The period of maximum productivity of extant cartularies occurred in the second half of the thirteenth century, so that part of the interest of the Garendon texts in the Lansdowne volume lies in their compilation in the late twelfth and early thirteenth century. Their broadly topographical arrangement conforms to the format suggested by David Walker, but perhaps takes that form of organization back to an earlier time. Godfrey Davis described Lansdowne MS. 415 as ‘elements of at least two cartularies, written in 12th- and 13th-century charter- and book-hands’, leaving aside extraneous later material added from the late thirteenth century through to the late fifteenth. Although his judgement is incontrovertible, a more extended discussion of the contents of the volume than was allowed in Medieval Cartularies may increase our knowledge of an earlier phase of production of monastic cartularies.

Founder and Foundation

Garendon, founded in 1133, belonged to that first wave of Cistercian houses established in England before the coronation of Stephen, numbering only some five convents compared with the thirty-five founded during his reign (1135–54). The attractiveness of Citeaux and the austerity of the Order was only one influence on the foundation of Garendon. Genealogical connections, important in so many foundations, had additional importance. The foundation of the house, however, has recently been considered to have taken place within the political context of the implicit territorial contest between the Earls of Leicester and Chester and their ‘affinities’, and, indeed, a substantial belt of Cistercian houses was located in the Midlands, associated with their connections.

The house was founded by Robert II, Earl of Leicester, in territory hitherto dominated by the Earl of Chester in north-west Leicestershire, and seemingly on the fee of a disseised tenant of Chester, contesting the influence of Chester in the county and region. The endowment of the house was afforded by the Earl of Leicester’s cousin, Roger, Earl of Warwick (d. 1153). The verdict of David Crouch, reviewing the benefactions of both the ‘Beaumont Twins’, the Earl of Leicester and the Count of Meulan, is that, whilst Meulan was a friend to the Cistercians (particularly through his
foundation of Bordesley), his brother, the Earl of Leicester, had no commitment to them; his religion was merely conventional, if his motives not cynical.\textsuperscript{10}

His benefactions do, indeed, seem to follow a pragmatic political life-cycle.\textsuperscript{11} His first act, adopting an eremitical community in Whittlewood Forest (Northants), sometime before 1120, providing a small piece of land for an oratory, was characteristic of foundations requiring little material outlay; similar provision for another eremitical community at Le Desert between 1121–5 marked his ‘permanent arrival’ as lord of Breteuil. The more substantial foundations of Garendon and Ulverscroft in 1133–5 reflected the political circumstances of his attempting to reduce the influence of the Earl of Chester across north Leicestershire.\textsuperscript{12} The planting of Leicester Abbey in the northeastern suburb of Leicester \textit{circa} 1138–9, effected through its appropriation of the collegiate foundation of St Mary de Castro, confirmed the mediatization of the borough, whilst challenging the Bishop of Lincoln, who held a liberty in that suburb and in Knighton (directly south of the borough).\textsuperscript{13} The establishment of another community of Cistercians at Biddlesden in 1147 confirmed the disseisin of its former, dissident tenant. Whilst Crouch attributed the patronage of the Order of Fontrevault to the influence of the Countess Amice, who retired to Nuneaton Priory in her widowhood in 1168, Chibnall has indicated the political significance of the foundation of that priory about 1147–53, marking the final reconciliation of the Earl of Leicester, who had initially supported Stephen, and Henry II, evidence of the consummate triumph of the Angevin party, and the resumption of England into the Angevin empire.\textsuperscript{14} The religious foundations of the Earl were thus not only designed for spiritual insurance, through patronage of several different Orders, but had a distinct political purpose.

\textbf{ENDOWMENT AND BENEFACTIONS}

The original endowment by the Earl, although more substantial than his previous donations to religious houses, was still a minimal investment. It consisted principally of lands of a (presumably) disseised tenant of the Earl of Chester and was located in a relatively poor \textit{pays}, Charnwood Forest. On its own, therefore, the endowment was quite marginal.\textsuperscript{15} Nevertheless, the estates were transformed by the later acquisition of substantial consolidated lands from generous other benefactors in north Leicestershire and southern Nottinghamshire, in much more productive arable areas, where the Abbey established granges in already settled and cultivated communities.\textsuperscript{16} Since this process was substantially complete by the early thirteenth century, the cartularies in Lansdowne 415 provide a solid picture of the accumulation and transformation of the estate.

