ANGLICA

An International Journal of English Studies

31/2 2022

UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW

Anglica An International Journal of English Studies

ISSN 0860-5734

www.anglica-journal.com

DOI: 10.7311/Anglica/31.2

Publisher:
Institute of English Studies University of Warsaw
ul. Hoża 69
00-681 Warszawa

Nakład: 30 egz.

Typesetting:
Tomasz Gut

Cover design:
Tomasz Gut

Printing and binding:
Sowa – Druk na życzenie
www.sowadruk.pl
+48 22 431 81 40

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Anglica 31/2 2022
ISSN: 0860-5734
DOI: 10.7311/0860-5734.31.2.05

Paulina Zagórska
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0686-5289
Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

Post-Conquest Forged Charters Containing English: A List*

Abstract: The paper presents a list of sixty-nine forged charters containing English produced following the Norman Conquest of 1066. The list can be considered a supplement to *The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1066–1220* (Da Rold et al. 2010) – a project conducted jointly at the University of Leeds and University of Leicester collecting all known texts containing English, in order to provide an insight and allow research into "transitional", post-Conquest English. The paper outlines the significance of charters in the Medieval world, and discusses some key issues and misconceptions related to studying this period in the history of the English language.

Keywords: charter, forgery, Norman Conquest, transitional English, diplomatics

1. Introduction

A charter is a legal document containing some kind of record (Tinti 2021, 2), such as transactions (sales, exchanges, leases, donations), grants of rights, powers, privileges, or functions – from the sovereign power of a state to individuals or institutions. Generally speaking, before 1066, most Anglo-Saxon charters were issued by kings, who would use them for political reasons, as a form of executing and demonstrating their power, whereas after 1066 charters were prevalent throughout all layers of medieval society[1].

The study of charters is known as "diplomatic" or "diplomatics", from *diploma* – a Classical Latin term[2] used for a wide range of charters, deeds, and

* This work was supported by the National Science Centre (NCN) under grant (2016/21/N/HS2/02 01), 12th century impressions of Old English in forged documents as a source for the reconstruction of early Middle English, 2017-2022.

writs (Sharpe 1994, 230). As documents referring to property, charters constitute a significant part of archival records (Geary 1998, 169), offering themselves as an interesting object in historical linguistic research, providing data on such areas as social and political relationships, economic organization, or customs and practices; sometimes even allowing an insight into lives of the bottom layers of society, as opposed to e.g. chronicles which tend to focus on those in power[3]. As written records of oral transactions (McKitterick 1990, 320) they typically contain information on the time, place, participants, and external circumstances of their production[4], and due to their performative character they furnish information about the spoken language (Tinti 2021, 12).

2. Pre-Conquest English charters

Compared to other Medieval European kingdoms, Anglo-Saxon England produced an impressive volume of vernacular texts (Clanchy 2013, 32). This is mostly due to religion in terms of its political and cultural dimensions – the collapse of the Roman Empire led to the institutionalization and bureaucratization of the Church[5]; both processes were rooted in the Latin documentary culture, reinforcing and disseminating it via the structures of the Church. In the late sixth and early seventh centuries, the introduction of Christianity had two linguistic-literary consequences to the contemporary English kingdoms: adoption of the Roman alphabet, and the emergence of early Christian, almost exclusively literary culture (Tinti 2021, 4). The first known Anglo-Saxon charters are seventh-century Latin diplomas – grants of land issued for religious communities; this means that the Anglo-Saxon documentary culture was established by accepting a foreign language (Latin) validated by religion (Tinti 2021, 5). Nonetheless, even the early Anglo-Saxon charters (dating back to the seventh and eighth centuries) were not entirely written in Latin, as they contained vernacular elements, such as place-names or personal names,[6] which later led to the establishment of Old English as a written language, and consequently – as the language of record (Seiler 2021, 117–119), ultimately making the Anglo-Saxon documentary culture bilingual (Kelly 1990). When it comes to charters, Old English was especially common in boundaries, i.e. land descriptions (Howe 2007, 32–38), which show the limits of land under conveyance in written form, walking the reader around the perimeter of the estate, citing features which the boundary passes, crosses or follows.[7] Bounds constituted the most practical aspect of charters for local residents, and as such they were often recorded in the vernacular – especially that Latin was known by only a small portion of society.[8] Additionally, the legal Latin of charters was highly formulaic, relying on fixed phrases and exemplars, whereas the language of bounds reflected the actual geography of a given parcel, and as such it did not follow conventions as easily; bounds were recorded in a

