

**British Academy – Royal Historical Society**

# **ANGLO-SAXON CHARTERS**

## **GUIDELINES FOR EDITORS**

The *Guidelines for Editors* were devised in 1984, to provide editors of charters with a set of basic rules and conventions governing the preparation of their editions. This PDF represents the current version, incorporating various revisions. It was converted to HTML format in March 1997, by Sean Miller, and to PDF format in May 2005.

# Contents:

- [I. The range of documents to be covered by the series](#)
- [II. The selection of documents within each fascicule](#)
- [III. The contents of each fascicule](#)
  1. Preliminaries
  2. Introduction
  3. Abbreviations
  4. List of charters
  5. Concordance
  6. Note on the method of editing
  7. The charters
  8. Appendices
  9. Indexes
- [IV. The editing of the charters](#)
  1. Preliminary matter
  2. Editorial procedures
  3. Commentary
- [V. Guidelines for preparation of typescript](#)
  1. General
  2. Spelling
  3. Quotations
  4. Numbers
  5. Abbreviations
  6. Punctuation
  7. Upper and lower case
  8. Dates
  9. References to manuscripts
  10. References to Domesday Book
  11. References to charters
  12. References to the Bible
  13. References to books and articles
  14. Conventions for references in footnotes

- [Annex 1: Example of layout of a charter](#)
  - [Annex 2: Description of single sheets](#)
  - [Annex 3: Note on terminology](#)
  - [Annex 4: An example of a list of Abbreviations](#)
  - [Annex 5: Compilation of Old English glossaries](#)
  - [Annex 6: Compilation of Latin glossaries](#)
  - [Annex 7: The treatment of boundary clause](#)
-

# I. The range of documents to be covered by the series

---

The new edition of Anglo-Saxon charters is intended to be a complete corpus of all pre-Conquest title-deeds known to have survived. It will include all documents relating to grants of lands and liberties, whoever their grantor (royal or otherwise), whoever their beneficiary (religious community, ecclesiastic, or layman), whatever their diplomatic form (diplomas, writs, leases, wills, and miscellaneous records such as those drawn up in consequence or settlement of a legal dispute), and whatever the language in which they are written (Latin or the vernacular). Unattached boundaries will also be included.

Documents which cannot be regarded as title-deeds, such as episcopal professions, will not be included. Such documents will be considered for separate treatment in one or more self-contained volume(s), within or outside the present scheme.

All manumissions will be edited together, in a separate volume (one section for each church where the manumissions were recorded).

If there is any uncertainty about the inclusion of a particular document, the matter should be referred to the Committee.

---

[Back to Contents](#)

## II. The selection of documents within each fascicule

---

Each fascicule will contain the documents preserved in one archive. But if the archive comprises less than a dozen or so documents, two or more archives will be edited together in the same fascicule (each archive, however, being dealt with in a separate section); in such cases the archives will (where possible) be those of communities situated in the same (pre-Conquest) diocese. For an analysis of documents according to the archives in which they have been preserved, see Keynes, *Anglo-Saxon Charters: Archives and Single Sheets*.

Those charters in an archive which represent grants to individuals will be edited together with the charters directly in favour of the religious community in question, whether their presence in the archive is to be attributed to a real transfer of title or merely to deposit (e.g. for safe-keeping).

In the case of a charter (or collection of charters) transferred from the archives of one church to those of another, the charter (or collection of charters) will be included in the fascicule relating to the archives of the church where it was eventually preserved. Thus, the charters of Lyminge and Reculver will be edited in the fascicule for Christ Church Canterbury; the charters of Minster-in-Thamet will be edited in the fascicule for St Augustine's Canterbury; and the charters of Crediton and St Germans will be edited in the fascicule for Exeter.

It may be advisable to preserve the identity of 'acquired' archives by allocating to each of them a special section of the fascicule; but this matter will have to be judged as the problem arises.

In the case of charters which were transferred from one church to another, when the archives of the first church survived and are to be edited in a separate fascicule, the transferred charters should be given a brief calendared entry in the fascicule for the church whence they originally came, with a reference to the fascicule where they will be (or have been) edited. Such calendared entries should form a following sub-section of the LIST OF CHARTERS.

There may be grounds for breaking these rules in certain cases, for example when a charter merely strayed from one archive to another at a relatively late date.

A few charters (e.g. S 1503) survive in more than one archive. In such cases there will probably be good grounds for editing the charter in the fascicules for each of the archives concerned, from the copy (or copies) preserved in the archive in question (with an eye, of course, on the copy or copies preserved elsewhere).

If there is any uncertainty about the inclusion of a particular charter in a given fascicule, the matter

should be referred to the Secretary (and if necessary will be considered by the Committee).

---

[Back to Contents](#)

### III. The contents of each fascicule

---

Each fascicule should comprise the following elements:

#### 1. Preliminaries

Half-title; Title page; Dedication (if desired); Foreword (to be supplied by the Chairman of the Committee); Acknowledgements or Editor's Preface; Contents; Illustrations. Please follow *Burton* (or any later fascicule) for style and layout.

#### 2. Introduction

This should be divided into various sections, modelled generally on the scheme outlined below; but of course the scheme need be regarded as no more than an indication of the subjects which ought to be covered in the introduction, for different archives will naturally require different arrangement and treatment. It should be noted that the purpose of some of the sections is essentially to bring together material which will be discussed in more detail in the commentaries on the individual texts, and to draw attention to its significance in the context of the archive as a whole, or indeed in a wider context.

Specialist guidance may be necessary and desirable in the preparation of some of these sections, and this should be sought, e.g. from members of the Committee, at an early stage. It would be helpful if any major departure from the scheme could be discussed in advance with the Secretary (for consideration by the Committee).

The introduction should perhaps begin with some general remarks to set the particular scene, placed directly after the main heading and before the sequence of sections. The sections themselves should be numbered, e.g. as follows.

1. *History of the archive and its components.* This section should convey a general impression of the range of documents contained in the archive, and provide some account of any special circumstances affecting its composition or affecting the preservation of the documents. The section might include reference to charters transferred to or from the archive; reference to any extant lists or mentions of charters which formed part of the archive; and reference to any extant lists or mentions of grants that might have been based on charters in the archive.

2. *The manuscripts.* This section might include general comments on the palaeographical interest of the documents preserved on single sheets (e.g. range of scripts represented; allusion to those instances where the scribe can be identified in other single sheets or books); but detailed description and

discussion should be reserved for the commentary following the text itself. Account of the cartularies or other manuscripts in which copies of the charters have been preserved. Discussion of the copyist's treatment of his exemplars (in so far as it is possible to tell, e.g. by comparing his text with that of such originals as may have survived); attention should be drawn not only to literal accuracy, but also to his treatment of pictorial invocations (e.g. + and Px), endorsements, witness-lists, etc. Discussion of the relationship between the manuscripts.

3. *History of the church and its endowment.* It is obviously essential to provide some account of the history of the church, of its landed endowment, and of any disputes or other events which affected its endowment (before and after the Conquest), in as much as such matters are relevant to the understanding and criticism of the charters themselves. This should be kept as short as possible, e.g. by directing it towards the charters edited. The 'purpose' of the cartulary, and the treatment of charters within the cartulary, should be considered in this connection. Full use should be made of the record of the church's endowment in Domesday Book, e.g. as an indication of what title-deeds one might expect to find in the archive. Charters which were preserved in the archive but which appear to bear no relation to the church's history or endowment should be identified and discussed as a group. It may be helpful to provide a map showing, for example, the location of estates covered by the charters, or owned by the church in question.

4. *Diplomatic.* There should be some general discussion of the diplomatic of the charters in the archive: for example, whether it is possible to discern significant links between the charters within the archive (which may reflect some form of 'house style' in their production, whether as genuine documents or as forgeries, or which may arise from editing by the compiler of a cartulary); or whether it is possible to discern significant links between the charters and those preserved in other archives. This may be a good place to discuss any interesting groups of charters within the archive, from a diplomatic point of view. For guidance on diplomatic terminology, see [Annex 3](#).

5. *Language.* Any comments on the language, or linguistic peculiarities, of the charters (Latin as well as vernacular), viewed as a group. Particular attention should be paid to any distinctive vocabulary in the Latin texts (with reference to the Latin glossary), to any interesting features of the content or style of the Latin formulas (e.g. evidence of learning, or occurrence of rhythmic prose or verse), and to the linguistic features of the vernacular texts (e.g. matters of vocabulary and style, or indications of date, dialect, etc.).

6. *Authenticity.* It might be helpful to include under this heading a brief summary of conclusions reached (in the separate discussions of the texts) about the authenticity of the charters in the archives, to give the reader from the outset a general idea of the quality of the material. Any conclusions about the forgery or general manipulation of texts in the archive might also be summarized here.

7. *Particular interest.* Any comments on matters of particular interest arising from consideration of the charters as a group (with heading and sub-headings as appropriate): e.g. discussion of some historical issue which is illuminated by charters in the archive; or, if the archive is that of an episcopal see, an account of episcopal succession; or, if the archive is that of a monastery, an account of abbatial



succession.

### 3. Abbreviations

This list should begin with all the non-bibliographical abbreviations which the editor intends to use, including abbreviations for libraries whose manuscripts are to be cited frequently. (Certain standard abbreviations (fo., fos, vol., vols, MS, MSS, OE, etc.) may be used without explanation.) There should then be a sub-heading, BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABBREVIATIONS, under which you should assemble and explain all the abbreviations for books, series, periodicals and articles which are cited on more than one or two occasions. The principles and forms of abbreviation are explained in [section V](#). Please follow the conventions of capitalization, punctuation and spelling implied by the examples given in [Annex 4](#).

### 4. List of charters

The charters should be listed in the order in which they are edited, reproducing the number, abstract and date from the preliminary matter at the head of each text; but, for the purposes of this list, the abstract may be simplified by the omission of the actual term used for the unit of assessment.

It is not necessary to refer at this point to the manuscript(s) from which the text has been edited. If the archive contains a quantity of 'lost' charters, there should be a cross-reference to the place where these are collected and discussed. The list should be followed by calendared entries for any charters transferred from the archive in question to another.

### 5. Concordance

Heading: CONCORDANCE OF THIS EDITION WITH SAWYER'S LIST AND OTHER EDITIONS. The numbers of the charters in the edition (marked up for bold type) should be given in the left-hand column. The corresponding numbers of the charters in the other main editions (e.g. Kemble; Birch; Harmer, *SEHD*; Whitelock, *Wills*; Robertson, *Charters*; Harmer, *Writs*) should be given opposite, as appropriate.