\textbf{THE CARTULARIES: CONTEXT}

‘No more than half a dozen cartularies are earlier than 1150 and fewer than 30 earlier than 1200.’\textsuperscript{17} The initial compilation of the cartulary thus falls within an early stage of the compilation of this sort of record. Within this corpus, however, Cistercian houses are
very well represented, since contemporary cartularies were produced for Kirkstall (after 1210), Rievaulx (after 1179), and Thame (circa 1203), whilst Kirkstead compiled two inventories of charters about the same time, and other houses of the Order cartularies in the early thirteenth century (Beaulieu, Pipewell, Stoneleigh and Warden). The precise stimulus for this record-keeping is unclear, but may have issued from the organization of the Order, with its early development of some central influence through Chapters General and the effective abandonment of new foundations after 1152. In the case of Garendon, the pattern of donations had clearly begun to decline by the early thirteenth century, which may have promoted the production of the several cartularies.

**THE CARTULARIES: COMPOSITION AND STRUCTURE**

A single volume, the cartulary nevertheless exhibits firm evidence of several discrete cartularies produced sequentially within a close timespan. Although this volume now comprises forty-two leaves (modern foliation), the cartularies, commencing at f. 5r, are complete by f. 35r. The format of the first cartulary is a common one: occasional rubrics denoting places in the broadly topographical arrangement (for instance f. 5r *Carte de Ybestocha*) with almost consistently another heading identifying the donor (for example, again, f. 5r *G. Camerarius de Clintun*). This format continues through to f. 24v, but when, after the insertion of material at ff. 25r–26r, the charter material resumes, at f. 26r, a different arrangement ensues.

It is easier to isolate this section (ff. 26r–35r) first as a discrete and distinct cartulary, because of this different format. It physically follows the earlier charter material and was manifestly compiled at a later date. By contrast with the earlier rubrics and full transcriptions, this cartulary consists of a digest of all charters (see fig. 1) arranged topographically, but with transcripts of only a select number of the charters. The precise form of the digest merits an example.

```
IN Svinefen habent monachi .iii. Carrucatas terre / et dimidiam de feodo Comitis de Warwick et .xvii. acras In campis scilicet de Hybestoca .iii. Carrucatas et .xvii. acras et in alia Ibestoca dimidiam carrucatam Harum autem tres carrucate secundum cyrogra/fa concessit Robertus de Burton' de dominio suo in ybestoc' pro .xxx. marcis argenti quas monachi ei / dederunt in liberacionem [sic] captiuitatis sue et dimidiam carrucatam terre de dominio item suo nominatim / cum Ingenulfo fratre suo quem in monachum susceperunt. Ricardus uero filius Roberti dedit item eis unam carucatam / in una ybestoke dimidiam et In alia ybestocka alteram dimidiam scilicet Hyndeley et pro hac / dederunt ei sex marcas argenti ad redempcionem suam super his. Habemus cartam Reinaldi filii Ingenulfi de donacione et aliam eiusdem de confirmacione. Item unam Willelmi filii Ricardi de burton' de confirmacione / et duas Henrici filii Ricardi de confirmacione. Item cartam Comitis de Warwick de quieta clamancia / seruicii dimidii militis. Item cartam Gaufridi de Glintona de quieta clamancia eiusdem seruicii. Item cartam de escambio
```
Lampstoni.

1.

Gargaris de Deo de Tychetta tunc auquit, sed dubitavit. Deo de
Lanston, In primo fons, de Lotoro de Boues, putat amuletam. Quid
fuisset "lato de aquirma". Vide de donec sibi. Sed de donec sibi. De
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predicti servicii et Baddesl'. Item cartam Reginaldi filii Reginaldi de .iii. or acris. Hec omnia habemus et tenemus in puram eleemosinam.

