: To the shire court of Kent. The address to Gundulf, bishop of Rochester, is appropriate, as Charlton was in the diocese of Rochester. Haimo is the only known sheriff of Kent during William II’s reign.


PLACE: No place-date.

CONTEXT, AUTHENTICITY: Charlton, between Greenwich and Woolwich in south-east London, is about six miles east of Bermondsey. In 1086 the manor, which answered for 1 sulung, was held of Bishop Odo of Bayeux by William fitz Odger (DB, i. 6d; Kent § 5. 33). The annals of Bermondsey place Robert’s gift in 1093, presumably because the
compiler knew that was the year he became bishop: ‘Et hoc anno Robertus Bluet, cancellarius Willelmi regis fit episcopus Lincolnie. Et dedit idem Robertus eodem anno monachis de Bermundeseye manerium de Charleton cum appendiciis suis’ (Annales Monastici, iii. 428). The gift appears in the spurious confirmation in the name of William II (000 § 2, Regesta 398) and in similar terms in the spurious confirmation in the name of Henry I (H1/000 § 2, Regesta 665). Henry III granted the monks a weekly market at their manor of Charlton in Kent in 1268 (Annales Monastici, iii. 464; CalCh, ii. 115). The manor was worth £20 annually to the monks in 1535, with a further 78s from 78 acres of land (Valor, ii. 58a).

The evidence for Bermondsey’s acquisition of Charlton is difficult to interpret. The lost cartulary contained a transcript of Bishop Robert’s deed confirming Charlton to Bermondsey ‘pro salute anime domini mei W. Anglorum regis et pro salute animarum patris et matris mee et pro salute anime fratris mei Baiocensis episcopi’ (EEA 1 Lincoln 1067–1185, 6–7, no. 6, from MS Glover B (via BL MS Harley 4757) and MS Cotton Claudius A. viii. The act also appears at Bodl. MS Dodsworth 102, fol. 97v). Charlton was to be held ‘sicit frater meus Baiocensis episcopus tenuit et similiter ego tempore W. regis et patris sui &c.’ This act is a fabrication. Bloet was not brother to Odo, bishop of Bayeux, nor to his successor Turold of Envermeu. The address comes before the bishop’s style, inverting the normal order seen in episcopal charters of this date. The deed appears to incorporate material derived from an act of King William I, half-brother to Odo, or, more likely, a deed of Count Robert of Mortain, Odo’s brother and half-brother of William I.

The present act is not free from suspicion. The address is correct, and there is not a great deal to object to in the wording, so if it is false it must follow an authentic writ-charter quite closely. The phrase ‘pro salute anime nostre’ is unlikely to have been in the original act. The plural form was not used in chancery productions at this date, and it is unusual for the ‘pro anima’ clause from the primary deed to be included in the confirmation. This may be, however, a simple mistranscription of nostre for mee. The interjection uidelicet episcopus Lincoln also seems somewhat out of place. No clarification of this kind would have been necessary during the reign of William II and it is possible this phrase has been added, perhaps by the cartularist, to make the link with the forged deed in Bishop Robert’s name more obvious. The act’s undue focus on the chancellor and the terms of his deed might even lead to the postulation that it was drafted by Robert himself.

Bloet’s aversion to monks, described by William of Malmesbury, Gesta pontificum Anglorum IV 177. 6–8, makes it unlikely that he gave the manor of Charlton to Bermondsey priory without any form of pressure. Perhaps William II gave the manor to Robert to enable him to make a benefaction to the priory. There are signs that the king made such ‘enabling’ gifts to increase the support and endowment of St Mary’s, York, but there a political motive for the king’s gifts can be inferred. No motive for such action is visible in the case of Bermondsey. Did Bloet ever actually hold Charlton? Might the deed in his name have been based on a deed of Robert of Mortain, brother of Bishop Odo, giving the manor of Charlton to the priory? As has been noted, Count Robert held a hide of land in Bermondsey, where he had a house, so he may have been intimately connected with the establishment of the priory. Robert’s son William sided with Duke Robert: he was taken prisoner at Tinchebray in 1106, when his estates were forfeit. If Bermondsey had received a significant gift from Robert of Mortain it would have been at risk after the forfeiture. The Bermondsey annals record that William of
Mortain was ‘miraculously freed from the tower of London by the power of the Holy Cross’ in 1118 and that in 1140 he came to Bermondsey and became a monk (Annales Monastici, iii. 432, 436). The Holy Cross was the crux sancti Salvatoris, said to have been found near the Thames in 1117 (ibid. 432). However, the pipe roll of 1129–30 shows that William was then still a prisoner in the Tower (PR 31 Henry I, 143). Whatever truth lies behind the entries in the Bermondsey annals, they demonstrate an association of some kind between William of Mortain and the priory. Greenway, suggests that William was freed by King Stephen, who had been given the Mortain lands and title many years earlier, and that it may have been Stephen who chose Bermondsey in view of his own close association with it (Henry of Huntingdon, Historia Anglorum, ed. Greenway, 698–9 n.).