### 6. Note on the method of editing

This should be modelled on equivalent sections in earlier fascicules: i.e. begin with a paragraph summarizing the manuscript sources for the charters in the archive, and explaining the use of sigla; then a paragraph on the conventions employed in the treatment of the manuscripts; and then a paragraph explaining the conventions employed (following Ker and Sawyer) in dating manuscripts and endorsements (in this connection, note the sequence: s. ix/x, s. x<sup>in</sup>, s. x<sup>1</sup>, s. x<sup>med</sup>, s. x<sup>2</sup>, s. x<sup>ex</sup>, s. x/xi).

### 7. The Charters

The documents in each archive should be arranged as far as possible in their chronological order.

Misdated documents should be placed at the point appropriate to their corrected date, and undated documents should be placed at what seems to be the most appropriate point in the series (which may normally be the end of the outer limits). Charters dated to the same year should be arranged, if possible, in chronological order within that year (e.g. by analysis of the witness-lists, as in the case of the charters of 956); otherwise, they should be in alphabetical order of grantee (which will normally correspond to the order in Sawyer).

It may well be desirable to retain the same number for different versions (e.g. in Latin, or in the vernacular) of the same document, or for very closely related documents; in such cases, the texts should be distinguished by a letter (a, b) following the number.

Editors are urged to produce, at an early stage, a list of the documents to be included in the fascicule, in their proposed order; any difficulties could then be discussed with the Secretary and by the Committee.

For an account of the principles to be followed in the editing of the charters, see [section IV](#).

## 8. Appendices

An Appendix or Appendices may be provided for some relevant purpose, e.g. for editing texts of particular relevance to the charters in the archive, or for collecting and discussing references to charters which no longer survive.

## 9. Indexes

The volume should be provided with a number of indexes. They should be preceded by a paragraph explaining general principles, and each index may need a separate word of explanation as well. See *Burton* for guidance on these matters, and on layout. References should begin with the charters themselves (cited by their number in the edition, marked up for bold type), followed by pages of the introduction (small roman numerals) and in the commentaries (arabic numerals).

Note that *W* (wynn) is replaced in the indexes by *w*, and that *Uu* is alphabetized as *w*.

1. *Index of Personal Names*. As a general principle, the forms of personal names found in the texts should be followed, but when a common name occurs in one or more variant forms the main entry should be in a normalized form and the variant forms should be listed in brackets after the head word; in such cases variant forms which differ substantially from the normalized form (e.g. *Ægil-*, *Æl-*, *Ail-*) should be included at their appropriate point in the alphabetical series, with a cross-reference to the normalized form (e.g. *Æthel-*). Note that it is not necessary to record variants between *Æ*, *Ae* and *E* (in both initial and medial positions), or between *ð*, *p* and *th*. In normalized forms, *th* should be substituted for *ð* and *p*. In making the separate entries under each head word, follow the practice of *Burton*.

2. *Index of Place-Names*. The main entry for each name should be in its modern form (followed by the pre-1974 county, in abbreviated form (see [section V](#)), if appropriate), giving text-forms in brackets (preceded by preposition, if necessary); it may sometimes be desirable to provide a separate entry for the text-form, with a cross-reference to the modern form. The index should cover place-names mentioned in the introduction and commentaries, as well as place-names in the charters themselves (unidentified as well as identified; note that names of places and rivers mentioned in the boundary clauses should also be indexed here, if the names survive in a modern form). Please refer for further guidance to [Annex 5](#).

3. *Words and Personal Names used in Boundary Clauses*. Besides the topographical terms and personal names used in the boundary marks themselves, this index should include verbs, adjectives and adverbs, where their meaning in context may present some difficulty to the reader. It may be necessary in certain cases to provide some discussion of obscure words, or at least a reference to a printed discussion if one is available. Please refer for further guidance to [Annex 5](#). It is not proposed to provide a glossary of words used in OE documents other than boundary clauses; but there may be a case for commenting on technical vocabulary or special usages at an appropriate point, e.g. in the introduction.

4. *Latin Glossary*. A glossary should be provided covering all unusual (i.e. unclassical or uncommon) Latin words, technical terms, or words used in an unusual sense. Please refer for further guidance to [Annex 6](#).

5. *Diplomatic Index*. Lists should be provided of verbal invocations, *initia* of proems, dispositive words (sub-divided according to tense), and royal styles (in two sections: one for styles in the dispositive clause, and one for styles in the subscription); a list of *initia* of sanctions might also be included, if it would seem helpful.

---

[Back to Contents](#)

## IV. The editing of the charters

---

### 1. Preliminary matter

The preliminary matter for each charter should be made up in accordance with the guidance below; please model layout on the example in [Annex 1](#).

- (i) Number of document, in arabic numerals (starting from 1 for each archive) and marked up for bold type.
- (ii) An abstract of the document, in italics (i.e. underlined for italics). Different types of document will naturally require different treatment, but please attempt to follow a common form for each type of document, modelled on abstracts in earlier volumes. In the case of a royal diploma for a layman: first the grantor (title and name, or name and style; the latter arrangement may be more appropriate in charters issued before the tenth century, and the style in such cases should be a translation of that used in the charter); then the assessment and location of the land granted (giving the actual term for the unit of assessment (after the translated form) in roman type within brackets; modern name of the place and pre-1974 county, if the place can be identified for certain; place left in roman type if unidentified); then the grantee's name (using normalized form, if possible) and status (as in the text, e.g. *dux*, *comes*, *minister*, *fidelis*, etc., but here in roman type); and finally the date, using arabic numerals in roman type (preceded by A.D., and followed by the exact day (in round brackets), if given in the text; note that a supplied or corrected date should be given in square brackets; the place of issue, if given, may be added after the date).
- (iii) References to the manuscripts from which the text is edited. Sigla to be in capital letters (A, B, C, etc.). Note that A is always to be reserved for originals or apparent originals, and is not to be used for later copies on single sheets or for copies in cartularies, etc.; when there is no surviving original or apparent original, the sigla will normally begin with B. Conventions governing the use of sigla from B onwards will need to be flexible within the series, and the practice adopted in a particular fascicule should be explained in the Note on the Method of Editing. For example, it will be necessary in the case of an archive with surviving later copies (or forgeries) on single sheets to reserve B for these; and it will be desirable to retain the same siglum, throughout the fascicule, for a particular cartulary. As a general principle, however, sigla should be assigned in such a way that their alphabetical sequence corresponds to the chronological order of the manuscripts. When two copies of the same charter occur in the same manuscript, they should be listed separately and distinguished as (e.g.) B1 and B2. In the case of any single sheet, describe its status (e.g. original, single sheet, copy on single sheet, etc.) and specify material, date of script and dimensions (vertical measurement first, in mm.); then record any endorsements (printing them in full, and dating them as closely as possible; endorsed documents will have to be treated in a different way, as appropriate in the individual case). In the case of a copy (e.g. in

a cartulary), describe it as such, and specify the date of the manuscript; then record any rubrics which relate to the specific text (printing them in full). In dating scripts and manuscripts in these connections, use the conventions stated in the Note on the Method of Editing (above, [section III](#)).

(iv) Ed.: References to all previous editions of the text, listed (in chronological order of publication) as a., b., c., etc., should be supplied here, stating source of each (using sigla) if appropriate. (In assembling this information, remember that Sawyer does not include reference to the first editions of certain works, such as the *Monasticon*, or to Sweet's *Oldest English Texts*.) References to Kemble and Birch should here be in the form: Kemble 444, Birch 935. References to *BAFacs.*, *BMFacs.* and *OSFacs.* should be included (specifying facsimile, in the case of *BAFacs.*, facsimile and transcript, in the case of *BMFacs.*, and facsimile, transcript and translation, in the case of *OSFacs.*). If a printed edition includes a translation, the reference should be followed by a statement to that effect.

(v) Listed: Reference to the number of the document in Sawyer's *List* (here cited in the form: Sawyer 594), and to its number in the relevant volume of the Finberg-Hart-Gelling series (e.g. Gelling, *ECTV* 71). Note that the Sawyer reference should come first.

(vi) Translated: If a separate translation (without text) of the document is available, e.g. in *EHD*, the reference should be supplied.

(vii) In the case of a charter which survives in more than one manuscript, state from which manuscript(s) it has been edited. For example, in a case where B is a copy of A:

Printed from A with main variants from B.

Or, in a case where B and C are independent copies of a lost original:

Edited from B and C.

## 2. Editorial procedures

It is to be expected that editorial procedures will have to be adapted according to particular textual circumstances, and it is difficult, therefore, to establish prescriptive guidelines. Much will necessarily be left to the judgement of the individual editors; but any doubts on matters of principle should be referred to the Secretary at an early stage.

It is a general principle of the series that the text of charters preserved on single sheets should be reproduced as faithfully as possible (without going to all the lengths of a fully 'diplomatic' edition). (This principle may need to be varied, e.g. if the single sheet is a later copy, and if another copy exists of the same document, drawn from the (lost) original.) Charters preserved only in later copies (e.g. in cartularies or antiquarian transcripts) should be edited in accordance with the normal principles of

textual criticism; in such cases a greater degree of editorial intervention may be necessary, and will be allowed. When interpreting and applying the guidelines given below, this distinction between the treatment of single sheets and later copies should be borne in mind.

(i) *Special letter forms.* *Æ* and *æ* (i.e. upper- and lower-case ash), *ae* and *e* (e-caudatur; no html code) should be distinguished. *Ð*, *ð*, *Þ* and *þ* (i.e. upper- and lower-case eth and thorn) should be distinguished. *W* and *w* (i.e. upper- and lower-case wynn; again, no html code) should be used where they occur in the manuscript. (Some normalization may, however, be necessary when editing texts from two or more later copies.)

(ii) *Capital letters.* Capital letters should be normalized, and used according to modern practice, in both single sheets and copies. (This applies to personal names and place-names; in running prose much will depend on punctuation and editorial judgement, but note that it may be desirable, when editing a single sheet, to use a capital letter at the beginning of a major diplomatic section, even if no full point precedes.) Any peculiarities demanding comment should be covered in the apparatus. On capitalization in boundary clauses, see [Annex 7](#).

