

THE
HEADS OF RELIGIOUS HOUSES
ENGLAND AND WALES

I

940–1216

Second edition

Edited by

DAVID KNOWLES

C. N. L. BROOKE

VERA C. M. LONDON

With new material by

C. N. L. BROOKE



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, VIC 3166, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa
<http://www.cambridge.org>

© Cambridge University Press 1972

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1972
Second edition 2001

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeface Monotype Ehrhardt 11/13 pt. *System* QuarkXPress™ [SE]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 0 521 80452 3 hardback

CONTENTS

<i>Preface (2001)</i>	page vii
<i>Preface (1972)</i>	viii
<i>List of manuscripts referred to</i>	xi
<i>List of printed books and articles cited, with abbreviated references</i>	xix
<i>List of other abbreviations</i>	xlvii

INTRODUCTION

I <i>The purpose and scope of this book</i>	1
II <i>The materials</i>	5
III <i>Special problems of the period 940–1066</i>	12
IV <i>The arrangement of the lists</i>	16

HEADS OF RELIGIOUS HOUSES: ENGLAND AND WALES 940–1216

THE BENEDICTINE HOUSES	21
INDEPENDENT HOUSES	23
DEPENDENCIES	85
ALIEN PRIORIES	99
THE CLUNIAC HOUSES	114
THE CISTERCIAN HOUSES	126
THE CARTHUSIAN MONKS	149
THE AUGUSTINIAN CANONS	150
THE PREMONSTRATENSIAN CANONS	192
THE GILBERTINE CANONS AND NUNS	200
THE NUNS	207

APPENDICES

I <i>Unidentified pre-Conquest abbots and abbesses</i>	225
II <i>Unidentified abbots and priors, after 1066</i>	228
III <i>List of pre-Conquest charters used</i>	229

CONTENTS

<i>Addendum (1972)</i>	238
<i>Corrigenda and Addenda</i>	239
<i>Additional Bibliography</i>	302
<i>Index of Heads</i>	310
<i>Index of Religious Houses</i>	350

INTRODUCTION

I. *The purpose and scope of this book*

This book aims at providing lists of all the known superiors of the religious houses that existed in England and Wales between 940 and 1216. The term religious house is understood as covering all establishments of monks, regular canons and nuns, whether of abbatial or lower rank and whether autonomous or dependent. Roughly speaking, therefore, it comprises all the houses existing between these dates that are listed in the relevant sections of *Medieval Religious Houses: England and Wales* – all, that is, save those of whose heads we know nothing – but the military orders are not included, nor are hospitals. Similarly, the groups of nuns staffing hospitals or serving guests or pilgrims on the outskirts of an abbey are not included unless they ranked as a religious community possessed of an income and domestic autonomy.

Four classes of establishment are represented: the autonomous abbey; the autonomous priory; the dependent priory with regular life; and smaller houses, priories or cells, whose exact status it is often difficult to define. Our lists make no claim to classify or divide the last group, as *Medieval Religious Houses* attempts to do; our concern is solely with the heads of all houses (save hospitals and the like) who are called in the documents abbots and priors. The exact distinction, in terms of authority and prestige, between the classes of abbots and priors, and the *raison d'être* of the status of a given house, are by no means as easy to define as might be expected. As a rule of thumb, Benedictine autonomous houses normally, but not always, had abbots, and size and wealth are a rough criterion; dependent houses are always priories, as were also Cluniac monasteries, however wealthy and important (e.g. Lewes). Cistercian monks and Premonstratensian canons, save in the rare cases of small dependencies, always had an abbot as superior. Augustinian canons, on the other hand, normally had priors, but during our period some 25 out of 180 had abbots, and though the majority of the abbeys are the largest and wealthiest houses (e.g. Cirencester), a few (e.g. Notley and Wigmore) are not. The reason for the distinction must often be sought in historical circumstances. It might be that a founder's intentions for endowment, upon which abbatial rank was assumed, failed to materialise. The Gilbertine canons had priors, but the head of the order, normally resident at Sempringham, was Master. Among the nuns a similar lack of uniformity prevailed. Abbesses were uncommon among Benedictine nuns save in the pre-Conquest houses; they are scanty among the

INTRODUCTION

Austin (Augustinian) canonesses, rare among the Cistercians and non-existent among the Premonstratensians. Sometimes the status of the house changed; more often, especially among the Austin canons, contemporaries used the wrong term. In any case, our lists record status; we do not ordinarily explain it.

The contents of our lists are explained in detail on pp. 16–20. We took *c.* 940 as the year when monastic life was revived in England by Dunstan at Glastonbury. For practical purposes of chronology, King John's death in 1216 is the most convenient date in the early thirteenth century; it was chosen also because the years round about mark an epoch in the history of the religious orders. The Fourth Lateran Council in the previous year (1215), the death of Innocent III (1216) and the birth of the two orders of friars all help to change the picture. From about that date, too, the survival of so many governmental and episcopal records and other religious documents give more plentiful information, and render many of the lists of superiors already in print fuller and more reliable.

The value of such lists, which vary in completeness, will be clear at once to a practising medievalist. Many events, great and small, bear no date in the normal narrative sources, but can often be dated, at least within a few years, by charters of foundation, of gifts, and of agreements. There is a mass of undated charters in this period; but they were usually witnessed or approved by a group of worthies, varying in dignity according to the importance of the occasion, and often containing heads of neighbouring monasteries. If the limiting dates of the term of office or life of one or more of these is known, and if also some names are common to other similar documents, the date of compilation of the document itself can often be ascertained within a narrow margin. This in turn may give us greater precision for a totally different occasion, and so a mass of information gradually builds up for the whole period. There are many other uses of these lists. Thus, taken as a whole, they will present for the first time a record as full as the evidence allows of the number and provenance of superiors from overseas in English houses from *c.* 1050 onwards. They reveal cases of pluralism, and of the practice in some orders of an able superior passing through several houses. They show the gradual elimination of superiors of Anglo-Saxon nationality or nomenclature; and also the affiliations of the early houses of Austin canons. Indeed, all precise factual information extends our knowledge of a religious community, and on the lowest and widest level there is a satisfaction in knowing what abbot was ruling a house when this or that event or building took place, and in being able to see his relationship in the past to this or another community. A medievalist will find in these lists many a glimpse of the world that he is trying to recover and to understand. The bare statement

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

that many Norman and French abbots were appointed to English monasteries may be illuminated by a glance at three or four of the greatest houses.