This digest is followed by a full transcription only of a charter of Henry filius Ricardi de Burton, but not the rest of the charters listed which had, with one exception, been fully transcribed in the earlier cartularies. Nevertheless, some duplication does occur between this last section and the earlier parts of the volume as illustrated in Table 1. By and large, the charters which are not repeated seem to be confirmations granted after the compilation of the earlier sections. It also seems clear that this section (ff. 26r–35r) was compiled after 1211, since a transcribed charter, of Hugh de Berges relating to lands in Burton on the Wolds (f. 31v), has a regnal year following the warranty clause:

Et ego et heredes mei inperpetuum Warantizabimus predictis monachis / contra omnes homines hec omnia predicta et omnes terras et omnia tenementa et escambia que ipsi habent et tenent de / feudo meo intertillio de Burton' unde saisiti fuerunt anno xiii" Coronacionis Regis Johannis / Testibus ... 

The completion of this section must have followed closely on this charter in view of the hand.

Digests of charters are by no means unusual; examples occur in the near contemporary ‘Hotot estate book’ and in the much later Novum Rentale of Leicester Abbey, which, despite its title, includes abstracts of charters relating to properties. The further interest of the Garendon digests is that they occasionally reveal the circumstances behind benefactions, not evident from the charters. For example, the digest cited above for Swinfen records that, in return for three carucates in Ibstock from Robert de Burton, the Abbey gave a consideration of thirty marks in liberacionem [sic] captiuitatis sue. The volume as a whole does not contain any charter of Robert de Burton (only subsequent confirmations by his successors).

The earlier sections of the volume are less easily disentangled than the final one, but there seem to be four different hands:
A: a well-formed twelfth-century hand, which continues throughout the earlier sections;

B: ff. 13r–23r a similar hand, but in a larger script;

C: a more angular and cursive thirteenth-century hand which partly interpolates material at ff. 21v, 23v and from f. 24r;

D: a more rounded early thirteenth-century hand at, for example, ff. 23v–24r.

The characteristics of these scriptores are sometimes idiosyncratic, especially Hand A at ff. 5r–12v, which, although close to textura and well-formed, engages in some extreme forms of contraction and suspension, if only of common terms (see fig. 2). The persistent notification in the charters to Garendon – Uniuersis sancte Matris Ecclesie filiiis – is rendered Uniuersis S. M. Ec. fili, whilst in the dispositive clause carta is reduced to car. and deo et ecclesie sancte Marie de Geroud’ et monachis ibidem deo servuentibus to deo et ec. S. Ma. Geroud’ et mo. ibidem deo serv[en]tibus. In that clause also, confir. and conces. are constantly used. Kinship terms are also heavily suspended, as ux. m. (in this case, uxoris mee) patris m. (patris mei), and ma. mee (matris mei). The words for free alms are reduced to in puram et perpe. elem. (in puram et perpetuam elemosinam) (although it should be noted that the suspension is even more extreme in the digest in the final section of the volume: in pu. ele.).

Hand B is larger than A, although similar in duct, and seems to commence at an appropriate point. Up to f. 13r, the charters are all privatae conventiones, but this hand begins where Papal bulls (or extracts), royal writ–charters, and charters of the patronal family (except for one at f. 5r) are first gathered together. It is possible, however, that B is simply A writ large to dignify these more public enunciations. On the other hand, the extreme contractions and suspensions characteristic of Hand A are not a feature here, although that difference too may result from the dignity of the acta described here rather than a change of hand. The subsequent private charters in Hand B are also from comparatively more important benefactors (Geoffrey de Clinton, the Earl of Warwick, Ivo de Harcourt, Thomas Despenser, Arnold du Bois, and William Peverel). Perhaps significantly, the topographical arrangement is slightly abandoned here.
Hand C mainly interpolates material, as when, at f. 23v, six words omitted from an earlier transcription of a charter are added in this hand at the foot of the leaf: *et duo mihi et heredibus nostris*. Hand D, more rounded, begins with a royal writ-charter at f. 23v, followed by some private charters (Luke de Quatremars, Arnold du Bois and Asketil de Berges). It has a characteristic S. for the truncated *Sancte*.