(iii) *Punctuation and accents.* In the case of single sheets, punctuation and accents should be reproduced as in the manuscript. In the case of texts preserved only in later copies, punctuation should be normalized in accordance with modern usage, and accents disregarded; but if there is reason to believe that a copyist is reproducing interesting features of his exemplar, there may be grounds for drawing attention to his practices (either generally, in the Note on the Method of Editing, or in the notes or commentary on the individual text).

(iv) *Paragraphing.* In the case of a single sheet, paragraphing should be as in the manuscript; in the case of texts preserved only in later copies, normal editorial practice should prevail.

(v) *Layout of witness-lists.* If the names in the witness-list are arranged quite clearly (in the manuscript) in a vertical column or columns, they should be typed in a vertical column. The composition of each column in the manuscript should be indicated, e.g. (in the case of a single sheet) by leaving a space between successive columns, or (in the case of a copy) by the provision of a lettered footnote after the last name in a column, with the statement 'First column of subscriptions ends here' (or words to that effect). If in the manuscript the names are simply listed one after another, along the line, they should be presented in the same way. There will be complications; in attempting to resolve them, please bear in mind that the order of names in a witness-list is often a matter of great significance.

(vi) *Orthography.* The orthography of documents preserved on single sheets should be reproduced accurately (e.g. manuscript distinctions between *u* and *v* should be retained if possible). In the case of texts preserved only in later copies, some degree of normalization may be necessary, e.g. when editing a charter from two or more manuscripts, or when it is apparent that a copyist has consistently misunderstood, or consistently misuses, particular letter forms (e.g. *p* for wynn).

(vii) *Word-division*. Word-division in Latin and OE will have to be at the editor's discretion: as a general rule, word-division in single sheets should be respected (more so, perhaps, in Old English than in Latin), but word-division in cartulary copies (and antiquarian transcripts, etc.) may need to be normalized. The treatment of compound names, etc., in OE boundary clauses will doubtless cause particular difficulty, and much will depend on the editor's interpretation of the boundary clause in question; for further guidance, see [Annex 7](#).

(viii) *Standard abbreviations*. These should be expanded silently (in roman type), in both single sheets and copies; in case of doubt, the abbreviation should be recorded and discussed in a lettered footnote. Note, however, that the sign 7 (for *and* or *ond*) should be retained in vernacular texts, but in Latin texts 7 and & should be printed as *et* (in roman type); 7lang in vernacular texts should be retained. The abbreviation <barred-p> (for *pæt* or *pet*) should be retained. The abbreviation *Ihs* (and inflected forms) should be expanded as *Iesus*, etc. In Latin texts, the abbreviations *xps*, *xpi*, etc., should be expanded either as *Cristus*, *Cristi*, etc., or as *Christus*, *Christi*, etc., in accordance with the editor's preference; a statement of the practice chosen should be made in the Note on the Method of Editing. In vernacular texts, *xpes*, etc., should be expanded as *Cristes*, etc. In the case of abbreviations for numerals, the roman figures should be retained and any associated suprascript letters should be reproduced; elongated final minims should also be retained.

(ix) *Interlineations*. Interlineations on single-sheet documents should be indicated by enclosure within caret marks. The treatment of interlineations in later copies must be left to the editor's judgement; they should be recorded as such (by enclosure within the same signs) if it is important to recognize that they are interlineations, but in some cases it may be sufficient to treat them simply as part of the main text (noting their status in a lettered footnote).

(x) *Erasures, changes of hand, changes of ink, etc.* These features on single-sheet documents should be recorded as they occur (in lettered footnotes), and their significance discussed (in the note, or in the commentary); any sign that a part of the document was written after folding should be recorded and discussed in the commentary. The treatment of similar features in later copies must be left to the editor's judgement; they need be noted only if they may be of some significance. Editors are reminded of the importance of examining the manuscripts (and particularly the single sheets) in person; photographic reproductions should only be used in the preliminary stages of the work.

(xi) *Glosses and marginalia*. These features should be recorded, dated and discussed in lettered footnotes.

(xii) *Line-ends*. Line-ends should not be indicated, unless significant for some interesting or aberrant form or spelling (and then in a lettered footnote).

(xiii) *Damaged manuscripts*. Illegible letters on single sheets should be represented by dots within square brackets; the number of dots should reflect the estimated number of letters missing, but if whole portions of the text are missing, the loss in words should instead be estimated in a lettered footnote. If

the reading can be supplied from a later copy of the same charter, the restored reading should be printed in the text in roman type, and the source of the reading and the actual reading of the single sheet should be recorded in a lettered footnote. If the missing letter(s) can safely be supplied by the editor, but without any manuscript evidence, the letter(s) should be printed in the text between square brackets ([ ]) and some explanation given in a lettered footnote if considered necessary. Illegible letters in charters known only from a later copy or copies should be dealt with in a similar way.

(xiv) *Scribal omissions*. In the case of any letter(s) or word(s) omitted accidentally by the scribe: restored readings supplied in the text without any manuscript evidence should be enclosed within angle brackets (< >), but when a missing word or words cannot be supplied with any certainty, it may be more appropriate simply to mark the point of omission (e.g. with three dots within angle brackets) and comment on the problem in a lettered footnote.

(xv) *Scribal blunders*. As a general rule, obvious mechanical blunders should be corrected in the text (e.g. *donationem*) and the manuscript reading (e.g. *donatitionem*) should be recorded in a lettered footnote. But under certain circumstances, e.g. when a number of such blunders occur in a single sheet, and when they seem to be of some significance (perhaps as a reflection of the sorry state of latinity at the time), it may be more sensible to retain them in the text and to draw attention to them in lettered footnotes and in the commentary.

(xvi) *Other peculiarities*. Any peculiarities of spelling or grammar in a single sheet should be retained in the text, and attention should be drawn to them in lettered footnotes (and, if appropriate, in the commentary and in the glossary at the end of the volume). The treatment of such features in charters preserved only in a later copy or copies is a matter which must be judged by the editor in each individual case: if the peculiarities seem to reflect the usage of the original scribe or draftsman (i.e. if they occur in the same or similar formulas in other charters), they should be retained in the text and attention should be drawn to them in lettered footnotes; but if they evidently arose in the course of copying, it may be more sensible to correct them in the text and to record the manuscript reading in a lettered footnote.

(xvii) *Variant readings*. If a single-sheet version has survived as well as one or more copies, the readings of the single-sheet version should (under normal circumstances) be given in the text; the variants found in the copies should only be given (in lettered footnotes) if they are of particular interest (e.g. to the linguist concerned with OE or ME, who will, however, not need to be given the most common spelling variants in common words or endings), or if they constitute interpolations or alterations to the text, or if they show evidence of a different manuscript tradition. If there are two or more manuscript copies, but no single-sheet version, the text should be edited in accordance with the normal principles of textual criticism: e.g. if one of the manuscripts is copied from the other, the readings of the manuscript closest to the original should be printed in the text and significant variants in the other copy should be recorded in lettered footnotes; but if the manuscripts are independent copies of the original, the text should be edited from both in accordance with the editor's judgement of their respective merits, and significant variants recorded in lettered footnotes. Errors or variant readings in earlier printed editions should not be recorded, unless a point of particular importance (e.g. one of interpretation) is at stake; if, however, the earlier editor is known to have printed the text from a manuscript now lost, the edition should be treated



in much the same way as a manuscript, with its own siglum.

(xviii) *Footnotes*. There should be one set of lettered footnotes (i.e. endnotes) for the textual apparatus; if and when *z* is reached, the alphabetical series should begin again with the addition of the number 2 after each letter (*a2*, *b2*, etc.); if and when *z2* is reached, the series should begin again with the addition of the number 3 after each letter; and so on. (Note that the practices employed in *Burton*, of omitting *j* and *v* in the alphabetical series, and of using doubled letters when there are only two series, should be discontinued.) More than one word can be identified as the subject of a lettered footnote by enclosing the words in question with the same letter (or letter + number) at each end (in which case the note would begin, e.g., *a ... a*). If the same note can be applied at several points in the text, it should be possible to provide the note on the first occasion and to use the corresponding letter in the text in two or more places as required, or to devise some other such economical usage. Numbered footnotes should be used for editorial comments on non-textual matters (e.g. for the identification of any biblical or other quotations), if such comments cannot be made more conveniently and effectively in the commentary itself. (Editors should try to avoid using a lettered footnote and a numbered footnote at the same place.) For other conventions in the use of footnotes, please follow *Burton* or [Annex 1](#). In laying out the footnotes at the end of the text, it may be more convenient to give them in a single vertical column (leaving the printer to arrange them properly); but note that the series of lettered footnotes should precede any numbered footnotes (e.g. *Burton*, p. 42).

### 3. Commentary

Detailed discussion of individual charters should be placed immediately after the text, and will be printed in smaller type. The nature and extent of the discussion will naturally vary from one charter to another, and from one type of document to another; but an attempt should be made to cover the different aspects of each text in a systematic and consistent way, bearing in mind that the establishment of its authenticity is always the primary consideration. Attention should also be paid to the history of the charter: under what circumstances it was produced; under what circumstances it entered the archive; how it was treated in the archive (e.g. by cartularists); and, in the case of a single sheet, how it passed from the archive to its present location.

The discussion of a charter preserved on a single sheet should begin with a physical and palaeographical description; see [Annex 2](#) for guidance. If the scribe can be identified in other contexts (charters or books), details should be given and the significance of the identification considered.

In the case of royal diplomas, matters for discussion would include: content and diplomatic; identity of beneficiary; dating and witness-list; identification and history of the estate concerned (including reference to the relevant entry in Domesday Book); any other points of interest (e.g. archival context). All this should be geared towards a judgement of the text's authenticity. For the location of the estate, reference should be made to the counties which existed until the reform of 1974; but any change resulting from these reforms should be noted. If the diploma has a boundary clause, there should be some discussion of the identification of the boundary marks, whether by reference to existing studies or

by the editor's own analysis; identified marks should be pin-pointed by reference to the National Grid. It may be too much to expect an exhaustive treatment of each boundary clause, but the object of this edition should at the very least be to provide a sound basis for further work by those with the specialized and local knowledge required. It may be helpful to provide maps of certain estate-boundaries; this is a matter which would have to be taken up with the Committee at an early stage. For further guidance on the treatment of boundary clauses, see [Annex 7](#).

It may be interesting and helpful in some cases to provide a map showing the distribution of the places mentioned in a will.

Should any specialized advice be needed (e.g. from members of the Committee) in the preparation of this section, it should be sought as the work is in progress (to avoid swamping, and to avoid any need for extensive revision at a late stage).