Westminster from 1076 to *c.* 1158 had the following abbots: Geoffrey, an unsuccessful Norman; Vitalis, a monk of Fécamp and abbot of Bernay; Gilbert Crispin the writer, a monk of Bec; Herbert, a monk of Westminster of unknown origin; and Gervase of Blois, a natural son of King Stephen, deposed *c.* 1158. Glastonbury between *c.* 1081/2 and 1171 had the following: Thurstan, a monk of Caen; Herluin, another monk from Caen; Seffrid, a monk of Séez; Henry of Blois, the royal Cluniac, who held the abbacy for forty-five years, putting in as prior Robert, a Cluniac from Lewes. St Albans between 1077 and 1166 had: Paul, a monk of Caen and a nephew of Lanfranc; Richard, of Norman (possibly baronial) family; Geoffrey de Gorrion, another Norman of baronial family; Ralph, an Englishman; and Robert de Gorrion, a nephew of Geoffrey. Peterborough, from 1069 to 1155 had: Turolde, a warlike monk of Fécamp moved from Malmesbury to contain Hereward; Matthew, a monk of Mont-S.-Michel; Ernulf, a monk of Beauvais, before becoming prior of Canterbury; John, a monk of Séez; Henry of Poitou, monk and prior of Cluny, bishop-elect of several sees and an ecclesiastical adventurer on a unique scale; and Martin, a monk of Bec and prior of St Neots. Some such pattern can be found in many of the monasteries and in almost every case the line of overseas abbots came to an end in the first half of the reign of Henry II, which implies that appointments from abroad lessened during the latter half of the reign of Stephen.

A few houses stand out as particularly fortunate or unlucky in their superiors. In the first class stands St Albans. During the whole of our period after the arrival of Abbot Paul in 1077 the house was governed by a succession of men who, whatever may have been their personal failings as seen through the eyes of critical chroniclers, were individuals of personality who were also monks by vocation. At the other extreme the equally wealthy and celebrated abbey of Glastonbury had a series of irregular happenings. After the deposition of the last English abbot by Lanfranc in 1078, the house was ruled on and off for twenty years by the tactless and ruthless Thurstan. Then, after twenty-five years of regular rule, broken at least once for some years by a long vacancy, the monks had for forty-five years as titular abbot the magnificent Henry of Blois, bishop of Winchester. Henry doubtless kept the place solvent, under a Cluniac prior, but it is perhaps no accident that the history of the house is virtually a blank for those years. Henry's death was followed by a vacancy of eighteen months, and another vacancy extending over nine years occurred soon after. Finally, in the last decades of our period, Glastonbury was harassed by the attempts, temporarily successful, of Bishop Savaric to engross the abbey.

INTRODUCTION

Somewhat unexpectedly, a summary glance at a number of houses shows that many abbots were long-lived. Given the common disinclination of a conservative community to elect a young man this is somewhat surprising, yet for many of the largest houses there were no more than eight or ten abbacies between the first appointment after the Conquest and the end of John's reign, giving an average tenure of over twelve years. This figure, however, is modest compared with the still more striking figure of eighteen years, the average for bishops of the age. These figures are a warning that the frequent emphasis by historians on the short expectation of life in the middle ages is only valid with certain qualifications; but on the other hand we must remember that in both classes of appointment there were numerous intermissions of a year or even longer between a demise and the subsequent appointment.

The term of office of cathedral priors was notably shorter than that of abbots, as may be seen at a glance at the two large Canterbury houses. The priors lacked the cachet bestowed in the abbatial blessing, which grew liturgically till it resembled an episcopal consecration, and had not, like an abbot, security for life. They were vulnerable to domestic revolts and to episcopal acts of power, and resignations and depositions were not rare. In addition they were candidates ready to hand for abbeys in search of a superior; Winchester in particular lost several of its priors in this way. Finally, a popular prior was the obvious choice for the monks who formed the chapter of their cathedral and though several such choices were refused by the king or other interested parties, one would now and again get home.

Equally short, in some cases, was the term of office of a Cluniac prior. In some cases, this was because the abbot of Cluny, or some mediate superior, replaced the priors from time to time; it was also because the leading Cluniac houses, Bermondsey and Lewes in particular, were favourite recruiting grounds from which abbots were taken to Reading, Faversham, Evesham, Glastonbury and even further afield. The list for Bermondsey has a special interest, since it raises too in an extreme form the critical problem of how the house preserved its records. The relation between these lists and the documents is discussed on pp. 6-7; cf. pp. 114ff., 266-7.

We give here deliberately only a selection of some of the points which may be noted in the lists: our purpose is to offer them for others' use, not to anticipate what that use may be. Clearly the compilation of such lists provides many aperçus into social and religious history, and the most substantial ground for a survey of monastic recruitment in the period. It also reveals points of interest which may not be anticipated. Thus at first sight the Gilbertine Order gives only lists of names of men who can never (save the founder himself, St Gilbert of Sempringham) be more than names. But the repetition of the same names

MATERIALS

in different lists – including some of exceptional rarity – suggests that it was a common practice to move a prior from house to house after a few years (p. 200; cf. p. 289), and that this was done on a scale without parallel elsewhere.

The Cistercians, who did not spread widely over England until the fifth decade of the twelfth century, show generally no influx of overseas superiors after the first abbot of a colony from the continent. Here the chief interest of the lists is to reveal the progress of a successful abbot from house to house, or the frequency of elections of a stranger, often a sign that the abbey, or a visiting abbot, felt the need of new blood.

Among the Austin canons, the provenance of priors or abbots sometimes gives welcome evidence of the filiation of one house from another. It shows also, as we have seen with the black monks, that certain houses were more distinguished or fortunate than others. Thus the London priory of Aldgate had a succession of long-lived priors who were also theologians and chroniclers of note. Dunstable, Merton and St Osyth's (Essex) were equally distinguished, and a prior of the last-named became archbishop of Canterbury in 1123. The imagination lingers over the name of Andrew of St Victor, a celebrated biblical scholar of English birth, who had two spells of office at Wigmore, deep in rural Herefordshire. His presence is partly explained by the interest previously taken in Wigmore by the bishop of Hereford, Robert of Bethune, a distinguished teacher, but it is one more instance of the cultural unity of western Europe in this century.