There are potential parallels here with the priory of Montacute, another Cluniac house, apparently founded by William of Mortain himself before 1104, when he left England before suffering forfeiture of his English lands. Montacute was claimed to be the site of the discovery c. 1035 of another miraculous cross, which was taken to Waltham where a new church was built to house it. According to Leland, Itinerary, ed. Toulmin-Smith, i. 158, ‘the counte of Moreton toke part with Robert Curthose agayn King Henry the first, and after that was toke, put in prisone and his landes attaintid: at the which tyme the 3 lordshipes gyven to Montegue priory were taken away and then were the monkes compellid to begge for a certein season. At the laste King Henry the first had pyte of them and offerid them their owne landes again and more . . .’. If the Cluniacs at Bermondsey saw their brethren at Montacute in such trouble, it would not be surprising to learn that they had set about revising their muniments to remove all reference to Robert of Mortain and his son William.

00† Purported charter of foundation

PRISAY REGISTER AND DERIVATIVES: Winchester Cathedral, MS XXB (Prise-Say Register, 1535), p. 187 (‘Bermondsey’, ‘187’) [B]; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 111 (s. xvi\(^{med}\)), p. 292 (‘Bermondsey’, ‘187’); Bodl. MS Lat. Hist. d. 2, fol. 39r (abstract, copied apparently by William Lambarde, c. 1566–8) [from B]; BL MS Lansdowne 863, fol. 92r (formerly fol. 91r) (s. xvii\(^{1/4}\), transcript by or for Richard St George) (‘Fundatio monasterii de Bermonse per Willelmum rufum angliæ regem’); BL MS Lansdowne 447 (Richard St George’s collection of foundation charters, 1624), fol. 16r (formerly fol. 15r); Bodl. MS Eng. Hist. c. 241 (s. xvii\(^{2/4}\)), fol. 14r (formerly fol. 12r); Bodl. MS Dodworth 66, fols. 132v–133r (s. xvii\(^{3/4}\)).

ANTIQUARY TRANSCRIPTS DERIVED FROM LOST CARTULARY: London, College of Arms, MS Glover B (1586–7), fol. 106v (tenor much abbreviated and clerical witnesses omitted) [from lost cartulary]; BL MS Harley 4757 (s. xvii\(^{1/4}\)), p. 2 (now fol. 2v) [from Glover B];

PRINTED: Dugdale, i. 642a [‘ex registro de Bermonsey penes uirum clariss(imum) Iohannem Seldenum armigerum’], repr. Monasticon, v. 100a (no. ii); L. M. May, Charlton: Near Woolwich, Kent (London, 1908), 3 (with English translation) [apparently from Monasticon].

CALENDAR: Regesta 398.

S(ignum) Eudonis dapifer’ +
S(ignum) Rotger(i) de Nonant +
S(ignum) Rotger(i) Bicol’ +
S(ignum) Petri de Valaniis +
S(ignum) Ricardi de Lamera +
S(ignum) Alwini ecclesiam sancti Saluatoris unacum rege in
manu monachorum de Carit(ate), Ricardi scilicet Osberti atque
Vinbaldi\textsuperscript{d} qui aderant, emancipantis.
Letaldus scripsit et subscripsit feliciter. AMEN.