Any passages of Old English in the text of a diploma should be translated in the commentary; but this need not apply if there is already a good (and accessible) translation of the document as a whole (e.g. in *EHD*). It should not, however, be necessary to translate the boundary clauses, though of course it may be helpful to translate particular phrases in the course of their elucidation. A document wholly in Old English need not be translated if a good translation is already available (as it will be in most cases, e.g. in the editions by Harmer, Robertson and Whitelock; translations by Earle may well suffice, but translations by Thorpe may not).

Editors are urged to keep footnotes to a minimum, in order to minimize printing difficulties and costs; it may be possible to supply some bibliographical references within brackets in the body of the commentary itself.

---

[Back to Contents](#)

## V. Guidelines for preparation of typescript

---

These guidelines are intended to help the editor in the preparation of the typescript, to minimize the extent of (time-consuming) sub-editing and of (expensive) proof-correcting, and to ensure that consistency will be achieved not only within a given volume but also in the series as a whole. The practices stated here represent a rationalization and modification of the practices adopted in *Rochester* and *Burton*; so while those volumes (and *Burton* in particular) may be treated as models in many respects, it will be seen that they should not be so treated in all.

Editors are asked in general to follow *Hart's Rules for Compositors and Readers at the University Press Oxford*, 39th edn (Oxford, 1983).

### 1. General

It is of the utmost importance that the printer is supplied with a strong ribbon copy or a good quality xerox. Please ensure that any letter which may be unfamiliar to the printer, such as Æ, æ, Ð, ð, Þ, þ, W or w (wynn), is unambiguous; this applied particularly to the descender of a thorn or wynn that is underlined. If a typescript is produced on a machine without Anglo-Saxon letters, the letters should be written in clearly. *All typing must be double-spaced.* Adequate margins must be left all round for sub-editing and for the printer's comments. Please avoid any word-breaks (especially in texts), since these may confuse the printer. Footnotes to the introduction should be numbered consecutively in one series and placed at the end of the introduction, starting on a fresh page; footnotes to each of the commentaries should be numbered consecutively in one series and placed at the end of the commentary in question, starting on a fresh page. The printer will distribute these (numbered) notes so that, when published, each is at the foot of the page to which it refers. Lettered and numbered footnotes to the texts should be placed in the typescript after the text itself and before the commentary; they will be printed in the same position. Any words to be printed in italic should be underlined; any numbers (or words) to be printed in bold type should be underlined with a wavy line.

### 2. Spelling (*Hart's Rules*, pp. 64-86)

As a general rule, spelling should be according to the form, or first form, in the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*. (-ize should be used where this dictionary recommends it.) The spelling of Old English names in normalized forms should be modelled, directly or by analogy, on those in the personal name indexes in earlier volumes of the series; but *th* should be substituted for ð and þ. The spelling of the names of kings and other familiar persons will doubtless cause difficulty and will inevitably give rise to inconsistency: for example, use Ecgberht (not Egbert), Æthelwulf (not Ethelwulf), Alfred (not Ælfred), Edward (not Eadward), Æthelstan (not Athelstan), Edmund (not Eadmund), Eadwig (not Edwig),

Æthelred (not Ethelred), and Edgar (not Eadgar); it may be appropriate to retain Ead- when the names refer to bishops, ealdormen, thegns, etc.

### **3. Quotations (*Hart's Rules*, pp. 49-50)**

A word or short phrase in Latin or Old English, when used in the context of modern English prose, should be underlined (to indicate italic) and not enclosed in quotation marks (e.g. minister, not 'minister'). Any quotation which is more than a few words long and less than about sixty words long should be printed in roman type and enclosed in single quotation marks. A longer quotation should be indented (and typed double-spaced) and neither underlining nor quotation marks used.

Editors are encouraged to provide a translation of any passage in Latin or Old English which they may be quoting and discussing, particularly if it contains a point of difficulty or importance; of course this need not apply in the context of diplomatic analysis. The translation should be enclosed in single quotation marks and, normally, placed in a footnote.

### **4. Numbers (*Hart's Rules*, pp. 16-20)**

Numbers should be in words if less than 100 and if not within a specific reference, measurement, date, list or table or part of statistical data generally (e.g. the tenth century; a late-tenth-century manuscript; on twenty-six occasions). Otherwise they should be in figures.

Numbers in a series (e.g. in page references) should be in accordance with these examples:

- (i) 30-4 (not 30-34), 191-6 (not 191-196 or 191-96) and 300-4;
- (ii) 13-18, 210-12 and 213-14 (not 13-8, 210-2 and 213-4);
- (iii) 232-43 (not 232-243);
- (iv) 191 and 204 (not 191, 204);
- (v) 191, 204 and 310 (not 191, 204, 310 or 191, 204, and 310).

(In references to strings of charters (by their S number), it may often be preferable to omit 'and' before the last in the series.)

### **5. Abbreviations (*Hart's Rules*, pp. 2-6)**

The abbreviation OE (without fullstops) may be used before a single word or short phrase (e.g. OE *cyning*), but not in running prose (e.g. Old English version, in Old English). Similarly, the abbreviations

MS and MSS may be used in certain types of references to particular manuscripts (e.g. ASC MS A, or S 971, MSS 2 and 3), but not in running prose (e.g. in another manuscript).

Standard abbreviations for counties are: Beds., Berks., Bucks., Cambs., Ches., Derbys., Devon, Gloucs., Hants [*sic*], Herefords., Herts., Hunts., Lancs., Leics., Lincs., Middx, Northants., Notts., Oxon., Salop, Staffs., Warwicks., Wilts., Worcs., Yorks. E.R., Yorks. N.R. and Yorks. W.R. (The others should not be abbreviated: Cornwall, Cumberland, Dorset, Durham, Essex, Isle of Wight, Kent, Norfolk, Northumberland, Rutland, Somerset, Suffolk, Surrey, Sussex and Westmorland.) The abbreviations should be used when locating particular places (e.g. an estate at Palterton, Derbys., was given), but not in general references to the county (e.g. another estate in Derbyshire was given); in the abstract placed at the beginning of a text, the county name should be given in full.

Contractions which include the last letter of a word should not be followed by a stop (e.g. Dr, St, bk, chs, nos, cols, edn, vols, fos); an exception is made for fo. (folio).

Please note that the word 'line(s)' should always be in full.

## **6. Punctuation (*Hart's Rules*, pp. 38-49)**

In general, British, rather than American, punctuation should be used, e.g. commas outside quotation marks, single rather than double quotation marks (except for quotations within quotations) and no comma before 'and' in a series. Please master the conventions described in *Hart's Rules*, since sub-editing punctuation is desperately tedious.

A suprascript number (or letter), referring to a footnote, should follow any punctuation associated with the word in question (i.e. ... end.<sup>6</sup> or ... end,<sup>6</sup> ... , *not* ... end<sup>6</sup>. or ... end<sup>6</sup>, ... ).

## **7. Upper and lower case (*Hart's Rules*, pp. 8-14)**

Lower case should be used for the initial letter of a word such as 'king', 'bishop', 'pope' or 'pontifical', unless the word is part of a title as in, e.g., King Alfred, Bishop Ealhmund, Pope Leo, or the Sherborne Pontifical; but note that the style in more specific references should be Alfred, king of Wessex (not King Alfred of Wessex), or Ealhmund, bishop of Sherborne (not Bishop Ealhmund of Sherborne). Lower case should be used for an individual church, and upper case for the Church as an institution: e.g. the church at Bosham, or Bosham church, and King Offa's gifts to the Church.

## **8. Dates (*Hart's Rules*, pp. 18-19)**

Dates should be standardized on the models 2 September 990, 2 September and September 990. There should be no apostrophe in a reference to a decade (e.g. the 990s). The expression 871-99 refers to the whole period; the expression 871 x 899 refers to an unknown point within these outer limits.

## 9. References to manuscripts

References to manuscripts cited frequently, or to libraries whose manuscripts are cited frequently, can be simplified by using an abbreviation for the library in question; the abbreviation should be given and expanded in the list of Abbreviations, and then used throughout the volume. For some examples, see Annex 4. Note that it is not normally necessary to use the abbreviation MS in a reference to a particular manuscript (but cf. above, p. 23). The abbreviations fo. and fos should not be used when the reference includes r (for recto) or v (for verso); but they will be needed in certain types of reference, e.g. to the manuscript as a physical object (Quire XII (fos 96-103)). The abbreviations r and v should be typed (and will be printed) on the line, thus: 173r. When r and v intervene, please give numbers in full, thus: 173r-175v (not 173r-5v). A reference to the recto and verso of the same folio should be given thus: 173rv.

Examples of references to manuscripts from libraries included in a list of abbreviations are:

BL Add. 46487, 10v

BL Cotton Vespasian E. iii, 4r-100v

BL Royal 1. B. VII, 15v

Bodleian, Wood empt. 5, 33r-34r

CCCC 111, pp. 70-1

Examples of references to manuscripts from libraries not included in a list of abbreviations are:

London, British Library, Add. 46487, 13r-14r

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Dodsworth 9, 1rv

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 111, pp. 145-6

## 10. References to Domesday Book

GDB, for Great Domesday Book, and LDB, for Little Domesday Book, should be included in the list of Abbreviations and used in specific references to the text; but note that in a general reference to Domesday Book in running prose, it may be more appropriate to spell the words out. References should be in the form: GDB 272r; GDB 272r-273v; GDB 34ra; GDB 170vb; LDB 183r.

## 11. References to charters

In the introduction and commentaries, charters from other archives should be cited by their number in Sawyer's catalogue, e.g. S 876 (not Sawyer 876 or Sawyer, no. 876); but it may sometimes be desirable to refer to a particular text of the charter, and in such cases reference to an edition should be added, e.g. in brackets: S 876 (KCD 684), S 678 (BCS 1036), S 906 (Sawyer, *Burton*, no. 28), S 1485 (Whitelock, *Wills*, no. 9). Note, however, that in the preliminaries to the texts themselves these references would be given in a different form: Sawyer 876; Kemble 684; Birch 1036; Whitelock, *Wills*, no. 9 (pp. 22-5), with translation. Volumes in the Finberg-Hart-Gelling series should be cited throughout in the form: Finberg, *ECWM* 185 (if the reference is to a particular charter, cited by its number), or Hart, *ECNE*, p. 368 (if the reference is to a page). Charters in the archive which is being edited should be cited throughout by their number in the fascicule, marked up for bold type.