more *ad hoc* manner than the main text of charters, rendering the vernacular a better choice. Apart from bounds, the English language was also generally used for various documents (for instance, wills or endorsements) (Gallagher 2018), and eventually became a literary and documentary code by the eleventh century (Marsden 1995, 1; O'Brien 1995, 3; Godden 2011, 586; Gretsch 2013, 291). In the words of Treharne (2012, 344):

> Extensive manuscripts and numerous documents that survive from multiple points of origin in Anglo-Saxon England bear testimony to the production and use of English as a legitimate and legitimizing phenomenon. Writing in the vernacular was clearly felt to have the potential to save souls, create emperors, rehabilitate society, validate truth, establish lineage, secure status and land and more: its intelligibility was widespread, its demographic ubiquitous.

3. Medieval forgeries

In the Middle Ages documents were widely used in order to prove rights to a given property, which facilitated widespread forgery (Sharpe 1994, 230; Hiatt 2004, 1; Clanchy 2013, 2). According to the classic, simple diplomatic definition,[9] a forged document is "any piece of writing, which according to the intention of its producer, gives itself for something other than it really is" (Hiatt 2004, 14). The French diplomatist Arthur Giry distinguished three basic types of unauthentic documents: "surreptitious", "re-written/re-made", and the "simple" forgery. The first type refers to (typically) authentic documents containing added clauses; the second one – to unauthentic documents which replace lost originals; and the third one – to forgeries produced with fraudulent intentions (Giry 1925, 863-864, in Hiatt 2004, 6). The second type can also include the so-called *retrospective documents* (Tillotson 2005) – i.e. documents produced in order to validate claims sanctioned by the oral tradition (in Giry's classification, such documents would fall into the "re-written/re-made" category), supporting the title or already established rights,[10] rather than documents devised for fraudulent purposes[11] (Sharpe 1994, 230; Clanchy 2013, 31). A more recent approach to medieval forgeries distinguishes between those which have elements of authentic validation (e.g. a seal), and "falsified acts", i.e. documents whose basis is genuine, but the contents were in some way altered. However, twentieth-century diplomatists seem to be less preoccupied with classifying various documents into types, focusing more on contextualizing them and – given the complexity of the matter – evaluating them in terms of levels of validity, rather than on a simple yes/no basis (Hiatt 2004, 7). Hence, unauthentic documents will be referred to using the umbrella term "forgery" here, regardless of the extent of forgery and exact motivations behind each case.

In the history of England, the "Golden Age" of forgeries refers to the period between the Norman Conquest and the beginning of the reign of Henry II (Hiatt 2004, 22). Those forgeries are today said to be a common testament to the shift from the oral (oath- and witness-based) to predominantly written (charter-based) governmental and administrative record, which were brought about by the aftermath of the events of 1066.[12] This is especially due to the increased reliance on formal documents, and the fact that institutions founded in Anglo-Saxon England sought to ratify their privileges by the new regime; additionally, given that William the Conqueror presented himself as a legitimate successor to Edward the Confessor (Hiatt 2004, 22-23; Clanchy 2013, 31), he was expected to obey the law by recognizing legal claims. On the other hand, one should not underestimate the significance of the pre-Norman written record (Hiatt 2004, 23); the oral and the written traditions should be viewed "in a situation of complementarity, even of interdependence, rather than antagonism" (Guyotjeannin et al. 1993, 374), especially since medieval written texts were both produced (transcribed) and performed[13] orally for their audience[14] (Geary 1998, 174).