II. *The materials*

At one time it was fashionable to argue about the relative merits of the chronicle and the charter as historical evidence: some scholars held up the charter to our admiration as an authentic, contemporary and objective witness; the chronicle as biased, subjective, liable to every wind of human error. The contrast no longer seems so clear: the authenticity of the charter is a matter for investigation, not assertion; it often needs careful interpretation; contrariwise, it has always been recognised that chronicles and annals contain a mass of authentic information.¹ Every kind of evidence is grist to the historian's mill: none of it can be accepted without critical enquiry. The lists contained in this book are based mainly on the evidence of chronicles and annals and charters; with copious help from obituaries and calendars, and occasional help from mortuary rolls, saints' lives, biographies, inscriptions, and other evidence. No

¹ See especially the wise comments of C. R. Cheney, *The Records of Medieval England* (Cambridge, 1956). Reference for individual chronicles, and, in some cases, discussion of their value, are given at the head of the lists. For a general survey of monastic chronicles, see the forthcoming book by Mrs A. Gransden [1974].

INTRODUCTION

detailed study of the nature of each type of evidence can be attempted here; but a brief analysis of the problems of using chronicle, calendar and charter evidence is a necessary introduction to the lists themselves; and the pre-Conquest sections, though not a large part of the whole, raise peculiar problems and demand a special explanation, which will be given in section III.

Monastic communities had long and tenacious memories. A fifteenth-century chronicle can retail entirely reliable information about eleventh-century abbots. Unfortunately, it can also, obviously enough, provide entirely unreliable evidence, and it can be a delicate matter to decide the status of many late entries. It is clear that there is a world of difference between the value of a contemporary entry in one of the eleventh-century versions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and the fifteenth-century annals of Bermondsey, which Rose Graham investigated in a well-known article and rejected altogether as evidence.¹ To help distinguish the value of local chronicles a note is given, where appropriate, of the date (and sometimes the nature) of these at the head of the lists. Where appropriate, we also note useful discussions of chronicles of wider range in the bibliography. But in many cases judgement is more subtle and difficult than this, and the present book can be no substitute for a critical survey of monastic annals.

Miss Graham's strictures on the Bermondsey annals were primarily due to the hopeless discrepancies between their lists of priors of Bermondsey and other evidence, especially for the thirteenth century; and the inveterate habit of the scribe who compiled them of converting one prior into two or three. Further study has established the fact that they are more reliable for the eleventh and twelfth centuries than for the thirteenth and fourteenth. This is at first sight paradoxical; but a little reflection readily explains how this can happen, and there are indeed several analogies. The author of the annals (if he can be dignified by the word) made incompetent use of varied materials: he seems to have worked from a mixture of earlier annals and lists of priors. It seems likely that there was an early and good set of annals which provided less opportunity for error in the period down to *c.* 1200 than the later material. Even in the twelfth century there is a slight tendency to multiply priors, and we have relegated obvious duplicates to footnotes; we have also indicated clearly where dates or names depend wholly on the annals; but with the aid of other evidence and by making judicious use of the annals a reliable list for the period can be compiled.

We are on safer ground with the Evesham and the Gloucester chronicles. The Evesham chronicle as we have it was compiled by Thomas of Marlborough at the outset of the thirteenth century; but it has been shown that the section relating to the eminent Abbot Æthelwig in the mid-eleventh century is a notice written perhaps by Prior Dominic *c.* 1110 and incorporated in the later compi-

¹ See p. 114; but see also pp. 266-7.

lation. For Gloucester we have thirteenth and early fifteenth-century witnesses from which an excellent contemporary record of the late eleventh and twelfth centuries can be reconstructed with some confidence, although the reconstruction is complicated by the fact that the Gloucester chronicle bore some relation to the spider's web of west country annals with its centre in John of Worcester's compilation.¹

These chronicles and their satellites provide information locally preserved of local abbots. There is abundant evidence that it was normal for monastic houses to be well provided with records of this kind, even though later scribes might quite often misunderstand the evidence before them. There are occasional astonishing lapses. Thus St Albans, famous for its historical tradition in the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries, seems to have retained only the haziest memory of its pre-Conquest history,² a memory perhaps affected by loss of documents (a common difficulty, made worse in many cases for the modern scholar by the practice of filling the gaps by fabrication), perhaps too by controversy as to the situation of St Alban's relics. The converse of this is the case of a chronicler like William of Malmesbury, who was interested in many houses, and whose *Gesta Pontificum* contains a wealth of information which almost makes us claim him as a fellow-author of this book.

Even William offers difficulties. If the scribe at Bermondsey was careless, William, in a sense, was too scholarly. Armitage Robinson showed³ that Hearne's edition of the *De Antiquitate* of Glastonbury represented an interpolated and confused version of what William wrote; and even when allowance has been made for this, that William had dated the pre-Conquest abbots, not in the main from annals, but by comparison of an earlier list of abbots with dated charters, often of doubtful authenticity. William's book represents a peak in historical research for its period; but his results are commonly of little critical value. Where the charters survive, however, they can be used directly; and it is possible to deduce the list of abbots with which he worked and compare it with an earlier surviving version, of the late tenth century.

Lists of abbots and priors are common; they provide valuable but treacherous evidence: treacherous, because they brought out the worst in careless scribes, because we often do not know how they were compiled, and because the chronological data can be ambiguous. The practice of keeping lists of kings and bishops, sometimes with notes of the length of their reigns, was ancient, and king-lists formed the most important chronological foundations for Bede's *Historia*.⁴ Many surviving lists of monastic superiors were based on notes made

¹ See R. R. Darlington in *EHR*, XLVIII (1933), 1–10; *MO*, pp. 704–5 (Evesham); on Ch. Gloucester, see p. 52; also R. R. Darlington in *WMVW*, pp. xvff., on John of Worcester [and John W., II and III].

² See pp. 64 ff. ³ J. A. Robinson (1921), chaps. I, II.

⁴ See D. P. Kirby in *EHR*, LXXVIII (1963), 514–27, and references cited; W. Levison, 'Bede as Historian', in *Bede, his Life, Times and Writings*, ed. A. Hamilton Thompson (Oxford, 1935), pp. 111–51, esp. p. 130.