## 12. References to the Bible

For a list of abbreviations for the books of the Bible, see *Hart's Rules*, p. 5. References to the Bible should be in the form:

Luke 13: 27

Matt. 25: 41

1 Tim. 6: 7

2 Cor. 4: 18

Quotations should be from the Vulgate; translations should be from the Douai-Rheims version (not from the Authorized Version).

## 13. References to books and articles

References to books and articles cited frequently should be simplified by devising an abbreviated form which is given and expanded in the list of Bibliographical Abbreviations; the abbreviated form should then be used elsewhere in the volume. A reference to a book or article cited only once or twice should be given in full at the first citation, and in an appropriate abbreviated form on a second occasion; such a book or article should not be included in the list.

As a general rule, *books* to be included in the list of Bibliographical Abbreviations should be reduced to the author's or editor's surname, followed by a shortened form of the title, e.g. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, and Robertson, *Charters* (where the edition used would be specified in the expanded reference). It may be convenient to reduce certain items, such as editions of chronicles or standard reference works, to no more than a shortened form of the title of the work itself, e.g. *GR* or *DEPN*, or to no more than the author's name, e.g. Asser (but of course this form of abbreviation should only be used

if the person in question is not known to have produced more than one work).

As a general rule, *articles* to be included in the list of Bibliographical Abbreviations should be reduced to the author's surname followed by the date of publication, e.g. Brooks 1974; if two or more articles by the same author and published in the same year are to be included, these should be distinguished from each other by following italic letters, e.g. Whitelock 1959*a*, Whitelock 1959*b*. In the case of an article re-published in a volume of collected studies, it may be necessary, or more convenient, to refer to it in this form: if the article has been revised, it should be cited with the date of re-publication (and the new reference given in the list of Bibliographical Abbreviations, perhaps followed by the original reference in brackets); but if the article has not been revised, it should be cited by the date (and with the pagination) of its original publication (and the original reference given in the list of Bibliographical Abbreviations, perhaps followed by the new reference in brackets). (This is a nightmare: Stenton's collected papers, because they are so widely dispersed, should probably be cited from Stenton, *Preparatory to ASE*; but Chaplais' articles in the *Journal of the Society of Archivists* should probably be cited from their source, rather than from *Prisca Munimenta*.)

In the interests of consistency within the series, it would be helpful if editors would adopt abbreviations used in earlier volumes (in so far as this is possible within the terms of the present guidelines).

For a full reference to a book or article, whether in the list of Bibliographical Abbreviations or (in the case of an item not included in the list) in the introduction and commentaries, please follow the conventions (of capitalization, punctuation, etc.) implied by the examples given in [Annex 4](#). Please note in particular:

(i) that an author or editor's Christian name(s), if given in full in the publication, should be reduced to initials;

(ii) that every important word in a title in English should begin with a capital (the use of capitals in foreign titles should be according to normal usage in the language concerned);

(iii) that book titles and names of periodicals should be in italic, titles of articles in roman within single quotation marks, and series titles in roman; unpublished dissertations should be treated like articles, i.e. cited by date and with full reference in roman within single quotation marks (e.g. Brooks 1968, in Annex 4);

(iv) that a series title and volume number should not be in brackets;

(v) that for a book the place of publication should be given, before the date of publication, in brackets;

(vi) that in a reference to a particular volume of a book which is in more than one volume, the volume number should be in lower-case roman numerals; that the volume number of a journal and the number of a book in a series should be in lower-case roman numerals; and that a volume number for a journal or



series should not be preceded by a comma.

## 14. Conventions for references in footnotes

When using an abbreviated reference to a book or article, in a footnote or (within brackets) in the body of the introduction or commentaries, please bear in mind the following examples and conventions:

See Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, p. 89.

Stenton (*Anglo-Saxon England*, p. 89) suggests ...

Whitelock 1979, p. 90.

Whitelock (1979, p. 85) argues ...

[not Whitelock 1979, p. 85, argues ... ]

Brooks 1974.

Brooks 1974, esp. pp. 217-18.

*PN Wilts.*, p. 100

Note that 'vol.' and 'p(p)!' should normally be omitted from abbreviated references which include both a volume number and a page number:

Plummer, *Two Chronicles*, ii. 65

But 'p(p)!' should be inserted in such a case if the reference is to pages in roman numerals:

Plummer, *Two Chronicles*, ii, p. lxxviii.

The adaptation of these conventions for items not included in a list of Bibliographical Abbreviations should be a matter of common sense. Note in particular that the pagination of the article as a whole should always be given in a first citation, perhaps followed by a more specific reference: e.g. N. Brooks, *et al.*, "A New Charter of King Edgar", *Anglo-Saxon England* xiii (1984), pp. 137-55, at 140-2.

A reference to a book may be shortened in a footnote by the omission of the author's name, if the author's name is given in the text above at the appropriate point; but a reference to an article, cited by author and date, should not be shortened in this way (i.e. one should never leave only the date in the footnote).

Ibid. (not op. cit.) should be used for *consecutive* references to the same work, e.g.:

Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, p. 310. Ibid.

Lapidge 1975, p. 99. Ibid. p. 100 n. 1.

Brooks 1974. Brooks (ibid. p. 219) ...

Cross references should be in the form:

See above, p. 00.

See below, p. 000 n. 0.

... (above, pp. 00-0) ...

It would be impracticable to provide examples of all types of reference that are likely to be required, or guidance on all problems that may arise in connection with the preparation of the typescript. It is essential, therefore, that the editors themselves pay very close attention to the forms of references, and indeed to all matters requiring consistency within the volume and within the series. In this way it is hoped that the extent of time-consuming and tiresome sub-editing will be kept to a necessary minimum.

---

[Back to Contents](#)

## Annex 1: Example of layout of a charter

---

*The example below (from the archives of Abingdon abbey) is intended to serve, in general terms, as a model for the layout of a charter in typescript. Note that in this archive, siglum B would probably need to be reserved for non-contemporary single sheets, siglum C for BL Cotton Claudius C. ix, and siglum E for the transcripts in CCCC 111. Needless to say, the example is not in its definitive state.*

*<Note also that because there is no html code for wynn, "w" appears for wynn in this file. In the printed text, wynn should be used.>*

### 64

King Eadwig grants sixteen hides (cassati) at Annington, Sussex, to Ealdorman Edmund, one of his optimates. A.D. 956

A. BL Cotton Augustus ii. 45: original, parchment, 240 x 360 mm.

Endorsements: (1) by the scribe of the charter: + Þis is þara .xvi hida boc æt Anninga dune þe Eadwig cing gebocode Eadmunde ealdorman on ece yrfe . (2) in a hand of s. xiv: Concessit istam terram cuidam optimati suo

D. BL Cotton Claudius B. vi, 56v-57r: copy of A, s. xiii

Rubric: Carta regis Edwii de Anningedune

F. Oxford, Bodleian Library, James 21, pp. 156-7: copy derived from A, s. xvii (incomplete)

Ed.: a. Kemble 445 and vol. iii, p. 439, from A

b. Chron. Ab. i. 227-9 from D

c. BMFacs. iii. 20 (facsimile and transcript) from A

d. Earle, p. 193 (incomplete) from A

e. Birch 961 from A and D

f. Barker 1949, pp. 79-80 (no. 37), from A, with translation, pp. 80-1

Listed: Sawyer 624

Printed from A with significant variants from D and F

Px<sup>a</sup> In sancte et indiuidue trinitatis uocamine . Ego Eadwig . egregius Angul Saxonum basileus cæterarumque plebium hinc inde habitantium crebro quidem coepi rimari quod ea que uidentur

temporalia ac caduca sunt et que non uidentur æternaliter mansura . Idcirco cuidam meorum optimatum cui nomen insitum est . <sup>b</sup>Eadmundo . xvi<sup>b</sup> cassatos perenniter impendo penes illum locum quo assertione multorum hominum profertur ita . æt Anninga dune . dum uero uitale spiramen suum fouerit corpus animo iocunda nostra dapsili deditioe perfruatur decurso scilicet suæ curriculo uitæ heredi cui<sup>c</sup> uoluerit impendat inperpetuum karisma . cum campis . pascuis . pratis . siluis . Hæc tellus a cuncto sit immunis seruitu nisi pontis et arcis expeditionis iuuamine . Augens fruatur domino . minuens ipse zabulo .

<sup>d</sup>Istis terminis circumgyrata assertur ante scilicet supradicta terra.

Þis sint þa land ge mæro to Anninga dune<sup>e</sup> ærest on þa deopan riþe be eastan Bremre swa west ofer Bremre to Cumb hæma ge mæro swa be Cumb hæma ge mæra to Den tunninga gemære of Den tunninga gemære swa to<sup>f</sup> Suntinga ge mære swa be Suntinga gemære to Bidelinga ge mære swa þanne<sup>g</sup> forþ east be Bidelinga ge mære oþ eft ut on Bremre<sup>h</sup> . Þis sint þa den stowa Broc hyrst 7 Beaddan syla 7 æt Fyrnþan 7 Hliþ wic 7 Strod wic .

Hæc carta scripta est . anno dominice incarnationis DCCCCLVI . indictione .xiiii.

- + Ego Eadwig gratia dei totius Britannice telluris rex meum donum proprio sigillo confirmaui
- + Ego Eadgar eiusdem regis frater cæleriter consensi .
- + Ego Oda Dorouernensis æcclesiæ archipresul alme crucis + signo roborauī .
- + Ego Ælfsinus Uuintaniensis æcclesiæ diuinus speculator proprium sigillum impressi .
- + Ego Oscytel . placabili mente consensi .
- + Ego Osulfus non rennui .
- + Ego Byrhtelm adqueiui .
- + Ego Apulf conclusi .<sup>i</sup>
- + <sup>i</sup>Æpelstan dux
- + Byrhtferþ dux
- + Æpelstan dux
- + Æpelsige dux<sup>k</sup>
- + Ælfsige minister
- + Wulfric minister
- + Æthelgeard minister
- + Ælfheah minister<sup>l</sup>
- + Ælfgar minister
- + Byrhtferþ minister
- + Apelwold minister
- + Wulfgar minister
- + Alfwold minister
- + Ælfsige minister<sup>m</sup>

<sup>a</sup> chrismon omitted D

<sup>b...b</sup> inserted in space originally left blank A

Ⓒ cuicumque D

Ⓓ Mete added as rubric D

Ⓔ D; d[. .]e A

Ⓕ D; gem[. . . . .] to A

Ⓖ D; p[. .]ne A

Ⓕ D; eft [ . . . . . ]remre A

Ⓕ First column of subscriptions ends here A

Ⓕ Ego supplied at this point in all subscriptions D

Ⓕ Second column of subscriptions ends here A

Ⓕ Third column of subscriptions ends here A

Ⓕ Fourth column of subscriptions ends here A

Description of A: <etc. etc.>

---

[Back to Contents](#)

## Annex 2: Description of single sheets

---

### I. Physical description

- (i) Membrane: method of preparation; quality; face of sheet hair or flesh side.
- (ii) Ink: colour, consistency.
- (iii) Dimensions: overall size of sheet [to be given in the preliminaries]; size of written area.
- (iv) Arrangement of main text and subsidiary text: number of lines; space between lines (?); number of columns (for lists) [may be covered adequately by textual notes].
- (v) Pricking and ruling.
- (vi) Damage and repairs.