The incidence of these hands provides some clue into the question of how many discrete cartularies exist within the volume. A further intimation may lie in the repetition – duplication and even triplication – of charters through the volume. Twenty-five charters are repeated (three of which are in triplicate), leaving 103 private charters which occur only once. The pattern of repetition suggests three or four distinct sections: ff. 5r-12v; ff. 13r-23r; ff. 23v-24r (later additions); and ff. 26r-35r.

Different versions of the charters contain differing numbers of witnesses, the first section in particular truncating the attestation clause. Additionally, different versions either anonymize by initials or provide in full the names of kin. Finally, some variants of the charters suffer from serious haplography, which other versions correct. These points are illustrated in Table 2 and in the Appendix.

### Table 2. Conspectus of Repeated Charters
(Figures in parenthesis indicate the number of witnesses listed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>f.</th>
<th>f.</th>
<th>f.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey de Clinton</td>
<td>Ibstock</td>
<td>5r(2)</td>
<td>15r-v(12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Warwick</td>
<td>Ibstock</td>
<td>5r(2)</td>
<td>15v(13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert de Harcourt</td>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>5v(1)</td>
<td>10r(7)</td>
<td>28r(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William filius Ricardi de Burton</td>
<td>Ibstock</td>
<td>5v(2)</td>
<td>24v(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Peverel</td>
<td>Costock</td>
<td>6r(2)</td>
<td>16v(15)</td>
<td>29r(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger de Burun</td>
<td>Costock/Rempstone</td>
<td>6r(2)</td>
<td>16v-17r(15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard de Luuetot</td>
<td>Wysall</td>
<td>6r-7r(3)</td>
<td>24r(22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John constabularius</td>
<td>Costock</td>
<td>7r(3)</td>
<td>17v(12)</td>
<td>29r(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John filius Radulphi</td>
<td>Costock</td>
<td>7r(2)</td>
<td>24r(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costenin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranulf de Cornings</td>
<td>Rempstone</td>
<td>7r(2)</td>
<td>24r(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Malet</td>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>8r(3)</td>
<td>18r(12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asketil de Berges</td>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>8r(3)</td>
<td>23v-24r(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph de Queniburc</td>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>8r-v(2)</td>
<td>18v(18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Despenser</td>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>8v(2)</td>
<td>32r(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idem</td>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>8v(2)</td>
<td>19r(9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald de Berneston</td>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>9r(2)</td>
<td>19r(11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reginald de Insula</td>
<td>Wymeswold</td>
<td>9r(2)</td>
<td>23r(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Putrel</td>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>9v(2)</td>
<td>23r(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serlo de Pleseleia</td>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>9v(2)</td>
<td>19r(6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert filius Radulphi</td>
<td>Eastwell</td>
<td>10r(2)</td>
<td>33r(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pincerne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke de Quatremars</td>
<td>Goadby</td>
<td>10v(3)</td>
<td>23v(6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffry Haget</td>
<td>Welby</td>
<td>11v(2)</td>
<td>33r(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William de Pereres</td>
<td>Sysonby</td>
<td>11v(2)</td>
<td>33r(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry II*</td>
<td>confirmation</td>
<td>22v(0)</td>
<td>23r(6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This actum does not have the style *dei gratia*, so is probably before 1172-3.
The compilation of the Garendon cartulary or cartularies thus reflects the pattern of some of the earliest cartularies, which were palimpsests. There seems to lie behind the text an evolutionary process, culminating in the final section, which contains the digest or abstracts, although the outcome was not planned as such. All versions were, however, produced within a very short space of time at a critical and propitious point in the monks’ acquisition of temporalities; few benefactions were received after the date of the final résumé of the charters.