INTRODUCTION

from time to time as abbots came and went, and are as reliable as contemporary annals. Commonly, however, they were not kept up consistently, and gaps were left, or were filled from memory or conjecture; or by injudicious use of the monastic calendars. Thus the fourteenth-century list of the abbots of Furness seems to have been drawn at conjecture from a calendar or obituary, and its early sections contain duplications, or abbots (maybe) of other houses, or abbots of Furness of other centuries. The order of abbots is of almost no authority, and can never be accepted without other evidence. The abbatial list for Fountains in the fifteenth-century 'President Book', however, contains precise information of the years, months and days of each abbacy, and it has been shown that in the large majority of cases they are precisely right;¹ though only if one appreciates that the list works on two eccentric principles: that a month is not a calendar month but a period of 28 days, and that each reign is calculated from the previous abbot's death, as if no vacancies occurred. This list implies a warning: the author was evidently a mathematician of some competence who took pains to make his data consistent. The scribes of many lists were content to copy entries written at different times and on different assumptions; and they normally failed to check if the numbers they quoted added up correctly. Furness and Fountains represent the extremes: every list has to be judged on its own merits – its date, source, relation to other evidence, and to any indication one can find of its authors' access to sound materials.

A useful supplement to the evidence of annals and lists is provided by entries in calendars and obituaries. Occasionally they give years as well as days of death; but for the most part they give (in their nature) only months and days; since liturgical books were more readily discarded than chronicles and charters, they had less chance of survival and are, comparatively speaking, rare; and with bare names – especially for the late Saxon period or the early Norman when a handful of English or Scandinavian and French names made up the modest range of choice brought to the font – identification can be hazardous. But obits have one great advantage over entries of day and month of death in chronicles, and that is that they are less subject to the major vagaries of scribal error. Within a few days they can seldom be relied on to be precise: the lists in this book provide copious examples of obits recorded over the range of several days. The calendar, strictly speaking, recorded when a man was minded, not when he died; and liturgical convenience, space in the calendar, scribal care or the reverse dictated within limits where the name was placed. There are a few cases in which a bishop (for one reason or another) was commemorated at quite a different time of year from his death; but in these lists, out of very numerous

¹ See note on p. 132.

MATERIALS

cases in which we can check a calendar or the like against other evidence, there are only a handful of discrepancies of more than a few days, and these seem mostly due to scribal error – in the majority of cases in the chronicle. St Francis of Assisi died on 3 October 1226 – though towards midnight; but he was immediately, and universally, commemorated on 4 October. We can never assume, unless we have the most precise information (as in Francis's case) from other sources, that we know the exact day of a man's death; nor would medieval computations of midnight satisfy a modern chronologer. Nor again can we assume that entries in chronicles (where no scribal error has altered the month or changed 'ides' to 'nones') are more reliable than entries in calendars, since clearly the former were often based on the latter. The editors of this book have therefore felt that it was misleading to draw too sharp a distinction between evidence drawn from chronicles and obituaries, and have used the shorthand 'd.' = 'died', rather than some periphrasis, with calendar evidence;¹ this is one of many cases where the shorthand used in lists of this kind can itself mislead unless interpreted in the light of the type of evidence available.

For all its inequalities and the problems that it raises, the evidence of chronicles, annals, abbatial lists and other directly chronological materials provides the bone structure on which lists of this kind must be based. The most copious sources of names for these lists are charters, but between 1066 and 1200 charters are commonly undated, and twenty or thirty charters may not tell us as much as one soundly based annal. Episcopal charters were not commonly dated in the twelfth century; private charters seldom before the reign of Edward I, and not regularly until the time of Edward II. At the very end of our period royal writs and charters began to be regularly dated, and dated final concords first appeared and then became prolific. The early chancery rolls, early collections of fines, and the one bishop's 'register' – the roll of Hugh of Wells, bishop of Lincoln – to survive from our period, are a very fruitful source of precisely dated information for the closing decades. For the rest, the copious evidence of charters can only be used when the charters have been interpreted and dated.

These processes are full of hazards. Forgery was common in the twelfth century, and far from unknown in the centuries which followed.² Fortunately one may reasonably presume of the large majority of the charters used in this book that they are not in any ordinary sense forgeries. To use them for the present purpose, however, it is necessary also to assume, broadly speaking, that all the witnesses were alive when the transaction described took place; that a

¹ The alternative is the practice of the new *Le Neve*, of using the word 'commemorated': this is unobjectionable, although it may suggest a degree of scepticism not justified by the evidence, and would add somewhat to the length of entries in lists of monastic superiors where such evidence is copious.

² For a general survey, with bibliography, *GF*, chap. viii, see also Brooke in *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, III (1965–9), 377–86.

INTRODUCTION

man will be called 'bone memorie' when he is dead; 'quondam' when he has resigned his office; that whether he be earl or abbot or archdeacon, a man will be given his title if he has one, but cannot be given it before it was inherited or earned. On such assumptions one must work if charters are to be dated at all; but none of them is watertight. We rarely know what relation a twelfth-century charter bore to the transaction it described. It is a reasonable assumption that it was normally written very soon after, and when the symbolic act of a grant or the like took the form of laying a charter on the altar, the charter must already have been written. But there are cases, especially the monastic foundation charters studied by Professor Galbraith in a well-known article, in which 'authentic' charters were drawn up years after the event, with many anachronisms.¹ We have almost no information as to how witness lists were compiled: thirteenth-century evidence shows that witnesses did not necessarily have to be present at any stage in the transaction;² the formulas used in the twelfth century and the precision with which the witnesses to particular stages in a transaction are sometimes noted, suggest the normal assumption of physical presence. Even so, there is plenty of room for error – scribal error in later copies, and even from time to time errors made by scribes in originals. Unfortunately, charters were often written after the event, and always written with the idea that they would be read by posterity; thus a living pope may be called 'beate memorie';^{3*} a royal clerk who collected patronage might frequently witness royal charters without any reference to his archdeaconry – while his neighbour, also an habitual absentee, could be regularly given his title. When a charter was drawn up later than the event it described, anachronisms could enter in, and a man might appear to have received a title some years before the accepted date. Finally, in the early twelfth century, surprising though it seems, it has been shown⁴ that the title 'comes' was commonly left out even with men whose earldom was perfectly well recognized; and in Stephen's reign, when the use of the title was becoming more stable, its tenure was often in dispute.