Additionally, numerous religious houses did not have complete documentation, for various reasons, such as loss, destruction, or the said reliance on the oral tradition. This meant that documents had to be produced in order to secure rights to their estates, and in some cases to validate dubious claims (O'Brien 1995, 12; Hiatt 2004, 22). Such a situation facilitated – or even encouraged – forgery, as even repairing and archiving charters would often be associated with replacing them (O'Brien 1995, 11; Clanchy 2013, 160). In fact, some monasteries – especially Westminster, St. Augustine's and Christ Church, Canterbury, Durham, and Glastonbury – are today somewhat (in) famous for producing forgeries on a massive scale, both for their own benefit, as well as to complete archives of other houses[15] (O'Brien 1995, 12; Hiatt 2004, 22):

> The more powerful and ancient the house, the more likely it was that its documents would be forged in a professional manner. Of the seals used by Christ Church, Canterbury, Archdeacon Simon Langton wrote to Gregory IX in 1238: 'Holy Father, there is not a single sort of forgery that is not perpetrated in the Church of Canterbury. For they have forged in gold, in lead, in wax, and in every kind of metal.' (Clanchy 2013, 299).

Another reason lies in the feudal system; monasteries were economically reliant on their lands and rural communities residing there, to whom they were feudal landlords (Tillotson 2005). Hence, a monastic house which required a document to support its claim to a property in a lawsuit would often simply fabricate an appropriate charter (Clanchy 2013, 150) – most religious houses, especially those that had been favored in Anglo-Saxon times, would try to avoid losses from the hands of the new lords by producing forged documentation (O'Brien 1995, 11).

4. Post-Conquest English

Following the Conquest, Latin became the language of all formal documentation[16] of the Anglo-Norman kingdom, largely eliminating standard Old English from its formal usage (Gretsch 2013, 291), and thus rendering numerous old documents composed in Old English useless from the legal perspective, which led to either translating them into Latin, or destroying them altogether (O'Brien 1995, 11). There is thus a popular notion that 1066 was a massive historical rupture, which partially stems from the fact that compared to the Anglo-Saxon period, following 1066 Old English was hardly used in formal documentation. In 1912, Ker wrote that "[f]or a long time before and after 1100, there is a great scarcity of English productions (…) This scantiness is partly due, no doubt, to an actual disuse of English composition" (Ker 2020, in Treharne 2012, 94). Davis (1976, 103) comments that "(…) English was relegated to the underworld of the unprivileged"[17] – in fact, writing in the vernacular (as opposed to writing in Latin) was supposed to be a source of embarrassment (Thomas 2003, 387). Da Rold (2006) explains that it is commonly stated that due to Old English completely losing its status, it produced hardly any literature worth academic attention, whereas Treharne (2012) cites scholars claiming that the English literature "disappeared" following the Conquest.

Indeed, compared to the bulk of Anglo-Saxon texts, relatively little new material was produced after the Conquest, which is one reason for describing the period between ca. 1066 and 1200 as "transitional" (Bartlett 2000, 49; Faulkner 2012, 276). The West Saxon *Schriftsprache*, i.e. a focused version of the language, was replaced with local, highly diversified dialects (Barlett 2000, 496; Thomas 2003, 379; Faulkner 2012, 280,). As a result, the post-Conquest circulation of texts was limited, forcing their authors to employ older exemplars, thus making the newly produced manuscripts consciously archaic[18] (Faulkner 2012, 281). This self-imposed belatedness is also related to the issue of forgery: religious communities forged their documentation by resorting to imitating and copying older charters, also to keep up the pretense of genuineness:

> Scribal archaism suggests both a consciousness of the past and a distance from it. Just like forgery, which is its textual equivalent, it required modification of the practioner's usual habits. (…) A draftsman of a spurious charter (…) adopted a consciously discontinuous relationship with the past, importing formulae alien to his normal repertoire, and so introducing the anachronistic elements upon which the detection of a forgery by modern critics depends. (Crick 2015, 160–162)