APPENDIX

BL, LANSDOWNE MS. 415, ff. 5r AND 15r–v: CHARTER OF GEOFFREY DE CLINTON

(The transcription is taken from ff. 15r–v, but indicating omissions and changes in the version at f. 5r.)

Carte de Ibestocha24 25 G. Camerarius de clintona .R. episcopo de cestria [sic]26 et omnibus Sancte matris ecclesie filis perpetuam Salutem in domino / Notum sit omnibus ubis quia [sic]27 Robertus de Burtunia28 concessu meo et bona voluntate dedit et / concessit deo et Sancte Marie de Geroldonia29 et monachis ibidem deo seruentibus in perpetua / elemosina [sic] tres carrucatas terre in Ibestocha30 cum omnibus appenditiis31 tam in pratis / quam in pascuis et in omnibus aliis necessariis predictis tribus carrucatis terre pertinetibus / Hec uilla Ibestocha32 reddebat mihi seruittium unius militis [et ad has tres carrucatas terre / predicte Ibestoche que est tercia pars uile quam predicti monachi modo in sa possessione / susceperunt pertinebat seruittium tercie partis unius militis]33 Set ego peccatis34 mei perterrritus pro / me ipso et omnibus amicis meis adhuc in hac fragili uiuentibus et pro anima / patris mei ceterorumque proprinquorum meorum iam35 defunctorum predictum seruittium tercie partis unius militis imperpetuum quietum concedo deo et Sancte Marie de Geroldonia36 et fratribus37 ibidem / deo seruentibus et Roberto de Burtunia38 Hanc autem quietationem et concessionem proprii sig / [f. 15v] illi impressione confirmo Quare uolo et omnibus presentibus atque39 futuris notifico quatinus predicti fratres In40 / predictam terram absque uilla41 calumnia42 omnium futurorum tam heredum meorum quam extraneorum bene et in / pace et honorifice et quiete imperpetuum teneant His testibus Roberto comite de Legrec43 Roberto comite de fer/rar44 [Hugone paupere Hernaldo de Bosco Galfrido abbate Roberto de Creft Galfrido de Turuilla Ricardo clerico / comitis Rogero de frieuilla Ricardo de Turneres Willelmo de Greseleia Edwino Dispensatore]45

Some further different readings in repeated versions

Charter of Ralph de Queniburc (ff. 8r–v and 18v)

1. 1 variously as Sancte Matris and Matris Sancte
Geroud' and Gerold'
Burtun and Burtuna
numbers given in roman numerals and as words in different versions
excambio and escambio in different versions
calumnia and calumpnia in different versions
in semitis et uis and in uis et semitis in different versions
et ego Radulphus de Queniburc et heredes mei and et ego et heredes mei in different versions
f. 18v includes before the witness list a consideration: Pro hac donatione et concessione dederunt
mihi / monachi triginta solidos et unum equum et Asketillo de Berges decem solidos, which is omitted
at f. 8v
f. 18v begins the witness list His Testibus, but f. 8v Testibus
f. 18v has the fuller witness list.

Charter of Thomas Dispensator (ff. 8v and 19r)
The style at 8v is Thomas Dispensator, but at 19r Tomas filius Galfridi Dispensatoris, although
both have a rubric T[homas Dispensator
Geroud'] and Gerold' in different versions
warantizabimus and guarantizabimus
Warranty clause at 19r includes ubi necesse fuerit
Witness lists begin variously as His Testibus and Testibus
f. 19r has the fuller witness list, including qualifying Turstino cleric de Suwelle as opposed to
simply Turstino clerico

There are minor discrepancies in versions of other charters.