Note: The above is confined to materials, the design of the document and the preparation for writing. Subjects like folding, sealing, evidence of wrapping-ties, whether prepared as a chirograph (double or triple), etc., would be part of the diplomatic description of the document and should normally follow the palaeographical part of the description.

### II. Palaeographical description

#### 1. *Script of the main text*

- (i) Definition of the script, including notes on variation (e.g. minuscule at line-ends in a half-uncial charter; use of majuscule forms for names); and exact accounts of changes of scribe and of interventions by correctors (whether contemporary or later).
- (ii) Letter forms: notes on significant forms, including alternatives such as uncial *d*, *g*, *n*, *r*, *s* in half-uncial and, in minuscule, open and closed *a* and the 'flourished' forms of *d*, *q*, *t*.
- (iii) Ligatures: frequent or infrequent; significant examples to be noted.
- (iv) Punctuation: word division; minor pauses, major pauses, paragraphs; at ends of lines, syllabification and run-overs; citations.

(v) Corrections: insertion, deletion, transposition.

(vi) Orthography: spelling; accents.

(vii) Abbreviations: a list of abbreviation marks should be provided.

(viii) Display script: the script should be defined (uncial, rustic capital, etc.) and main characteristics noted.

(ix) Initials: size (e.g. in number of lines), script; details of any decorative elements (including form of pictorial invocation).

## 2. *Script of subsidiary texts*

Follow the same scheme as for the main text.

## 3. *Script of endorsements*

Main details should be given in the preliminaries to each charter, and care should be taken there to specify whether any of the endorsements are by the scribe of the text. If any of the later endorsements are in hands which can be identified elsewhere (e.g. in endorsements on other single sheets), details should be given (most conveniently, perhaps, in the commentary).

## **Note**

To be reliable, even a selective palaeographical description needs to be based on a complete collection of all the relevant palaeographical facts. Editors ought, therefore, to begin by collecting all the information available under the above headings - the amount of work involved for each charter will not be very laborious. Guidance as to what should be recorded in the descriptions can be had from the descriptions of early Insular manuscripts, e.g. Lowe *CLA II* (2nd edn, 1972), and from the descriptions of manuscripts in later Anglo-Saxon minuscule and in Caroline minuscule, in Ker's *Catalogue* and Bishop's *English Caroline Minuscule*.

[Based on guidelines prepared by TJB in 1974]

## Annex 3: Note on terminology

---

The technical vocabulary relating to Anglo-Saxon charters should be used with special care, since it is desirable to achieve some degree of consistency within a single fascicule and within the series as a whole; we should not allow the uninitiated to emerge with the impression that we intend some distinction between, for example, a curse, a commination and an anathema. It will be noted that the terminology used in *Burton* differs in some respects from that used in *Rochester*; the terminology given below is based on *Burton* (with some necessary modifications and additions), and should be followed in future fascicules.

'Charter' may be used in its comprehensive sense to cover all the different kinds of document which fall within the scope of the series, but the use of the appropriate term for particular types of document is to be encouraged in the interest of greater precision: e.g. diploma, writ, lease, will, chirograph, and (Latin or vernacular) record or memorandum.

The plural of formula should be formulas (as in *Burton*), not formulae (as in *Rochester*). One can refer to the text, or formulation, of a charter.

The use of beneficiary, as opposed to grantee, is preferred in general, though grantee may be better in some contexts (e.g. when reference is being made to the grantor on the one hand and the grantee on the other).

It may be possible to show that a charter preserved on a single sheet (or single-sheet ..., if used adjectivally) is an original; if not, it may be an apparent original, or perhaps a contemporary copy. It may otherwise be possible to show that it is a forgery (of whatever date), or a later copy. Please bear these (and other such) distinctions in mind.

A typical diploma might comprise some or all of the following elements:

- pictorial invocation (cross, chrismon, etc.)
- verbal invocation
- proem [not arenga]
- exposition
- dispositive section [not *dispositio*]
  - superscription
    - royal style or royal title [not regnal style, etc.]
  - notification clause
  - dispositive word (or clause) [not granting clause, etc.]
  - immunity clause (granting exemption from various burdens)



- reservation clause (reserving the performance of the common burdens)
- prohibition clause
- sanction [not *sanctio*]
  - anathema [not curse or commination]
  - blessing
- boundary clause or bounds
- dating clause
  - year of the Incarnation
  - indiction, epact, concurrents, etc.
  - regnal year
- witness-list [please note hyphen]
  - royal subscription [not regnal signature]
  - episcopal subscriptions, etc.
- endorsement (on the dorse, as opposed to the face)

It will doubtless be necessary to use other terms for other specific parts of the formulation, especially in reference to the dispositive section. Please ensure that the meaning of the terms chosen is clear, and that they are employed consistently.

For writs, follow the terminology used by Harmer, and by Bishop and Chaplais.

---

[Back to Contents](#)

## Annex 4: An example of a list of abbreviations

### Abbreviations

BL	London, British Library
Bodleian	Oxford, Bodleian Library
CCCC	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College
D. & C.	Dean and Chapter
DRO	Diocesan Record Office
GDB	Great Domesday Book
LDB	Little Domesday Book
PRO	London, Public Record Office
s.	<i>saeculo</i>
Soc. Ant.	London, Society of Antiquaries
TRE	<i>Tempore Regis Eadwardi</i>
TRW	<i>Tempore Regis Willelmi</i>

### Bibliographical Abbreviations

ASC	<i>Anglo-Saxon Chronicle</i>
Asser	<i>Asser's Life of King Alfred</i> , ed. W.H. Stevenson (Oxford, 1904)
BAFacs.	<i>Facsimiles of Anglo-Saxon Charters</i> , ed. S. Keynes, Anglo-Saxon Charters, Supplementary ser. i (Oxford, 1991)
BCS	For 'Birch' in citations of charters
Bede, <i>HE</i>	Bede, <i>Historia Ecclesiastica</i>
Birch	W. de G. Birch, <i>Cartularium Saxonicum</i> , 3 vols (London, 1885-93)
Birch, <i>Index</i>	W. de G. Birch, <i>Index Saxonius: an Index to all the Names of Persons in Cartularium Saxonicum</i> (London, 1899)
Bishop 1957	T.A.M. Bishop, 'A Charter of King Edwy', <i>Bodleian Library Record</i> vi.1 (1957), pp. 369-73

Bishop and Chaplais	<i>Facsimiles of English Royal Writs to A.D. 1100 presented to Vivian Hunter Galbraith</i> , ed. T.A.M. Bishop and P. Chaplais (Oxford, 1957)
<i>BMFacs.</i>	E.A. Bond, <i>Facsimiles of Ancient Charters in the British Museum</i> , 4 vols (London, 1873-8)
Brooks, <i>Church of Canterbury</i>	N. Brooks, <i>The Early History of the Church of of Canterbury: Christ Church from 597 to 1066</i> (Leicester, 1984)
Brooks 1968	N. Brooks, 'The Pre-Conquest Charters of Christ Church, Canterbury', unpubl. D.Phil. thesis, Oxford University (1968)
Brooks 1971	N. Brooks, 'The Development of Military Obligations in Eighth- and Ninth-Century England', <i>England before the Conquest: Studies in Primary Sources presented to Dorothy Whitelock</i> , ed. P. Clemoes and K. Hughes (Cambridge, 1971), pp. 69-84
Brooks 1974	N. Brooks, 'Anglo-Saxon Charters: the Work of the Last Twenty Years', <i>Anglo-Saxon England</i> iii (1974), pp. 211-31
Brooks 1979	N. Brooks, 'England in the Ninth Century: the Crucible of Defeat', <i>Transactions of the Royal Historical Society</i> 5th ser. xxix (1979), pp. 1-20
Campbell, <i>Encomium Emmae</i>	<i>Encomium Emmae Reginae</i> , ed. A. Campbell, Camden 3rd ser. lxxii (London, 1949)
Campbell, <i>Rochester</i>	<i>Charters of Rochester</i> , ed. A. Campbell, Anglo-Saxon Charters i (London, 1973)
Campbell, <i>The Anglo-Saxons</i>	<i>The Anglo-Saxons</i> , ed. J. Campbell (Oxford, 1982)
Chaplais 1965	P. Chaplais, 'The Origin and Authenticity of the Royal Anglo-Saxon Diploma', <i>Journal of the Society of Archivists</i> iii.2 (1965), pp. 48-61 (repr. in <i>Prisca Munimenta</i> , ed. F. Ranger (London, 1973), pp. 28-42)
Chaplais 1966	P. Chaplais, 'The Anglo-Saxon Chancery: from the Diploma to the Writ', <i>Journal of the Society of Archivists</i> iii.4 (1966), pp. 160-76 (repr. in <i>Prisca Munimenta</i> , ed. F. Ranger (London, 1973), pp. 43-62)
Chaplais 1968	P. Chaplais, 'Some Early Anglo-Saxon Diplomas on Single Sheets: Originals or Copies?', <i>Journal of the Society of Archivists</i> iii.7 (1968), pp. 315-36 (repr. in <i>Prisca Munimenta</i> , ed. F. Ranger (London, 1973), pp. 63-87)