Although Old English significantly declined as the language of record (O'Brien 1995, 4), having lost the prestige and functionality it enjoyed prior to 1066 (Timofeeva 2013, 204), the process was neither immediate nor complete. In recent years there has been a growing body of research indicating that texts written

in Old English were recycled, copied, and read for a long time after the Conquest (Faulkner 2012). Treharne (2012) demonstrates that – judging by the number of Old English manuscripts that were copied in the twelfth century – there must have been a great interest in the seemingly "lost" culture and language. These texts were not just a symptom of nostalgia; they served numerous functions, such as "teaching, preaching, chronicling, and carrying out all ecclesiastical and pastoral duties" (Treharne 2012, 97). Moreover, those copies typically accommodated for linguistic changes (Gretsch 2013, 288), thus providing an insight into the so-called "transitional" period in the history of English.

5. List of post-Conquest forged charters in English

The myth of the "death" of Old English following the events of 1066 has been put to question especially by the project *The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220* conducted jointly at the University of Leeds and the University of Leicester. The aim of the project was to

> identify, analyse and evaluate all manuscripts containing English written in England between 1060 and 1220; to produce an analytical corpus of material from late Anglo-Saxon England, through the Norman Conquest and into the high Middle Ages; to investigate key questions including the status of written English relative to French and Latin; and to raise awareness of agenda informing the production of so many texts in English during this important period,

which resulted in an extensive catalogue of post-Conquest texts written in English, including glosses, notes, marginalia, etc. The project demonstrated clearly that English texts copied between 1100 and 1200 are under-utilized resources – which is most likely the case due to their status of "copies" (Treharne 2012, 133).

Nonetheless, although the project's catalogue contains the following charters: (by Sawyer number) 914, 988, **1047**, 1088, 1090, 1222, 1229, 1280, 1313, 1317, 1362, 1377, 1389, **1428**, 1432, 1440, 1443, 1446, 1448, 1452, 1453, 1507 identified as examples of post-Conquest documents written in English, a careful examination of the list of charters on the Electronic Sawyer, an online catalogue of Anglo-Saxon charters, reveals other cases[19] of charters containing English from after 1066: namely, forgeries. It seems that in spite of the attention post-Conquest forgeries have gained from scholars of diplomatics, and the extent of the Leeds & Leicester project, the English language of the post-Conquest forgeries has not been a subject of an extensive, independent study based on a larger number of texts. This is not to say that forged charters have not been studied at all; for example, there is a chapter on post-Conquest English forgeries by Julia Crick (2015) – however, with a few exceptions, Crick's material is exclusively in Latin.

The list presented here was compiled based on *The Electronic Sawyer – An Online Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Charters*, available at https://esawyer.lib.cam.ac.uk/. Using the catalogue's browser (*manuscript date category*), all earliest surviving copies[20] dating to the period from the mid-eleventh to mid-twelfth century were selected, based on the assumption that the first century following the Conquest was the most intense period of documentary fabrication. Since most charters survive in numerous copies, it was assumed that later copies would have too many linguistic adjustments, and hence the earlier the copy, the more useful it should be for the purpose of analyzing the "transitional" English. Next, all charters which did not contain English (in the main text, bound, or both) were filtered out. Finally, charters which most scholars agree to be genuine were eliminated from the list, leaving sixty-nine forgeries which meet all the criteria stated above.

Confirming a document's legitimacy is a complex, interdisciplinary issue relying on such fields as history, historical geography, codicology, paleography, to name just a few. Nonetheless, in spite of years of research and advanced technology, there are still numerous documents whose legitimacy is questionable, especially those based on original charters (Tillotson 2005). In the case of the charters included in the list, the identification of forged documents is typically based on the study of paleographical evidence, also considering such features as *mise-en-page*, seal, lists of witnesses, etc. (Sharpe 1994, 230-231). As a type of medieval text, charters were especially meant to appeal to both the mentality and social consciousness of the contemporary people – they had to satisfy expectations in terms of form and appearance (Hiatt 2004, 12). Documents issued by the same authority would display a pattern of a sort,[21] as well as an adherence to some more or less standardized forms; hence deviation from that pattern may indicate a forgery. Ironically, given that most confirmed documents missed some elements, such as date, place, etc., often it is the abundance of information that gives a forgery away.