\textsuperscript{a} om. CCC\textsuperscript{C} \textsuperscript{C}
\textsuperscript{b} om. Dodsworth 66
\textsuperscript{c} Vind’ Dodsworth 66, Lansdowne 447 | Lundoniensis in error Dugdale
\textsuperscript{d} perhaps Vmbaldi B

The posterity of all faithful people shall know that I William, king of the English, for my
soul and the soul of my father King William, whom I succeeded in the kingdom, have
given to God and the monks of La Charité [1] the church of St Saviour of Bermondsey
together with Bermondsey itself with all its belongings, to possess by perpetual right,
free and quit of all things and customs. I also grant to them and confirm whatever
others have given, whether in lands or in tithes or in any other things, that is, [2]
Charlton with its belongings, which Robert, bishop of Lincoln, gave to them; [3a] the
church of Hardwick with the land adjoining the church and the tithe of the forenamed
vill; [3b] and the tithe of Upton, which Winebald, de Ballon gave to them; [3c] also the
church of Ampney and the land and tithe of the same, [3d] with other tithes of
Eastington [3e] and Alvington, which Winebald’s knight Odo of Tiron gave them, [4]
moreover the tithe of Fyfield, which John fitz Waleran’s knight Roger gave to them, the
same John granting; [5] moreover two hides of land at Stone, which Walter fitz Ansger
gave to them; [6] similarly the land of Hoddesdon, which Peter of St Olave gave to
them just as he himself well held in my father’s time; also whatever else is given to them
in London, in churches or in tithes or in houses or in lands or in any other things,
whether in the city or without the city, that is in woods, in meadows, in mills, in
fisheries, and in all things. Therefore I will and command that the monks of
Bermondsey shall hold all their possessions and all their things well and freely and in
peace and honourably. William, by the will of God, king of the English, has confirmed
and corroborated this by his seal.

Signum of King William +
Signum of Henry, brother of the same king, approving this +
Signum of Walkelin bishop of Winchester +
Signum of Osmund bishop of Salisbury +
Signum of John <bishop> of Somerset +
Signum of Eudo Dapifer +
Signum of Roger de Nonant +
Signum of Roger Bicol +
Signum of Peter de Valognes +
Signum of Richard de la Mere +
Signum of Ailwin, releasing the church of St Saviour with the king into the hands of the monks of La Charité, that is, Richard, Osbert, and Winebald who were present. Letaldus wrote this and subscribed faithfully. Amen.

DATE: The apparent date is after the nomination of John as bishop of Wells in 1088, and before the death of Ailwin, Bermondsey’s founder, in 1094. ADDRESS: ‘Nouerit omnium fidelium posteritas’, suggesting the act was drafted by a monk of La Charité. See Authenticity.

WITNESS: Attested by signa, as in a diploma. The king himself is followed by his brother Henry and three bishops including the bishops of Bath and Winchester. The priory lay in the diocese of Winchester and held land in the diocese of Bath. The bishops of London and Lincoln are notable by their absence. Eudo Dapifer was a common witness to acts of William II. Roger de Nonant attests for William II only here and 000, Regesta 377 for Winchester; Roger Bicol attests an act of William I for the abbey of Saint-Julien at Tours (W1/279); Richard de la Mere attest only here, but is named in the per clause of a writ for Aubrey de Vere datable 1100 × 1107 (H1/000, Regesta 849). Peter de Valognes is also an infrequent witness for William II, but was addressed several times in his capacity as sheriff of Essex and Hertfordshire. Ailwin, the founder of Bermondsey, is known only from this act and the annals that report his death in 1094. As discussed in more detail in the Headnote, the compiler of the annals of Bermondsey derived the names of the first monks at Bermondsey, who came from La Charité in 1089, from this diploma, adding the name of the first prior Peter. Winebald may have been intended for Winebald de Ballon, a benefactor who became a monk at Bermondsey after 1128 and was never a monk of La Charité (see below, § 3); or perhaps Umbald or Humbald was intended, a name which occurs several times in the cartulary of La Charité (Cartulaire du Prieuré de La Charité-sur-Loire, ed. R. de Lespinasse, Publication de la Société Nivernaise des Lettres, Sciences et Arts (Nevers, 1887), passim).

PLACE: No place date.

CONTEXT: A general confirmation of the church of Bermondsey and its possessions to the monks of La Charité, naming the main benefactors and specifying their gifts. Ailwin, founder of Bermondsey according to the annals, is not included in the list of benefactors, though he is said to have handed over the church alongside King William. There is no mention of liberties or rights, but the king orders that the monks of Bermondsey (not La Charité) are to hold ‘well and freely and in peace and honourably’.

[1] In 1086 the king held the manor of Bermondsey, answering for 12 hides, reduced from the 13 hides that Earl Harold had before 1066. There was a new and beautiful church (DB, i. 30b; Surrey § 1. 4). Robert, count of Mortain, held a hide of the king’s land in Bermondsey, ‘where his house stands’ (DB, i. 34b; § 17. 2).