2 D. Walker, ‘The organization of material in medieval cartularies’, in D. A. Bullough and
Davis indicated, substantial parts of the cartularies have been printed by John Nichols, but I
have completed an independent transcription of all the charter and non-charter material to enable
a full analysis of the volume. In particular, Nichols only transcribed the first version of a charter (in its order of appearance in the volume) and only noted the existence of later variants.
4 ‘Earlier’ here excludes the compilation of cartularies by a few pre-Conquest houses of the
Benedictine order. See also M. T. Clanchy, From Memory to Written Record. England 1066-
5 These are the figures given by B. D. Hill, English Cistercian Monasteries and their Patrons in the
Twelfth Century (Urbana, Illinois, 1968), p. 27 (the figures exclude Savignac houses transferred
to the Order in 1147). A figure of 37 houses founded before 1153 is given by C. J.
General Chapter of 1152 prohibited further foundations, but six more houses acceded to the
foundation of British Cistercian houses’, in C. Norton and D. Park (eds.), Cistercian Art and
6 For this influence, Holdsworth, op. cit., p. 183.
7 See further below.
8 Hill, op. cit., pp. 35-6, describes the association of foundations with the Earls and the belt across
the Midlands, within which Garendon was a precursor, but was not explicit about the
territorial rivalry. The foundation of Pipewell in 1143 may be viewed cynically as a flanking move
by the Earl of Chester against the Earl of Leicester (analogous perhaps with the earlier
Basset-Ridel marriage), a point not noted by Hill.
9 E. King, ‘Mountsorrel and its region in King Stephen’s reign’, Huntington Library Quarterly, xliv (1986), pp. 1–10. For the general context, M. Chibnall, The Empress Matilda. Queen Consort, Queen Mother and Lady of the English (Oxford, 1991), pp. 133 (‘many lords used monastic foundations as a means of pushing their claims into disputed territory’), 134 (‘These foundations helped to strengthen their interests in a particular region, and to demonstrate their rights to the lands and customs given to the monks’). The Earl of Leicester’s foundation of Ulverscroft Priory (Austin Canon) before 1135, also in Charnwood Forest, within miles of Garendon, represented a further undermining of Chester’s position. Ulverscroft just falls chronologically within the period of the predilection for houses of Austin Canons associated with the curiales of Henry I. For Chester lands across north Leicestershire and south Nottinghamshire, see C. P. Lewis, ‘The formation of the honor of Chester, 1066–1100’ in A. T. Thacker (ed.), The Earldom of Chester and its Charters. A Tribute to Geoffrey Barraclough, Journal of the Chester Archaeological Society, lxxi (1991), pp. 42, 44–5.


11 The following sequence is based on Crouch, Beaumont Twins, pp. 198–204.

12 For the Chester estates at this time, see Lewis, ‘The formation’, passim.


16 For the whole debate about the nature of Cistercian granges in relation to existing populations, see Isabella Alfonso, ‘Cistercians and feudalism’, Past and Present, cxxxiii (1991), pp. 3–30.

17 Clanchy, From Memory to Written Record, p. 102.

18 Davis, Medieval Cartularies, nos. 40, 518, 774, 811, 936, 957, 998.


21 This raises the question of whether this benefaction was made by oral disposition in extremis. See also V. H. Galbraith, ‘Monastic foundation charters of the 11th and 12th centuries’, Cambridge Historical Journal, iv (1932–4), pp. 205–22.


24 F. 5r, Ybestocha.

25 F. 5r, G. Camerarius de Clintun.

26 Although the see was transferred from Chester to Coventry in 1102, the style continued to be bishops of Chester through the first half of the twelfth century: E. B. Fryde, D. E. Greenway, S. Porter and I. Roy (eds.), Handbook of British Chronology (3rd edn., London, 1986), p. 253. The bishop is certainly Roger de Clinton, Geoffrey’s brother, who was prelate from 1129–48: ibid, and also D. Crouch, ‘Geoffrey de Clinton and Roger, earl of Warwick, new men and magnates in the reign of Henry I’, p. 119.

27 F. 5r, quod.

28 F. 5r, Burtun.

29 F. 5r, de Geroud.

30 F. 5r, Ybestoc.

31 F. 5r, pertinenciis.

32 F. 5r, Ybestoc.

33 F. 5r, all in square parenthesis omitted.

34 F. 5r, pecc’is.

35 F. 5r omits meorum iam, but has uel.