In total, the list offers a 14,300-word corpus, and provides details following Sawyer's Catalogue.[22] It is arranged according to Sawyer number. In most cases (forty-six) English is found in bounds, with only twenty-one charters written in the vernacular in the main text – this is to be expected given that the vernacular was common especially in bounds. The shortest sample is fifty-three words long (S 388), whereas the longest is 657 words long (S 1154). Some charters are actually written by the same hand; since charters were hand-written, and *signum* was considered a safeguard against forgery (Clanchy 2013, 305), paleographic analysis is the main way of identifying forged documents (see the "additional information" section under the table, which contains references to appropriate studies on such charters). Unsurprisingly, most of the forgeries listed here come either from Christ Church, Canterbury, or Winchester, Old Minster – the two institutions (especially the latter) are well known for fabricating forged documents following the Conquest (Yorke 1982; Clanchy 2013, 319). Additionally, the Christ Church scriptorium is generally renowned for its post-Conquest activity (Da Rold 2006, 753; Clanchy 2013, 135),

housing a rich archive of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts (offering plenty of exemplars), and being a center of Anglo-Saxon text production long after the Conquest, as evidenced by (among others) the magnificent *Eadwine Psalter*, produced in the mid-twelfth century, which contains an interlinear Old English gloss. In fact, this prolificacy can be seen as an act of rebellion:

> Although Anglo-Saxon was not used after the 1070s by the king's government or by the clergy as a whole, it found defenders in the monastic antiquarian reaction which maintained English ways in the face of the Norman conquerors. Those monastic houses (…) were also among those which were most concerned to preserve a knowledge of Anglo-Saxon. Anglo-Saxon texts continued to be copied for a century after the Conquest (…). The reaction at Canterbury took the form of producing bilingual Latin and Anglo-Saxon documents, (…) and a number of royal charters written by scribes at Christ Church. (Clanchy 2013, 214)

The list containing post-Conquest charters written in Old English offered here, compiled on the basis of information found in Sawyer's catalogue can be treated as a supplement to the Catalogue devised by the Leeds team. It should be a valuable resource for any scholar interested in studying the language of post-Conquest forgeries, which – as demonstrated above – is a promising area for investigating not only the English language, but also other aspects of life in England under the Norman rule.

Table 1. List of post-Conquest forgeries containing English.

Sawyer Number	Date	Date of Production	Archive	English	Number of Words
60	770	xi 2	Worcester	bounds	219
72	680	Xii	Peterborough	main text	666
124	785	xi med.	Westminster	bounds	106
179	816	xi 2	Worcester	bounds	561
201	851	xi 2	Worcester	bounds	219
211	866	xi 2	Worcester	bounds	113
216	875	xi 2	Worcester	bounds	114
222	883 x 911	xi 2	Worcester	bounds	108
242	701	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	bounds	169
254	737	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	bounds	89
272	825	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	bounds	335
273	825	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	bounds	119
274	826	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	bounds	65
276	826	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	bounds	310
304	854	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	bounds	89
308	854	Xi	uncertain	bounds	65
309	854	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	bounds	137
310	854	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	bounds	177
325	854	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	main text	418
345	882	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	bounds	203
351	939	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	bounds	66
354	878 x 899	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	bounds	224
377	909	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	bounds	218
378	909	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	bounds	530
381	no date	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	bounds	278
382	no date	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	bounds	146
383	no date	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	bounds	63
386	924x939	xi med.	Exeter	bounds	105
387	924x939	xi med.	Exeter	bounds	76
388	924x939	xi 2	Exeter	bounds	56
389	670 for 924 x 939	xi med.	Exeter	bounds	105
393	905/931x934	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	bounds	240
423	933	xii med.	Sherborne	bounds	118
427	963 x 975	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	main text	400
433	937	xi med.	Exeter	bounds	91