[3] Gifts to Bermondsey by Winebald de Ballon and his tenants are referred to in two other royal acts, neither of them authentic. 000 § 2, not in Regesta, confirms ‘decimam de Operetuna que Winebaldu de Balaon eis dedit, decimam similiter de Estentona quam dedit Odo de Tirone miles eiusdem Winebaldi’. H1/000 § 11, Regesta 1990 confirms ‘ecclesiam de Hardewych’ et decimam eiusdem uille et tres hidas terre in eadem uilla et decimam de Upetona que dedit eis Winebaldu de Balaun’. Some time after 1086 Winebaldu de Ballon acquired some of the lands held by Thurstan fitz Rolf at the Survey (‘The family of Ballon and the conquest of South Wales’, J. H. Round,
Leaving aside the two forgeries for Bermondsey printed here and another two for Gloucester (W1/157; 000, *Regesta* 219), Winebald first appears in 1095, when William II demanded reliefs from the tenants of the bishopric of Worcester. ‘Winebald de Balaon’ was to pay £10 (000, *Regesta* 387). He was living in 1128, when he was addressed in an act of Pope Honorius II for Llandaff (Davies, *Book of Llandaf*, 155, no. 16). A single deed of Winebald de Ballon for Bermondsey has been preserved and is discussed at § 3b below. There Winebald says he has become a monk at Bermondsey, so the date is 1128 or later. Nevertheless it is possible that Winebald, one of the three monks of La Charité named in the present act as receiving Bermondsey church from William II and Ailwin, is intended for him. The Bermondsey annals report under 1092: ‘Et hoc anno Wynebaldu de Baalum dedit monachis de Bermundeseie Bridesthorne [Burston, Bucks] et tres uirgatas terre et dimidiam in Widone [unidentified] et vj uirgatas tere in Hardewik cum ecclesia de Hardewik, decimas de Estentona, et decem solidatas in Suttone [unidentified] de molendino ibidem, que postea uendita fuerunt per Iohannem priorem de Bermundeseie pro perpetuo ad emendum manerium de Richemond in parochia de Bengehoo pro clx marcis. Dedit etiam idem Winebaldus medietatem Uptonie. Deditque Odo miles eiusdem Winebaldi ecclesiam de Omeneya cum decimis eiusdem uille predictis monachis’ (*Annales Monastici*, iii. 427). The lost cartulary included several deeds given by Winebald’s successors. Henry de Neufmarché confirmed to Bermondsey half of Upton, with certain exceptions ‘sicut fuerat in tempore Winebaldi’, and all alms given by ‘Winebaldus auus meus et Rogerus et Milo filii eius . . . scilicet duas hidas in Brideston’ et tres uirgatas terre et dim’ Wiedon’ et sex uirgatas terre in Hardewich et ecclesiam eiusdem uille . . . ’. He also granted the tithe of the demesne in Eastington and 10s from the mill of Sutton (MS Glover B, fol. 110r–v; MS Cotton Claudius A. viii, fol. 118r).

[3a] In 1086 Thurstan fitz Rolf held 19 hides in Hardwick. The count of Mortain and Miles Crispin held a further three hides between them (DB, i. 146b, 150b, 151b; Bucks §§ 12, 11, 23, 24, 35, 2). The church at Hardwick is not mentioned in Domesday, but still today retains Anglo-Saxon work (Pevsner, *Bucks* (†1994), 371). If Winebald made a deed giving the church, it has not survived. Bishop Robert of Lincoln, at the request of Matthew de Ballon, Winebald’s son, confirmed Winebald’s gift of the church to the monks (D. M. Smith, *EEA* 1 *Lincoln* 1067–1185, 5–6, no. 5, copies at MS Glover B, fol. 110v; MS Cotton Claudius A. viii, fol. 118r). Whether this was Robert Bloet (1093–1123) or Robert de Chesney (1148–1166) is difficult to say. As Smith pointed out, the use of the first-person singular to some extent favours Bloet, which would mean a date during Winebald’s lifetime. Matthew, who does not otherwise appear, may have been rector of the church. Henry de Neufmarché’s deed, mentioned above, confirms the church and six virgates in Hardwick to the monks. The spurious general confirmations in the name of Henry I confirm the church, tithe, and three hides in Hardwick (H1/000 § 11, *Regesta* 1990; H1/000 § 6, *Regesta* 665).