It is a delicate matter to balance the probabilities in using these criteria. Some must be ignored: the pious aim of a charter can be expressed as 'pro salute anime' of a donor's family and overlords; or 'pro anima'; no doubt there was a tendency to use the latter formula for the dead, the former for the living. The exceptions were too numerous for this criterion ever to be used.⁵ Similarly, the appearance or absence of 'comes' down to the death of Henry I gives no reliable guidance. On the other hand abuse of 'bone memorie' seems to have been rare;

¹ *Cambridge Historical Journal*, IV, iii (1934), 205–22, 296–8.

² See the well-known document quoted e.g. by J. C. Russell in *Speculum*, XV (1940), 492–3.

³ Innocent II is 'beate memorie' in an original of *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum*, II, no. 1687 (CCXLVIII). Cf. Brooke in *EHR*, LXXII (1957), 690 where a later date for the text is suggested; but see P. Chaplais in *EHR*, LXXV (1960), 266, who shows it to be the work of a chancery scribe. See, however, *Reg.* III, p. xiii and n.

⁴ By Sir Charles Clay, *EYC*, VIII, pp. 46–7.

⁵ See *idem*, *EYC*, IV, pp. xxvii–xxx.

MATERIALS

and it is sometimes possible to deduce whether a particular charter is likely or most unlikely to contain informalities or anachronisms of this kind. A charter which names Peter of Blois but not his archdeaconry may safely be dated before he acquired it – when that happened is not so easily determined;¹ no such criterion works with William de Sainte-Mère-Eglise until he becomes a bishop. Problems abound; hopeless inconsistencies are, however, comparatively rare. There is a document naming Richard de Belmeis II, bishop of London, as dean of St Alcmund's Shrewsbury, but not as bishop, and on its date turn the dates of several Shropshire and Staffordshire dignitaries; it seems probable that he was already bishop when it was drawn up, and if so, it is in our experience a unique case of a bishop not carrying his order. Fortunately, such lapses are rare.²

Fortunately, too, much of the spade work has already been done. The work of many scholars, from Bishop Stubbs to Professor Cheney, makes the lists of bishops in the *Handbook of British Chronology* (2nd edn.) thoroughly reliable; the same work contains lists of earls and other magnates distilled from the *Complete Peerage*. The new Le Neve has now embarked on the period before 1300: the volumes for the London diocese and the monastic cathedrals have appeared, and close collaboration beyond the printed page has happily been possible. Many of our lists are obviously based on the work of other scholars.³ We are surrounded by a cloud of witness in our study of twelfth-century chronology. This does not mean that we have abdicated responsibility: the date proposed for a charter in our lists has in every case been checked.⁴ Many will be subsequently improved by other scholars; all are offered with the provisos implicit in this survey of the problems of twelfth-century chronology. None the less, the dating of charters is not a morass: so far as they go, with all allowance for error, we believe that most of our dates are tolerably reliable.

In this survey, many incidental sources of evidence, many sources of truth and error, have been omitted; they will speak for themselves as they appear in the lists. As a final instance of a document peculiarly reliable, if discreetly handled, yet occasionally most misleading, the Pipe Rolls have a special claim to be selected. The central contemporary records of the Exchequer, virtually complete from 1155,⁵ carry many references to the revenues of vacant monastic houses which were tenants in chief; and these entries often specify the

¹ See J. A. Robinson (1921), pp. 113–14, corrected by E. Cohn in *EHR*, xli (1926), 58f. In very numerous cases Peter witnesses charters of Archbishop Richard of Canterbury with William of Northolt, archdeacon of Gloucester. In all that we have seen they are always either both without title or both archdeacons. This confirms the date *c.* 1177 for Peter's promotion (for William, see *GF*, p. 284; Le Neve, revised edn., II, 107). ² See *Mon.*, VI, 263.

³ See pp. ix–x, 17 on Sir Charles Clay and others who have particularly helped us; the *EYC* has also provided extensive help in dating charters, both from its notes on documents and from its exceptionally helpful notes on lay barons and knights of the twelfth century. ⁴ See pp. 18–19.

⁵ The series of Pipe Rolls includes, of course, an isolated survivor from 1130. The sifting of the early Pipe Rolls was one of Z. N. Brooke's many contributions to the book.

INTRODUCTION

approximate length of the vacancy. They cannot be used as negative evidence: a vacant house could be administered without any direct reference in the Pipe Roll. But the positive evidence is exceedingly reliable. Yet even the Pipe Rolls lay traps for the historian. Some are well known. A debt may be recorded year after year, even after the debtor has died. Somewhere in the series 'sed mortuus est' may appear; but even this can be a scribe's error and if correct may first be noted some years after the event. Such traps rarely affect records of vacancies, but they may affect mentions of apparently living abbots and priors. The oddest error, noted independently by Professor Finberg and the late Professor Z. N. Brooke, is due neither to the normal conventions of the Exchequer nor to carelessness. About 1158 Walter, abbot of Tavistock, died; yet years later his name continued to appear on the Pipe Rolls, not only in relation to old transactions, but to new scutages, thought of long after his death. This may have originated in an error: it is clear that in the long run it became a standing joke among the Exchequer clerks – if an abbot of Tavistock was mentioned, he must be called 'Walter'.

Even Exchequer clerks were human; and even in sifting such apparently mechanical materials as make up these lists, the final lesson of diplomatic has always to be borne in mind: that all our documents were the products of human agency; they are subject to human error and to the human circumstances which produced them.

III. *Special problems of the period 940–1066*

We have started our lists in 940; and this has involved us in facing the special problems of pre-Conquest evidence. We would like, however, to say at the outset that this is also a field admirably prepared by a succession of scholars – and that without the foundations laid long ago by W. G. Searle, and more recently in such works as Professor Whitelock's *Anglo-Saxon Wills*, Miss Robertson's *Anglo-Saxon Charters* and Miss Harmer's *Anglo-Saxon Writs*, this part of our enterprise would have been exceedingly hazardous and far more difficult.