Sawyer Number	Date	Date of Production	Archive	English	Number of Words
443	938	Xi	Winchester, Old Minster	bounds	166
516	903 for 946 x 951	xii med.	Sherborne	bounds	69
517	945	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	bounds	241
540	948	Xi	Winchester, Old Minster	bounds	224
571	956	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	bounds	191
669	961	xi 2	Exeter	bounds	145
672	956	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	bounds	173
770	969	xi 2	Exeter	bounds	144
783	1021x1023	Xii	Bury St Edmunds	bounds	195
794	974	xi 2	Ely	bounds	90
817	1052 x 1066	xi/xii	Canterbury, Christ Church	main text	283
832	977	xi 2	Exeter	bounds	195
879	996	xi 2	Burton	bounds	182
907	1004	xii med.	Ely	bounds	99
946	984 x 1001	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	main text	106
959	1023	xi 2	Canterbury, Christ Church	main text	592
980	1021 x 1023	xi/xii	Bury St. Edmunds	bounds	195
981	x	xi ex.	Canterbury, Christ Church	main text	204
1026	1055	xi/xii	Evesham	bounds	230
1047	1042x1066	xi med.	Canterbury, Christ Church	main text	180
1062	1062 x 1066	xi 2	Westminster	main text	98
1089	1052 x 1066	xi/xii	Canterbury, Christ Church	main text	219
1120	?	Xii	Westminster	main text	167
1124	1042 x 1066	Xii	Westminster	main text	115
1134	1053 x 1066	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	main text	99
1137	975 x 978	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	main text	197
1138	?	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster and Winchester, New Minster	main text	512
1140	1062 x 1066	Xi	Westminster	main text	98
1141	948	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	main text	96
1142	1042x1066	Xii	Canterbury, Christ Church	main text	290
1154	934	xii med.	Winchester, Old Minster	main text	657
1185	781 x 796	xi 2	Worcester	bounds	117
1227	1046 x 1062	xi 2	Worcester	bounds	87
1428	970	xi/xii	Ely	main text	652

Additional information:

272, 273, 274, 276: forger used charters of the 820s, likely the same hand (Smyth 1995, 253; Foot 2000, 180);
325, 817, 946: fabricated by the same forger (Chaplais 1966b, 171);
386, 387, 389, 433: fabricated by the same forger (Chaplais 1966a, 5–9);
443, 540: fabricated by the same forger (Wormald 1988, 39);
770, 832: apograph in the same hand (Bishop 1955, 195);
1185, 1227: identified as related to each other (Ker 1948, 59–68).

Notes

1 https://charlemagneseurope.ac.uk/charter-basics/ (Accessed: 10th January 2022)
2 The term comes from Greek, in which it literally means a "doubling", reflecting the idea of a double will behind its production: that of the issuer, and the receiver (Hiatt 2004, 1).
3 https://charlemagneseurope.ac.uk/charter-basics (Accessed: 10th January 2022)
4 Even if some information is missing, it is often possible to deduce it on the basis of what is available.
5 "In many areas of life the functions previously fulfilled by Roman institutions and the roles occupied by Roman officials were replaced by a Christian administration", https://charlemagneseurope.ac.uk/charter-basics/ (Accessed: 10th January 2022)
6 Personal names are typically the first lexical category recorded in the vernacular (Seiler 2021, 121).
7 *LangScape: The Language of Landscape: Reading the Anglo-Saxon Countryside.* <http://langscape.org.uk>, version 0.9, accessed 10 May 2022.
8 Timofeeva (2013, 202) estimates that only 0.25% - 0.5% of the population was literate in Latin.
9 See *Chapter one: The 'problem' of medieval Forgery* in Hiatt 2004 for an extensive discussion regarding this definition,
10 In some cases the rights to a property actually extended to times before charters were even expected to confirm oral grants (O'Brien 1995, 12).
11 Clanchy (2013, 150) argues that contemporary forgers would most likely not see their work as a crime, but rather as a means for fulfilling God's or the patron saint's wishes for their institution to flourish.
12 See O'Brien 1995.
13 See Geary 1998.