[3b] In 1086 Thurstan fitz Rolf held Upton as a manor of five hides, reduced from ten hides in 1066, when it had been held by Brictric (DB, i. 63a; Berks § 55. 1). The lost cartulary copied Winebald’s deed, apparently made in 1128 or later, giving ‘c solidatas terre in Operatuna cum decima quam ibi prius habebant et cum terra Teocii post recessum illius; atque post hanc donacionem ab eisdem monachis habitum monachilem suscepi’ (MS Glover B, fol. 110v; MS Cotton Claudius A. viii, fol. 118r). Roger de Ballon, with the consent of his brother Miles, granted the monks the land of Teocius of

---

Upton, which his father Winebald had given (MS Glover B, fol. 111r). Hawise de Gournay confirmed that her husband Roger Ballon had given half of Upton to the monks, and that her son, another Roger Ballon, had given 100s land in Upton (MS Glover B, fol. 111r; MS Cotton Claudius A., viii, fol. 118v). The spurious general confirmations in the name of Henry I confirm the tithes of Upton (H1/000 § 12, Regesta 1990; H1/000 § 6, Regesta 665). In 1535 Bermondsey had let the manor for £14 annually (Valor, ii. 59a).

[3c] In 1086 Thurstan fitz Rolf held a manor of seven hides in Ampney [Crucis] (DB, i. 169c; Glos §§ 67. 1–2). Two acts of Henry I for Tewkesbury (000, 000, Regesta 497, 847) mention Winebald de Ballon’s gift of Ampney to that abbey, and a lost act of Henry II (H2/2588) warned Henry de Neufmarché not to vex the monks of Tewkesbury in their possession of Ampney, against the chirograph of Winebald de Ballon his grandfather. The church as well as the manor passed to Tewkesbury abbey. In 1139 × 1150 Simon, bishop of Worcester, confirmed to Tewkesbury ‘ecclesia de Amenel que fuit Winebaldi de Baalun cum pertinentiis suis’ (EEA 33 Worcester 1062–1185, 61, no. 85). A presentation to Ampney Crucis by the abbey is recorded in 1281 (Reg, Godfrey Giffard, 136). The church was appropriated to Tewkesbury by 1368 (VCH Glos, ii. 63b).

[3d] Eastington is not mentioned in Domesday, but was probably included under Fretherne, where Thurstan fitz Rolf held a manor of three hides (VCH Glos, x. 127; DB, i. 169d; Glos § 67. 7). Bermondsey had £1 annually from Eastington church in 1291 (Taxatio, 221a). A forged general confirmation in the name of Henry I includes ‘10 shillings in tithe from the demesne of Eastington, which Hamelin de Ballon gave’ (H1/000, Regesta 1990). Hamelin was presumably the son of Winebald de Ballon who witnessed his deed mentioned in § 3b above. The tithe of the demesne of Eastington was included in Henry de Neufmarché’s confirmation noted in § 3 above. At an uncertain date Reginald de Ballon, son of Reginald, confirmed to Bermondsey the gift of 10s from the tithe of the demesne of Eastington made by his grandfather Hamelin de Ballon (MS Glover B, fol. 112v; MS Cotton Claudius A., viii, fol. 119v).

[3e] Alvinton (Glos), where Thurstan fitz Rolf held a manor of six hides in 1086 (DB, i. 185d; Herefs § 17. 1; Glos § E 8). Parochial rights in Alvinton were later the subject of continued disputes between the priories of Lanthony and Tintern, but nothing is said of Bermondsey’s rights to tithes (VCH Glos, v. 13), which are not visible in the Taxatio of 1291. Alvinton is not mentioned in the Bermondsey annals.