The long lists of signatories to Anglo-Saxon diplomas give many names of abbots. In all but a handful the abbey is not named; in many cases the abbeys cannot be identified, or identified with anything approaching certainty; in numerous cases the authenticity of the diploma is questionable. Since a substantial amount of vital information has to be taken from these documents, the entries for pre-Conquest abbots have both to be more elaborate and to use a different formula from the rest of our lists. Chronicle and other precise evidence is given as elsewhere; likely identifications in the charters follow, covered

by a variety of phrases such as ‘presumably’, ‘probably’ and ‘possibly’. We have tried to be generous in giving cross-references to other abbots with whom confusion is possible or easy; and unidentified abbots and abbesses are gathered in Appendix I – which does not, however, include abbots identified with any degree of probability in the main lists.

To state in every case where a charter is used the extent of our faith in it would be quite impractical; it is equally impossible, however, to cite the diplomas without any discrimination between them. We have therefore included in Appendix III a list of all the diplomas to which reference has been made. For a number of years one of us has kept a note-book with references to serious discussions of the authenticity of pre-Conquest charters; recently Professor P. H. Sawyer has put all students of such documents heavily in his debt by publishing his *Anglo-Saxon Charters: an annotated List and Bibliography*;¹ and by his kindness we were able to study the book in proof, and with its aid very much to simplify Appendix III. *Anglo-Saxon Charters* is the first step towards the full new edition of the collections by Kemble and Birch which is now under way. This will take many years; in the meantime Professor Sawyer’s book has made it possible for us to check in a large majority of cases one or more of the best manuscripts of the charters we use, so that our lists are not dependent on Kemble’s or Birch’s texts; and also to be sure that we had made a tolerably full inspection of known charters not printed by either.²

It is now widely recognised that authenticity is not simply a matter of distinguishing genuine from forged, but of establishing the status of a particular text in a much wider and subtler range of possibilities. In the present state of knowledge, it would be impossible to describe the precise status as evidence of all the charters we have used: many have not been subjected to detailed analysis by experts, and for those which have there is a range of possibilities – from outright forgery, through interpolation or tendentious alteration, to innocent re-writing and careless copying – and a range of disagreement which would make any attempt at a sophisticated indication within our lists meaningless. It would be unduly sceptical, however, to claim on this account that there was no merit in constructing such lists: the cumulative effect of most of the information given here is tolerably reliable; and we hope that as an analysis and index of the material we have sifted, our lists may help in clearing the ground for the new edition and fuller analysis of the charters which is to come.

Our task is at once complicated and simplified by the fact that our concern

¹ Royal Historical Society Guides and Handbooks, no. 8, 1968.

² We have referred throughout – save for documents in *AS Chts.*, *AS Wills* and *AS Writs* – to Kemble and Birch, since these remain the most accessible *corpora*; we note in Appendix III which texts have in fact been used. Where a reliable modern edition exists, this has of course been followed.

INTRODUCTION

is not primarily with the authenticity of the charters in the full sense, but with the reliability of their lists of *signa*. It is clearly true that we shall have most confidence in *signa* from an authentic original,¹ and that we shall always be uneasy about using *signa* from a document known to have been forged or rewritten. But it is clear that in many cases a forger used a genuine list of *signa*; and it is a theoretical possibility that the scribe of an original – who in pre-Conquest England invariably (so far as our information goes) wrote all the *signa* himself – could be more careless than a later forger copying the work of a better scribe. This means that every list must be considered on its merits; and since many of them are very long – and the chronological data for the bishops especially is relatively copious – we can reckon to have fair confidence in any list which cannot be proved to be chronologically inconsistent; and this has been our main criterion, although we have naturally placed more reliance on documents probably genuine than on those probably forged. Inconsistency can take two forms: the accumulation of names clearly not contemporary with one another, and the appearance of one or two signatories dead or not yet in office at the time when the bulk of the *signa* could reasonably have been gathered. The first case usually occurs in arrant forgeries, and they have been little used here – occasional reference is made to such lists, to establish that a particular name occurred among the materials available to eleventh- and twelfth-century forgers, which doubtless included much genuine evidence not now surviving. In the more numerous cases where there are minor discrepancies in long lists of *signa*, it is clear that an early, genuine list of some sort must lie behind the document as we have it: no forger could or would have reconstructed such lists with so near an approximation to consistency, before the publication of Kemble's *Codex*, without in the main using earlier lists. On these lists we can rely in a general way; but not, of course, in detail when they can be shown to be faulty in detail. In such cases we put a query before the date in our lists.

Two qualifications, however, need to be emphasised. First, we have almost no information as to how lists of *signa* were compiled; but since *diplomata* could clearly be drawn up some time after the events they described, we need not be unduly surprised by the occasional occurrence in an apparently authentic list of a minor anachronism. This is, however, a hazard quite distinct from the practice of some medieval scribes of giving artistic verisimilitude to a list by adding a few names from other documents – which is the probable explanation of some of the minor inconsistencies, and perhaps of a few of the major.

The second relates to our criterion of consistency. Broadly speaking, this is based on the lists of bishops, who can usually be identified and dated with more

¹ On the meaning of the word in this context, see Chaplais (1965), (1968). On the general problem of authenticity, see esp. *AS Writs*; Whitelock in *EHD*, I, 337ff.

precision than the abbots – though princes, ealdormen, earls and thegns can help; and we have of course made use of the abbots themselves wherever possible. But since abbots are very rarely, and bishops comparatively rarely, given the titles of their abbeys and sees in authentic documents, the basis of evidence is somewhat less than might at first appear. We have to assume, too, that we know the dates of bishops: for this purpose, we have used the evidence cited in Searle's *Anglo-Saxon Bishops, Kings and Nobles*, revised by modern studies, where they exist – such as Armitage Robinson's *Saxon Bishops of Wells*, and the notes to *AS Chts., Wills and Writs* – and corrected by our own observations. In due course these lists will be further revised, and this will affect our work; but we hope in the process our own lists may be of some use. The criterion of consistency is further weakened by the possibility of abbeys, and even bishoprics, having two heads at a time. There is no doubt that some abbeys had two abbots simultaneously, especially in those cases where a great monastic paladin like Leofric of Peterborough had accumulated offices under his hand: the evidence is discussed at length in our list for Bath, the best-documented example. There are three cases in this period in which there is reason to suspect that a see had two bishops. A Bishop Wulfric of unidentified see occurs from 958 to 970.¹ He may have been an assistant to another bishop, or to an archbishop, like Siward of Abingdon, assistant (later called 'chorepiscopus') to the archbishop of Canterbury, 1044–8; his existence seems clearly proved and he has not been used to bring charters into question. The third example is the puzzling case of Bishop Brihtwine. This name occurs in the bishops' lists of both Sherborne (twice) and Wells in the early eleventh century, although there is hardly space in the Wells list for such a bishop. William of Malmesbury makes two bishops of Wells, Brihtwine and Æthelwine, play Cox and Box – each twice ejected, twice restored – in a manner which is hardly credible;² and Armitage Robinson suggested that Brihtwine of Wells was due to confusion between Brihtwine of Sherborne and Brihtwig of Wells. It seems clear that Sherborne had two bishops of the name: the first occ. 1018–22, the second 1031–45; the presence of the shadowy Brihtwine of Wells in the episcopal list of Wells and in William of Malmesbury may indicate a tradition that the bishop of Sherborne had acted as coadjutor in the neighbouring see. Whatever the explanation, Brihtwine's *signum* can neither be used to call a charter in question nor to lend precision to its date.