Chaplais 1969	P. Chaplais, 'Who Introduced Charters into England? The Case for Augustine', <i>Journal of the Society of Archivists</i> iii.10 (1969), pp. 526-42 (repr. in <i>Prisca Munimenta</i> , ed. F. Ranger (London, 1973), pp. 88-107)
Chaplais 1981a	P. Chaplais, 'The Letter from Bishop Wealdhere of London to Archbishop Brihtwold of Canterbury: the Earliest Original "Letter Close" Extant in the West', in his <i>Essays in Medieval Diplomacy and Administration</i> (London, 1981), at pp. XIV 3-23 and Addendum (originally publ. in <i>Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts &amp; Libraries: Essays presented to N.R. Ker</i> , ed. M.B. Parkes and A.G. Watson (London, 1978), pp. 3-23)
Chaplais 1981b	P. Chaplais, 'The Authenticity of the Royal Anglo-Saxon Diplomas of Exeter', in his <i>Essays in Medieval Diplomacy and Administration</i> (London, 1981), at pp. XV 1-34 and Addendum (originally publ. in <i>Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research</i> xxxix (1966), pp. 1-34)
Chaplais 1985	P. Chaplais, 'The Royal Anglo-Saxon "Chancery" of the Tenth Century Revisited', <i>Studies in Medieval History presented to R.H. C. Davis</i> , ed. H. Mayr-Harting and R.I. Moore (London, 1985), pp. 41-51
ChLA iii, iv	> <i>Chartae Latinae Antiquiores: Facsimile Edition of Latin Charters Prior to the Ninth Century</i> , ed. A. Bruckner and R. Marichal, pts iii and iv (Olten and Lausanne, 1963-7)
<i>Councils &amp; Synods</i>	<i>Councils &amp; Synods with other Documents Relating to the English Church, I: A.D. 871-1204</i> , ed. D. Whitelock, M. Brett and C.N.L. Brooke, 2 pts (Oxford, 1981)
<i>Crawford Charters</i>	<i>The Crawford Collection of Early Charters and Documents now in the Bodleian Library</i> , ed. A.S. Napier and W.H. Stevenson (Oxford, 1895)
Davis, <i>Cartularies</i>	G.R.C. Davis, <i>Medieval Cartularies of Great Britain: a Short Catalogue</i> (London, 1958)
DEPN	E. Ekwall, <i>The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names</i> , 4th edn (Oxford, 1960)
Drögereit 1935	R. Drögereit, 'Gab es eine angelsächsische Königskanzlei?', <i>Archiv für Urkundenforschung</i> xiii (1935), pp. 335-436
Earle	J. Earle, <i>A Hand-Book to the Land-Charters, and other Saxon Documents</i> (Oxford, 1888)
Edwards, <i>Charters</i>	H. Edwards, <i>The Charters of the Early West Saxon Kingdom</i> , British Archaeological Reports, British ser. cxcviii (Oxford, 1988)

EETS os, es	Early English Text Society, original series, extra series
EPNS	English Place-Name Society
Finberg, <i>ECDC</i>	H.P.R. Finberg, <i>The Early Charters of Devon and Cornwall</i> , Department of English Local History, Occasional Papers ii, 2nd edn (Leicester, 1963)
Finberg, <i>ECDC Supplement</i>	H.P.R. Finberg, 'Supplement to <i>The Early Charters of Devon and Cornwall</i> ', in W.G. Hoskins, <i>The Westward Expansion of Wessex</i> , Department of English Local History, Occasional Papers xiii (Leicester, 1960), pp. 23-44
Finberg, <i>ECW</i>	H.P.R. Finberg, <i>The Early Charters of Wessex</i> (Leicester, 1964)
Finberg, <i>ECWM</i>	H.P.R. Finberg, <i>The Early Charters of the West Midlands</i> , 2nd edn (Leicester, 1972)
Gelling, <i>ECTV</i>	M. Gelling, <i>The Early Charters of the Thames Valley</i> (Leicester, 1979)
<i>GP</i>	<i>Willelmi Malmesbiriensis Monachi De Gestis Pontificum Anglorum Libri Quinque</i> , ed. N.E.S.A. Hamilton, RS (London, 1870)
<i>GR</i>	<i>Willelmi Malmesbiriensis Monachi De Gestis Regum Anglorum Libri Quinque</i> , ed. W. Stubbs, 2 vols, RS (London, 1887-9)
Grundy 1919, 1920	G.B. Grundy, 'The Saxon Land Charters of Wiltshire', <i>Archaeological Journal</i> , 2nd ser. xxvi (1919), pp. 143-301; xxvii (1920), pp. 8-126
Haddan and Stubbs	<i>Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britain and Ireland</i> , ed. A.W. Haddan and W. Stubbs, 3 vols (Oxford, 1869-78)
Harmer, <i>SEHD</i>	<i>Select English Historical Documents of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries</i> , ed. F.E. Harmer (Cambridge, 1914)
Harmer, <i>Writs</i>	F.E. Harmer, <i>Anglo-Saxon Writs</i> (Manchester, 1952)
Hart, <i>ECE</i>	C. Hart, <i>The Early Charters of Essex</i> , Department of English Local History, Occasional Papers x, 2nd edn (Leicester, 1971)
Hart, <i>ECEE</i>	C.R. Hart, <i>The Early Charters of Eastern England</i> (Leicester, 1966)
Hart, <i>ECNE</i>	C.R. Hart, <i>The Early Charters of Northern England and the North Midlands</i> (Leicester, 1975)
Hart 1970	C. Hart, 'The <i>Codex Wintoniensis</i> and the King's <i>Haligdom</i> ', <i>Land, Church, and People: Essays presented to Professor H.P.R. Finberg</i> , ed. J. Thirsk (Reading, 1970; = <i>Agricultural History Review</i> xviii (1970), Supplement), pp. 7-38

<i>HRH</i>	D. Knowles, C.N.L. Brooke and V.C.M. London, <i>The Heads of Religious Houses England and Wales 940-1216</i> (Cambridge, 1972)
KCD	For 'Kemble' in citations of charters
Kelly	
Kelly	
Kelly	
Kelly	
Kemble	J.M. Kemble, <i>Codex Diplomaticus Aevi Saxonici</i> , 6 vols (London, 1839-48)
Ker, <i>Catalogue</i>	N.R. Ker, <i>Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon</i> (Oxford, 1957; repr. with addenda, 1990)
Keynes, <i>Diplomas</i>	S. Keynes, <i>The Diplomas of King Æthelred 'the Unready' 978-1016: a Study in their Use as Historical Evidence</i> (Cambridge, 1980)
Keynes, <i>AS Charters</i>	S. Keynes, <i>Anglo-Saxon Charters: Archives and Single Sheets</i> , Anglo-Saxon Charters, Supplementary ser. ii (Oxford, 1995)
Keynes 1985	S. Keynes, 'King Athelstan's Books', <i>Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England: Studies presented to Peter Clemoes</i> , ed. M. Lapidge and H. Gneuss (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 143-201
Keynes 1995	S. Keynes, 'Addenda to Professor Sawyer's Anglo-Saxon Charters', <i>Anglo-Saxon England</i> xxiv (1995), pp. 000-00
Keynes and Lapidge, <i>Alfred the Great</i>	S. Keynes and M. Lapidge, <i>Alfred the Great: Asser's 'Life of King Alfred' and other Contemporary Sources</i> (Harmondsworth, 1983)
Kleinschmidt, <i>Untersuchungen</i>	H. Kleinschmidt, <i>Untersuchungen über das englische Königtum im 10. Jahrhundert</i> , Göttinger Bausteine zur Geschichtswissenschaft xlix (Göttingen, 1979)
<i>Mon. Angl.</i>	R. Dodsworth and W. Dugdale, <i>Monasticon Anglicanum</i> , 3 vols (London, 1655-73)
<i>Mon. Angl.</i> (rev. edn)	W. Dugdale, <i>Monasticon Anglicanum</i> , ed. J. Caley, H. Ellis and B. Bandinel, 6 vols in 8 (London, 1817-30)
<i>MRH</i>	D. Knowles and R.N. Hadcock, <i>Medieval Religious Houses England and Wales</i> (London, 1971)
O'Donovan, <i>Sherborne</i>	<i>Charters of Sherborne</i> , ed. M.A. O'Donovan, Anglo-Saxon Charters iii (London, 1988)

O'Donovan 1972, 1973	M.A. O'Donovan, 'An Interim Revision of Episcopal Dates for the Province of Canterbury, 850-950: Part I', <i>Anglo-Saxon England</i> i (1972), pp. 23-44; ' ... Part II', <i>Anglo-Saxon England</i> ii (1973), pp. 91-113
<i>OSFacs.</i>	W.B. Sanders, <i>Facsimiles of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts</i> , 3 vols (Ordnance Survey, Southampton, 1878-84)
Parsons 1939	M.P. Parsons, 'Some Scribal Memoranda for Anglo-Saxon Charters of the 8th and 9th Centuries', <i>Mitteilungen des österreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung</i> , Erg.-Bd. xiv (1939), pp. 13-32
Pierquin, <i>Recueil</i>	H. Pierquin, <i>Recueil général des chartes anglo-saxonnes: les Saxons en Angleterre, 604-1061</i> (Paris, 1912)
<i>PN Wilts.</i>	J.E.B. Gover, A. Mawer and F.M. Stenton, <i>The Place-Names of Wiltshire</i> , EPNS xvi (Cambridge, 1939)
Robertson, <i>Charters</i>	<i>Anglo-Saxon Charters</i> , ed. A.J. Robertson, 2nd edn (Cambridge, 1956)
RS	Rolls Series
S	For 'Sawyer', in citations of charters
S (Add.)	For Keynes 1995, in citations of charters
Sawyer	P.H. Sawyer, <i>Anglo-Saxon Charters: an Annotated List and Bibliography</i> , Royal Historical Society Guides and Handbooks viii (London, 1968)
Sawyer, <i>Burton</i>	<i>Charters of Burton Abbey</i> , ed. P.H. Sawyer, <i>Anglo-Saxon Charters</i> ii (London, 1979)
Scharer, <i>Königsurkunde</i>	A. Scharer, <i>Die angelsächsische Königsurkunde im 7. and 8. Jahrhundert</i> , Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung xxvi (Cologne and Vienna, 1982)
Smith, <i>EPNE</i>	A.H. Smith, <i>English Place-Name Elements</i> , 2 vols, EPNS xxv-xxvi (Cambridge, 1956)
Stenton, <i>ASE</i>	F.M. Stenton, <i>Anglo-Saxon England</i> , 3rd edn (Oxford, 1971)
Stenton, <i>Latin Charters</i>	F.M. Stenton, <i>The Latin Charters of the Anglo-Saxon Period</i> (Oxford, 1955)
Stenton, <i>Preparatory to ASE</i>	<i>Preparatory to Anglo-Saxon England, being the Collected Papers of Frank Merry Stenton</i> , ed. D.M. Stenton (Oxford, 1970)
Stevenson, <i>Asser</i>	<i>Asser's Life of King Alfred</i> , ed. W.H. Stevenson (Oxford, 1904)
Sweet, <i>OET</i>	<i>The Oldest English Texts</i> , ed. H. Sweet, EETS os lxxxiii (London, 1885)