14 Lately there have been numerous studies into medieval literacy and the role(s) charters played in aiding access to the written word on different social levels, questioning the application of the modern understanding of "literacy" to the early medieval reality, especially in terms of assumptions regarding the limited role the written word played then. Those studies argue that traditionally-understood illiteracy was no obstacle in participating in the documentary culture, as documents were read out during (often highly ritualistic) proceedings, when communication was conducted via not just speech and text, but also actions, gestures, etc. (Tinti 2021, 1–3).

15 The phenomenon was so widespread that monastic forgery practices were commonly shared between various scriptoria (O'Brien 1995, 13).

16 O'Brien (1995, 10) argues that the first two decades following the Conquest were characterized by "the linguistic confusion caused by the uncertain hierarchy of three languages" (i.e. English, Latin, and Anglo-Norman).

17 Bartlett (2000, 490) observes that English was actually widely used in preaching, and that it definitely was not a "peasants'" language, as evidenced by the fact that Norman aristocracy already spoke it by 1100. According to Davies (1997, 11), the idea that English was purposefully downgraded is outdated; in fact, bilingualism played an important role in the assimilation and shaping of the newly formed Anglo-Norman society (Thomas 2003, 385).

18 This also explains the scarcity of evidence for early French borrowing (Faulkner 2012, 281).

19 The two charters in bold are deemed forgeries on Electronic Sawyer.

20 Documents typically survive in numerous copies (O'Brien 1995, 7).

21 Those are also used simply for dating a given charter; they show how attitudes to writing changed over time (Clanchy 2013, 296).

22 Information missing from Sawyer is marked with a question mark.

References

The Electronic Sawyer: Online Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Charters. -2021. London: King's College. https://esawyer.lib.cam.ac.uk

Bartlett, Robert. 2000. *England under the Norman and Angevin Kings 1075–1225*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bishop, T. A. M. 1955. "Notes on Cambridge Manuscripts, Part II." *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 2 (1955): 185–192.

Chaplais, P. 1966a. "The Authenticity of the Royal Anglo-Saxon Diplomas of Exeter." *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research 39* (1966): 1–34.

Chaplais, P. 1966b. "The Anglo-Saxon Chancery: From the Diploma to the Writ." *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 3 (1966): 160–176.

Clanchy, Michael. 2013. *From Memory to Written Record*. 3rd edition. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Crick, Julia. 2015. "Historical Literacy in the Archive: Post-Conquest Imitative Copies of Pre-Conquest Charters and Some French Comparanda." *The Long Twelfth Century View of the Anglo-Saxon Past*. Ed. Martin Brett and David A. Woodman. Farnham: Ashgate Publishin Limited. 159–190.

Da Rold, Orietta. 2006. "English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220 and the Making of a Re-source." *Literature Compass* 3: 750–766.

Da Rold, Orietta, Takako Kato, Mary Swan, and Elaine Treharne. eds. 2010. *The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220*. University of Leicester, University of Leeds 2010. last update 2013. http://www.le.ac.uk/ee/em1060to1220.

Davis, Ralph Henry Carless. 1976. *The Normans and their Myth*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Faulkner, Mark. 2012. "Rewriting English Literary History 1042–1215." *Literature Compass* 4: 275–291.

Foot, Elizabeth. 2000. *Female Religious Communities in England*, 871–1066. Aldershot; Routledge.

Gallagher, Robert. 2018. "The Vernacular in Anglo-Saxon Charters: Expansion and Innovation in Ninth-century England." *Historical Research* 91: 205–235.

Geary, Patrick J. 1998. "Land, Language and Memory in Europe 700–1100." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*. Vol. 9. 169–184.

Giry, Arthur. 1925. *Manuel de diplomatique*. 2nd edition. Paris: Alcon.

Godden, Malcolm. 2011. "Literacy in Anglo-Saxon England." *The Cambridge History of the Boook in Britain*. *Vol. I: c. 400-1100*. Ed. Richard Gameson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 580–590.