In preparing these lists we have wandered among the manuscripts to a fair degree; but not sufficiently, nor with sufficient philological knowledge, to have any independent or precise information to offer about the spelling of

¹ See below, p. 230, n. 1.

² *WMGP*, p. 194; cf. Robinson (1918), pp. 68–9.

INTRODUCTION

pre-Conquest abbots. We have followed the advice and the practice of recent experts in this field, and only occasionally have we thought it right to indicate early variants. Although variants are very numerous, the confusion they cause cannot be cleared up by mere lists, and it would be a very elaborate exercise to distinguish those which come from early texts and those due to the corruptions and changes of later centuries. We believe that for present, practical purposes the reasonably intelligible, normal spellings we use are best for the purpose; but it is essential for anyone using these lists for detailed research to be aware of the confusions that easily arise; in particular, that some names normally distinct – such as Æthelric and Ælric, Æthelwine and Ælfwine – may be treated by scribes as a single name, especially in late and poor texts.

IV. *The arrangement of the lists*

It should be emphasised at the outset that complete consistency in the layout of the entries in each list proved neither desirable nor possible. Within each list the abbots or priors are in chronological order, wherever this is known; within each entry the occurrences etc. are normally in chronological order. But there are many cases where the order is not precisely known; where the nature of the evidence or convenience of reference demands some grouping of items. Thus many houses have chronicles whose evidence is most conveniently summarised at the beginning of each entry; many have abbatial lists giving the numbers of years of an abbot's tenure: this can sometimes be explained only if evidence for accession and death or resignation are brought together, before the occurrences and other evidence.

Where possible, each list has the following items.

1. Name, county and dedication. The dedications are not the result of an elaborate investigation, but are mainly based on documentary evidence observed in the course of our work.¹ For Cistercians and dependencies we give also the names of the mother house; and in all cases, under or immediately after the name of the house, alternative names.²

2. Date of foundation, from *KH*:³ where a community moved from one place to another, the moves are noted; in many cases the earlier places are found as

¹ Cistercian houses were all dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, so only those which had an additional dedication are noted, otherwise a blank means that we have not found solid or early evidence. We are much indebted to Dr Hadcock, and also to Miss Barbara SoRelle of Cornell University, for providing us with notes of a number of dedications. [See p. 239.]

² See below for houses which moved. These alternatives are vital for the identification of heads, and a variety of medieval forms are sometimes noted in the Index.

³ Where we wished to give a different date from that in *KH*, 1st edn., we have given references; but see now, p. 20. We gladly acknowledge the help of Dr Hadcock, who has been at work *pari passu*, with MDK, in the preparation of *KH*, 2nd edn.

the heads' titles in the texts; and it is no uncommon thing for a name to last after a move has taken place. A particularly confusing case is Kingswood (Cistercian), which began and ended a prolonged exodus at Kingswood, and was sometimes called by that name, sometimes by others, in the interim. Normally a later name (like Stoneleigh) cannot be anticipated; though an earlier (like Stoneleigh's predecessor, Radmore) may linger for a time after the move.

3. A note of former lists.¹ In every case, we include a *VCH* list where one exists. The lists noted vary enormously in usefulness, ranging from those for many Yorkshire houses by Sir Charles Clay – or by Dr Greenway, in the revised *Le Neve* for Cathedral priories, or in a number of recent volumes of the *VCH* and elsewhere – to which we have rarely been able to make any significant addition, to those in some of the early *VCH* volumes, which are of no critical value. Apart from this, we only give lists where they have some critical value. Our debts are innumerable; we have, however, listed as many as we could in the Preface. In the following cases, collaboration has been so close that it seemed impossible not to give another author's initials at the head of the list – though for its present form and for its errors we are wholly responsible:

C.T.C. Sir Charles Clay (virtually all Yorkshire houses).

M.C. Dr Marjorie Chibnall (all Shropshire houses).

D.G. Dr Diana Greenway (all monastic cathedrals, except Bath and Coventry).

V.B. Mrs Vivien Brown (Eye Priory).

C.Ĵ.H. Dr Christopher Holdsworth (Rufford Abbey).

H.P.R.F. Prof. H. P. R. Finberg (Tavistock Abbey).

This paragraph also includes a note of important annals, lists of abbots and priors, and calendars etc., containing obits, for the house.

4. An entry for each head known, in chronological order wherever possible; interspersed with occasional notes on vacancies, or discussing special problems by the way (see especially Bermondsey, Cluniac). Each list ends, in principle, with the first death or resignation after 1216. Frequently, and in particular when no precise date can be attached to this, the first occurrence of the next head is noted; in some cases it is necessary to carry the list further to tidy up some problem of succession. Obit lists and undated charters produce many names which may really belong to a somewhat later epoch, but are noted to save

¹ Lists by the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century antiquaries are commonly not specifically mentioned – it would be a very laborious and expensive task to include every list made by Browne Willis or Blomefield or Nichols, or every list in the new *Monasticon*, and they are now almost valueless for critical purposes. But this means no disrespect for the generations of pioneers; our own work has taught us great respect for them – they have often wasted our time by making us search to no purpose; far more often they have anticipated what we found, or shown us what we might have missed.

INTRODUCTION

confusion. No systematic attempt has been made to note all cases of ‘ghost’ heads – names in old lists for which no evidence can be found or which are due to confusion; but a number have been noted, especially where they can either be confidently dismissed or are likely to be based on evidence no longer available.