[4] The gift of the tithe of Fyfield is confirmed in identical terms in 000 § 3, not in Regesta. A manor of 1½ hides in Fyfield was held by Roger of John fitz Waleran in 1086 (DB, ii. 84b; Essex § 40.6). The annals report under 1094: ‘Et etiam hoc anno Rogerus miles Iohannis filii Waleranni concedente eodem Iohanne dedit monachis de Bermundeseie decimas de Fihide quam donationem confirmauerunt Willelmus secundus et Henricus primus reges Anglie’ (Annales Monastici, iii. 428). Henry I’s general confirmation includes ‘the tithe of Fyfield’ but gives no details (H1/000 § 5, Regesta 665). Later Maud wife of Hasculf [de Tany], with her son Gralent, ‘pro anima Asculfi mariti mei’, gave Fyfield church to Bermondsey, thus suggesting to genealogists that Maud was daughter and heir of Roger (Sanders, English Baronies, 4). This cannot have been before 1130, as Hasculf de Tany was then living (PR 31 Henry I, 53, 56, 58, 60). The gift was confirmed by H(enry), bishop of Winchester (1129–1171) and by Henry II in 1154 × 1162 (H2/215), but was nevertheless entered under 1107 in the annals (Annales Monastici, 431). Gralent de Tany confirmed his mother’s gift with
the consent of Maud his wife and Hasculf his son. The younger Hasculf had succeeded by Michaelmas term 29 Henry II, 1183, when he made a fine with Bertram, prior of Bermondsey, concerning the advowson (MS Glover B, fol. 114r; MS Dodsworth 102, fol. 100v). Bermondsey had a ‘pensio cum portione’ of £4 out of Fyfield in 1535 (Valor, ii. 58b).


[6] In 1086 Peter, a burgess, held two hides in Hoddesdon of the king (DB, i. 142b; Herts § 42. 7). In the annals, under the year 1096, we read ‘Hoc anno Petrus de Sancto Olauo dedit terram de Hoddesdone monachis de Bermundeseye, quam donationem confirmauerunt Willelmus rex secundus et rex Henrici primus’ (Annales Monastici, iii. 429). The spurious general confirmation in the name of Henry I confirms two hides in Hoddesdon, but does not name the donor (H1/000 § 10, Regesta 665). J. A. Tregelles, A History of Hoddesdon in the County of Hertfordshire (Hertford, 1908), 58, 325 reports ‘but one allusion to it [sc. Bermondsey’s land] in the old court rolls, 3½ acres in Estfield (Rye) being noted in 1435 as belonging to Bermondsey’ and states further that Bermondsey held 5½ acres at the Dissolution. M. Carlin, Medieval Southwark (London, 1996), 86, associates Peter with the church of St Olave in Southwark, thereby proposing 1096 as the latest date for its foundation.

AUTHENTICITY: Clearly not a product of the royal chancery, but could it have been a contemporary beneficiary production? The act lacks the invocation of the Holy Trinity, the arenga, and the elaborate dating clause that are usual in diplomas. The address, Nouerit omnium fidelium posteritas, is similar to the address Nouerit fidelium sacra posteritas used in several La Charité documents of the late eleventh century, e.g. an act of Robert, count of Nevers and bishop of Auxerre, dated 1094 (Lespinasse, Cartulaire, 76–7, no. xxiii); an agreement between the monks of La Charité and Humbald Blancus and his brother Agano, dated 1089 (ibid. 92–3, no. xxxii); a charter of Hugh de Lurcy, dated March 1088 (ibid. 96–7, no. xxxiv); and a memorandum recording a gift by Archimbald de Lamenay to La Charité, dated 1089 (ibid. 101–4, no. xxxvii). A number of factors point to a date of compilation long after the reign of William II. There are parallels with Henry I’s general confirmation, H1/000, Regesta 665, a forgery containing chronological contradictions, is also attested by signa and lacks invocation, arenga and dating clause, with an address Noscat omnis fidelium sacra posteritas. There are other similarities of phrasing. William’s act has ‘cui ego successi in regno’, ‘ab omnibus rebus et consuetudinibus liberam et quietam’, where Henry’s has ‘cui ego in regno successi’, ‘quietam et liberam ab omnibus rebus et consuetunibus’. These suggest the two acts were drawn up at the same time. Only four acts of William II, whether authentic or not, are attested by his brother Henry. Henry’s approval of the transaction here, hec laudantis, is unique and indicates fabrication or inflation after his accession to the throne in 1100. The failure to mention Ailwin, except as symbolically handing over his church, suggests that the priory had already forgotten exactly what his contribution was.

00†  Purported charter confirming gifts of land in Little Hallingbury (Essex) and tithes in Alferton (in Great
Dunmow, Essex), Upton (Berks), Eastington (Glos) and Fyfield (Essex)

ANTIQUARY TRANSCRIPTS: London, College of Arms, MS Glover B (1586–7), fol. 113v [B]; BL Harley 4757 (s. xvii1/4), p. 19 (now fol. 11r) [from B].
PRINTERED: Not previously printed.
CALENDAR: Not in Regesta.