Thorpe, <i>Diplomatarium</i>	B. Thorpe, <i>Diplomatarium Anglicum Ævi Saxonici</i> (London, 1865)
VCH Wilts. ii	<i>A History of Wiltshire</i> , ed. R.B. Pugh and E. Crittall, ii, Victoria History of the Counties of England (London, 1955)
Whitelock, <i>EHD</i>	<i>English Historical Documents c. 500-1042</i> , ed. D. Whitelock, English Historical Documents i, 2nd edn (London, 1979)
Whitelock, <i>Wills</i>	<i>Anglo-Saxon Wills</i> , ed. D. Whitelock (Cambridge, 1930)
Whitelock 1952	D. Whitelock, 'On the Commencement of the Year in the Saxon Chronicles', <i>Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel</i> , ed. C. Plummer, 2 vols (Oxford, 1892-9, repr. 1952) i, pp. cxxxix-cxliid
Whitelock 1959a	D. Whitelock, 'The Dealings of the Kings of England with Northumbria in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries', <i>The Anglo-Saxons: Studies in some Aspects of their History and Culture presented to Bruce Dickins</i> , ed. P. Clemoes (London, 1959), pp. 70-88
Whitelock 1959b	D. Whitelock, 'Recent Work on Asser's <i>Life of King Alfred</i> ', <i>Asser's Life of King Alfred</i> , ed. W.H. Stevenson (Oxford, 1904, repr. 1959), pp. cxxxii-clii
Whitelock 1979	D. Whitelock, 'Some Charters in the Name of King Alfred', <i>Saints, Scholars and Heroes: Studies in Medieval Culture in Honour of Charles W. Jones</i> , ed. M.H. King and W.M. Stevens, 2 vols (Collegeville, Minn., 1979) i. 77-98
Whitelock, <i>et al.</i> , <i>ASC</i>	<i>The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle</i> , ed. D. Whitelock, D. Douglas and S.I. Tucker (London, 1961; corr. imp. 1965)
Wormald 1983	P. Wormald, 'Bede, the <i>Bretwaldas</i> and the Origins of the <i>Gens Anglorum</i> ', <i>Ideal and Reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society: Studies presented to J.M. Wallace-Hadrill</i> , ed. P. Wormald (Oxford, 1983), pp. 99-129
Wormald 1985	P. Wormald, <i>Bede and the Conversion of England: the Charter Evidence</i> , Jarrow Lecture 1984 (Jarrow, [1985])
Wormald 1988	P. Wormald, 'A Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Lawsuits', <i>Anglo-Saxon England</i> xvii (1988), pp. 247-81
Yorke 1981	B.A.E. Yorke, 'The Vocabulary of Anglo-Saxon Overlordship', <i>Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History</i> ii, British Archaeological Reports, British ser. xcii (Oxford, 1981), pp. 171-200

Other abbreviations and references should be devised in the spirit of these examples.



[Back to contents](#)

## Annex 5: Compilation of Old English glossaries

---

The main purpose of the glossary is to identify and translate the linguistic components of the boundary-marks in boundary clauses: e.g. *grene* and *dic* for *grenan dic*, and *mearth* and *scaga* for *mearthes scaga* in the *Burton* glossary. All words in those boundary-marks which have not survived as place-names should be listed in the glossary, with a translation, and an index to all their occurrences in the texts in the fascicule. Boundary-marks which do survive as names should be entered in the glossary under the OE forms which occur in the text, with cross-referencing to the Index of Place-Names (where their modern forms will be entered). No translation need be given if the modern name can be looked up in a standard reference book such as *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names* or an English Place-Name Society survey. It may, however, be useful to supply a gloss for minor names in counties for which there is as yet no EPNS survey; this was done, e.g., for Scounslow Green in Marchington, Staffs., in the *Burton* glossary. This consideration applies *a fortiori* to modern field-names if these are cited as the surviving form of a boundary-mark.

In the case of place-name-forming terms which are not included in Smith's *English Place-Name Elements*, the glossary should give a reference to a printed discussion, and this reference should be included in the Bibliographical Abbreviations. An example from *Burton* is the Old Norse word *\*sprogh*, for which it would have been helpful to give the reference Fellows Jensen, *Scandinavian Settlement Names in Yorkshire*, p. 114, and *Scandinavian Settlement Names in the East Midlands*, p. 187. Words not recorded except in place-names should be asterisked, as in *English Place-Name Elements*.

If all boundary-marks are listed and either glossed or identified with items in the Index of Place-Names (or both, in the case of some minor names), and all occurrences of each term or name in the volume have been indexed, the minimum requirements of the glossary will have been fulfilled. The editor may feel moved to provide further assistance for the reader in the form of translation of verbs, prepositions, adjectives and adverbs which are not part of the boundary-marks. Very little help of this kind was provided in the *Burton* glossary, though *thwers*, 'crosswise', was included, and each word in the phrase *butan fif lan beheonan* was indexed and glossed. In the *Sherborne* volume some verbs (e.g. *scytan*), adjectives (e.g. *eastewardne*) and adverbs (e.g. *rihtes*) are glossed. This will certainly be helpful to the reader, but it is practicable because *Sherborne* is a small archive with few boundaries. It is doubtful whether a comprehensive word-list for the bounds in the Worcester, Abingdon and Winchester charters would be a realistic undertaking. The decision as to how much should be included in addition to the boundary-marks should be taken by the editor, but it is advisable to think about this at an early stage and to discuss it with the relevant members of the Committee.

Passages in boundary clauses which might be specially difficult for the reader to follow could be translated and commented on in the discussion of the bounds in the commentary on the charter. This would probably have been a better way to deal with *butan fif lan beheonan* in *Burton* 35.

Passages of Old English in the texts of charters, as opposed to the boundary clauses, should be translated in the commentary, unless a reference can be given to a reliable translation readily available in print. Words from such passages need not be included in the glossary.

MG

---

[Back to contents](#)

## Annex 6: Compilation of Latin glossaries

---

Editors of individual volumes should always bear in mind the fact that the Latin of many charters (especially those from the reign of Athelstan) is often extremely difficult, and that, without some sort of assistance, a charter can prove unintelligible even to readers with a sound knowledge of Latin. Editors would therefore provide a valuable service in supplying a glossary of all unusual Latin words which occur in the charters of the archive which they are editing. A useful index to whether a word is unusual or not is whether it is listed in Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, or in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. As a general rule it would be helpful to gloss all words in the charters not found in Lewis and Short, or the *OLD*, but particular attention should be given to the following classes of vocabulary:

- (a) technical vocabulary used to describe the charter or the transaction (e.g. *breuicula*, *cedula*, *cyrographum*, etc.);
- (b) uncommon vocabulary used to describe members of the royal household and witnesses of charters in general (e.g. *clito*, *optimas*, *satrapa*, etc.; but not *rex*, *dux*, etc.);
- (c) vocabulary used to describe an estate and its appurtenances (e.g. *pascuarium*, *piscuarium*, *siluaticus*, etc.);
- (d) technical vocabulary used in the assessment of land (e.g. *cassata*, *mansa*, *tributarius*, etc.);
- (e) hermeneutic vocabulary of any kind, but especially the unusual Greek-based vocabulary which is common in charters from the reign of Athelstan onwards;
- (f) words used in a sense not recorded in Lewis and Short or *OLD* (e.g. *resipisco* apparently used to mean 'to dissuade' in *Selsey* 14)

The entry for each word in the glossary should give: the part of speech of the word (using the abbreviations n., v., adj., adv., and p.p. for noun, verb, adjective, adverb and past participle respectively); in the case of a grecism the Greek original from which the word derives; and a simple modern English equivalent. Glossaries should be modelled on those in the Burton and Sherborne volumes.

ML

## Annex 7: The treatment of boundary clauses

---

The boundary clauses of Anglo-Saxon charters are not constructed with set formulas, as to some extent the Latin texts are, and the grammar and syntax of Old English are less rigid than those of Latin. This makes it virtually impossible to offer comprehensive guide-lines for the editing of bounds.

The Committee has decided that systematic capitalization of proper names will render boundary clauses more intelligible. It is easier to illustrate the intended practice than to lay down rules for it. Thus, in the boundary clause of S 624 (used as an exemplum in Annex 1) *Bremre* has been given a capital because it is a river-name (it survived as *Bramber* until c. 1600); *Cumb hæma ge mæro*, *Den tunninga gemære*, *Suntinga ge mære* and *Bidelinga ge mære*, meaning 'boundary of the people of Combes / Dankton / Sompting / Bidlington', are adjacent land-units, so their names qualify for capitals; the names of the woodland pastures also qualify, though not all of them have survived on the modern map. The only item not capitalized in this set of bounds is *deopan riþe*, a boundary-mark which is not known to have become a place-name. The use of such boundary-marks, as opposed to delimitation by reference to neighbouring land-units, is very much commoner in areas other than south-east England, so most edited boundary clauses will require less capitalization than this example.

Apart from this, the only generally applicable principle is that emendation should be kept to the necessary minimum. That is to say, word-division in texts preserved on single sheets should be respected, and emendation restricted to what is required to make sense of the text; but in the case of texts preserved in cartulary copies, it may well be desirable to normalize word-division, etc., in accordance with the editor's editorial judgement. Bear in mind that it will never be possible to say whether (e.g.) *in to* or *into* would have seemed more correct to the composer of a clause. Nor is there any way of knowing what would have seemed correct to him in the way of punctuation marks.

Editors of large cartularies, such as those from Winchester, Abingdon and Worcester, will become familiar with the practice of particular scribes, and will be able to correct consistent errors of transcription from Old English originals and widespread confusion of Old English letters. Apart from this, the only standards generally applicable are those provided by the existence of more than one copy of the same boundary clause, or by the occurrence of the same boundary-marks in surveys of adjacent estates, or by repetition of boundary-marks within the same survey. In such circumstances it will sometimes be possible to replace a garbled phrase with something better.

Emendation of spelling or of grammatical endings should probably only be attempted when there is another copy of the text which gives authority for it. Non-conformity to classical Old English standards may reflect regional forms which are of considerable interest, and most apparent irregularities should be faithfully reproduced in the edition.