The entries for individual heads frequently consist solely of one or more occurrences; where there is fuller information, they may consist of the following.

i. Name and outside dates; and surnames when known.¹

ii. Brief summary of previous history and family (if known).

iii. Date of election and blessing; also length of tenure (if specified by the sources). All independent evidence from sources in which any credence can be placed is included; though occasionally, for events richly documented, we give only a selection.

iv. Occurrences. Where a head’s career is well documented, occurrences are only very selectively noted – to support a date of accession or death, to fill a gap, to help establish that a long tenure was indeed continuous; but never to give a comprehensive impression of the documentary evidence. No strictly consistent principles can be established in such cases, and it must frankly be admitted that over the years during which the lists have been compiled, some differences of practice have made unavoidable a certain degree of inconsistency in the book itself. We have tried to give what was useful, but not too burdensome. With pre-Conquest heads, we have the special difficulty that they normally appear without the name of their houses: the special arrangements of these parts of the lists are explained above, pp. 12–16; grouping of dates and references, normally avoided elsewhere, has seemed appropriate in this case. The use of an initial (before a date)² indicates that the head is identified by an initial only in that particular case; in all others, before or after such an initial, the full Christian name is given – though the surname can only be assumed to be in a source when this is specified.³ Christian names are given in their modern form, where such exists, rationalised where it is safe to do so – Osbern and Osbert were identical names by *c.* 1100 and are given as Osbert; Ranulf and Ralph distinct, though frequently confused – and Randulf can do service for either.

The *dating* of undated documents has, needless to say, been one of the major problems in compiling this book. All the dates offered have been checked, and a majority represent our own calculations based on the dates of bishops, abbots,

¹ For toponymics, we use ‘of’ before an English place-name, where readily identifiable in its modern form; ‘de’ before a continental name or the medieval form of an English name not clearly identifiable.

² An initial is occasionally used elsewhere simply to save space.

³ When no source is specified for a surname, the first reference may be presumed to give it.

ARRANGEMENT OF THE LISTS

priors, earls, archdeacons and the like. In a fair number of cases reference is made to a modern edition of a charter or a cartulary whose editor has provided an adequate explanation for a date; in such cases we give no note. Where the date depends on the mention of a bishop,¹ a royal official or an earl,² readily checked in the *Handbook of British Chronology*, or an abbot or a prior, to be found elsewhere in this book, we give no note; where it is based on evidence provided by Sir Charles Clay in *York Fasti* or by Dr Greenway in the new *Le Neve, 1066–1300*, I, *St Paul's London* (London, 1968), or II, *Monastic Cathedrals* (London, 1971), or (for sheriffs) in the *PRO List of Sheriffs*, or (for papal legates) in Tillmann, again, we give no note. In some cases editors have provided dates which seem plausible, but whose precise grounds we have not been able to check – in such cases we sometimes quote their date in *italics*. Originals can sometimes only be dated very approximately on palaeographical grounds, and in such cases 'pal.' is noted. In all other cases we have given the evidence for the date in notes. Our dates are not definitive – the book would never have been published had we attempted to make them so; but we have tried to ensure that any scholar using the book can readily check the dates. In all cases we use the modern convention of dating a year from 1 January.

'+' attached to dates means in or after; '–' means in or before; '×' links the limiting dates of an undated charter or the like.

References in nearly all cases are given to all essential primary sources; those to secondary literature are much more selective (see p. ix). We have not attempted a ruthless consistency in referring, e.g. to cartularies or fines by page or number; but in all cases where ambiguity could arise, 'p.' or 'no.' is specified – and we have tried on the whole to give convenient reference in each case.

In a number of cases, the problem of *identification* is very difficult. Insoluble references are collected in Appendix II. Cases in which confusion is easy have sometimes been noted in the lists. Thus for 'De Insula' among the Gilbertines, see Haverholme; for 'Novus Locus' – Newark, Newhouse, Newstead – see especially Newark. A characteristic example is Kir(k)by – priors of 'Kirkby' have been identified by editors as of Kirby Bellars, Leics, which was founded in 1315, and of Kirkby, Lincs, which seems never to have existed (see references under Monks Kirby, Warws).

A number of houses have been excluded because we have found no evidence of priors before 1216; and whereas we have included any Benedictine house whose head claimed to be a 'prior', we have excluded all hospitals not

¹ For Archbishop Theobald's titles, see *GFL*, App. II, pp. 505–6, whose findings are assumed in this book.

² For the difficulty that earls can appear, at least in the early twelfth century, without the title, see above p. 10 and n. 4.

INTRODUCTION

themselves conventual. Thus Tunstall has a list starting in 1164 in *VCH Lincs*, II, 197; but the twelfth-century prior probably belongs to Haverholme (q.v.). Walter Rye (*Suffolk F. (Rye)*, p. 7; cf. p. 25) described one Thomas as prior of St Peter, Dunwich; but this was an error for parson (*personam* in *Suffolk F.*, PRS LXX, no. 303).

Finally, the *order of lists* broadly follows *KH*; and to save difficulty for those who use the two books together, we have given the same (Ordnance Survey) forms for all but a handful of houses, and reckoned their prefixes as part of the alphabet – thus Great Malvern appears under G; but cross-references are given in such cases, to reduce such inconvenience as this may cause. In this book, however, it has seemed desirable for convenience of reference to eliminate some smaller pockets and to re-divide the Benedictines in a manner suited to the special circumstances of the period before 1216 and of the likely use of the book. Thus the Benedictine lists are in three sections: the independent houses – all but a handful great houses whose lists are fullest and likely to be most frequently used; their dependencies; and the alien priories. The aliens include dependencies of Fontevrault (male) and Tiron, but lesser Cluniac and Augustinian houses have all been included in the alphabetical sequence within those orders; and the nuns have been gathered into a single alphabet, which includes the double houses of Fontevrault, but not the Gilbertines. This treatment of the nuns has the incidental advantage of resolving the uncertain cases, in which we cannot be sure to which order a community belonged, in one or two cases because the nuns themselves seem to have been in doubt.

NOTE

The revision of *KH*, 2nd edn., and of this book were completed in close collaboration; this involved a number of changes in our headings, so that the principle enunciated in p. 16, n. 3 could not be consistently applied; some minor differences of statement or interpretation remain between our dates and those in *KH*. References to *KH* are to the 2nd edn.