William by God’s grace king of the English to all his sworn men French and English of the realm of England greeting. Know that I have granted to St Saviour of Bermondsey [1] the land of Hallingbury and the tithe of Alfriston just as Geoffrey Martel with the consent of Geoffrey de Mandeville for his soul gave it to them [etc.] <*> [2] and the tithe of Upton, which Winebald de Ballon gave to them, similarly the tithe of Eastington, which Winebald’s knight Odo de Tiron gave [3] and the tithe of Fyfield, which John fitz Waleran’s knight Roger gave, the same John granting. [etc.] <*> Witness Robert earl of Northumberland and William Bainard and Ralph de Marcy.

DATE: The apparent date is after William II became king, 1087, and before the fall of the witness Robert de Mowbray, earl of Northumberland, in 1095. The Bermondsey annals date the gifts confirmed here to 1092, 1093, and 1094 (see Context). As with 000, Regesta 362, it is only the supposition that Bermondsey was founded in the reign of William II that causes this act to be assigned to William II rather than William I.
ADDRESS: To all sworn men, French and English, of the realm of England, an irregular form and an indication of forgery.
WITNESS: Robert de Mowbray, earl of Northumberland, attests two other acts of William II: a diploma of 1093 resolving a dispute between the archbishop of York and the bishop of Lincoln (000, Regesta 328), and an act for St Paul’s, London of 1093 × 1095 (000, Regesta 372c). William Bainard otherwise attests for William II only 000, Regesta 389a for Bermondsey. Ralph de Marcy was probably sheriff of London. He
was addressed, presumably in that capacity, by 000, Regesta 389a for Bermondsey and 000, Regesta 399a for St Paul’s.

PLACE: No place-date.

CONTEXT: The charter confirms a series of gifts to Bermondsey. Its text has been preserved only in a single abbreviated copy, so it is possible that further gifts were included in its original form. Two of the three gifts confirmed here are included in the so-called ‘foundation’ charter for Bermondsey, 000, Regesta 398.

[1] For Bermondsey’s manor of Monkbury in Little Hallingbury, see Morant, Essex, ii. 516b; for Alfriston, now called Bigods, in Great Dunmow, see ibid. ii. 425–6; PN Essex, 475–6; J. H. Round & W. R. Powell, ‘The counts of St Pol in Essex and Kent’, Essex Archaeology and History, 3rd ser. 27 (1996), 193–201, at pp. 197–8. In 1086 [Little] Hallingbury, Alfriston, and several other places in Essex were held by ‘Martel’ of Geoffrey de Mandeville. Geoffrey Martel appears elsewhere in Domesday as a tenant of Geoffrey de Mandeville: the names Martel and Geoffrey Martel may represent the same person (DB, ii. 60a, 61a; Essex §§ 30, 24, 31 and notes), or alternatively Geoffrey may have been Martel’s son. The Bermondsey annals date these gifts to 1093: ‘et eodem anno Galfridus Martel concessione Galfridi de Magnauilla dedit terram de Halyngbury et decimas de Alfertone. Que omnia confirmauerunt Willelmus rex secundus et Henrici regis’ (Annales Monastici, iii. 428). The general confirmation by Henry I, H1/000 § 3, Regesta 665, includes ‘unam hidam terre Halingberiam quam donauit Gaufridus Martil cum decima de Alferestona’. William de Mandeville, earl of Essex 1166–1189, confirmed the manor of Hallingbury to Bermondsey (MS Glover B, fol. 113v). By a fine of 1278 John prior of Bermondsey and John de Burgh agreed that the latter would not give, sell or otherwise alienate the manor of Alyngebyr’ in Essex (Essex Fines, ii. 24, no. 84). The monks’ property in Hallingbury was assessed at £9 16s 8d in 1535 (Valor, ii. 58b).

[2] For Winebald de Ballon’s gift in Upton (Berks) and Odo de Tirone’s in Eastington (Glos), see 000 § 3, Regesta 398.

[3] For Fyfield, see 000 § 4, Regesta 398.

AUTHENTICITY: Not authentic. The act is clearly intended to pass for a chancery production, so dei gratia and the address are out of place. The nature of the act, a confirmation of a series of gifts, is unusual in authentic chancery productions in William II’s time. There is no injunction, but this may have been omitted by the transcriber. The witness list appears to have been derived from names in 000, Regesta 389a, except that Robert earl of Northumberland has been substituted for Robert count of Meulan. In its abbreviated form it is difficult to discern the date and purpose of the forgery.