Gretsch, Mechtild. 2013. "Literacy and the Uses of the Vernacular." *The Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature*. Ed. Malcolm Godden and Michael Lapidge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 273–294.

Guyotjeannin, Olivier, Jacques Pycke, and Benoit-Michel Tock. 1993. *Diplomatique medieval*. Turnhout: Brepols.

Hiatt, Alfred. 2004. *The Making of Medieval Forgeries: False Documents in Fifteenth-century England*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Howe, Nicholas. 2007. *Writing the Map of Anglo-Saxon England*: *Essays in Cultural Geography*. Yale: Yale University Press.

Ker, N. R. 1948. "Hemming's Cartulary: A Description of the Two Worcester Cartularies in Cotton Tiberius A. xiii." Ed. Richard William Hunt, William Abel Pantin, and Richard William Southern. *Studies in Medieval History Presented to Frederick Maurice Powicke*. Oxford: Praeger. 49–75.

Ker, W.P. 2020. *Medieval English Literature.* Frankfurt am Main: Outlook Verlag GmbH.

Kelly, Susan. 1990. "Anglo-Saxon Lay Society and the Written Word." *The Uses of Literacy in Early Mediaeval Europe*. Ed. Rosamond McKitterick. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 36–62.

LangScape: The Language of Landscape: Reading the Anglo-Saxon Countryside. <http://langscape.org.uk>, version 0.9. Accessed 10 May 2022.

Marsden, Richard. 1995. *The Text of the Old Testament in Anglo-Saxon England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McKitterick, Rosamond. 1990. "Conclusion." *The Uses of Literacy in Early Medieval* Europe. Ed. Rosamond McKitterick. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 319–333.

O'Brien, Bruce. 1995. "Forgery and the Literacy of the Early Common Law." *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 27.1: 1–18.

Rio, Alice, Janet L. Nelson, John Bradley et al. 2014–. *The Making of Charlemagne's Europe*. last update 2015. https://charlemagneseurope.ac.uk/

Seiler, Annina. 2021. "Germanic Names, Vernacular Sounds, and Latin Spellings in Early Anglo-Saxon Charters." *The Languages of Early Medieval Charters. Latin, Germanic Vernaculars, and the Written Word*. Ed. Robert Gallagher, Edward Roberts, and Francesca Tinti. Leiden, Boston: Brill. 117–153.

Sharpe, Richard. 1994. "Charters, Deeds, and Diplomatics." *Medieval Latin: An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide*. Ed. Frank Anthony Carl Mantello and A. G. Rigg. CUA Press. 230–240.

Smyth, Alfred. 1995. *King Alfred the Great*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thomas, Hugh M. 2003. *The English and the Normans: Ethnic Hostility, Assimilation and Identity 1066–c.1220*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tillotson, Diane. 2005. "Forged Charters" on *Medieval Writing. History, Heritage, and Data Source* https://medievalwritings.atillo.com.au/. Accessed 8 March 2021.

Timofeeva, Olga. 2013. "*Of ledenum bocum to engliscum gereorde*: Bilingual Communities of Practice in Anglo-Saxon England." *Community of Practice in the History of English*. Ed. Joanna Kopaczyk and Hans Sauer. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 201–224.

Tinti, Francesca. 2021. "Latin and Germanic Vernaculars in Early Medieval Documentary Cultures: Towards a Multidisciplinary Comparative Approach." *The Languages of Early Medieval Charters. Latin, Germanic Vernaculars, and the Written Word*. Ed. Robert Gallagher, Edward Roberts, and Francesca Tinti. Leiden, Boston: Brill. 1–21.

Treharne, Elaine. 2012. *Living through Conquest. The Politics of Early English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wormald, P. 1988. "Æthelwold and his Continental Counterparts: Contact, Comparison, Contrast." *Bishop Æthelwold: his Career and Influence*. Ed. Barbara Yorke. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press. 13–42.

Yorke, B. A. E. 1982. “The Foundation of the Old Minster and the Status of Winchester in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries.” *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society* 38 (1982): 75–83.