

THE LIST OF SAXON CHURCHES IN THE TEXTUS ROFFENSIS.

BY GORDON WARD, M.D., F.S.A.

AMONGST all the charter books kept by the monasteries of Kent in years long past few are so famous as the *Textus Roffensis*. Its nature and its adventures have been discussed in *Archæologia Cantiana* and elsewhere. A fairly full transcription of its contents was published by Hearn in 1720. This publication is not very readily accessible to the average archæologist and the list of churches which it contains has not to my knowledge been republished elsewhere, although it has been very often referred to. I have, therefore, by the courtesy of the Dean and Chapter of Rochester, made a careful examination of the original, comparing it word for word with the transcript published by Hearn. I have also considered the probable date of this list and various other questions which arise. On these I venture to set out the views and conclusions which follow.

The list is headed by a paragraph in Latin which may be translated as follows :

Concerning the number of churches of the bishopric of Rochester and the payments which they each make when they receive the holy chrism from the episcopal mother church.

The holy chrism was the consecrated oil used in the rite of baptism. This was distributed at Easter to subordinate churches. The word "churches" does not in fact cover the whole list, for towards the end there is interposed a cross heading "*De capellis*" (Concerning the chapels). All churches paid ninepence and every chapel sixpence. These sums are not written in full but are contracted to "*ix den*" or "*ix d*", etc., according to the exigencies of space.

THE CHRISM FEE.

The fact that the churches in the diocese of Rochester paid either ninepence or sixpence is of particular interest because it contrasts very strongly with the usual payments in the Canterbury diocese which were almost without exception either sevenpence or some multiple of sevenpence. The usual multiple was twenty-eight pence. It is clear from the Domesday Monachorum that this sevenpence unit was in use before 1070 and was even at that date "an old custom". The same is probably true of the Rochester unit of ninepence but I have found no record on this point. Neither of these units is employed in reckoning Romescot nor, so far as I have observed, in the manorial accounts of the church between 1066 and 1100. Nor do they bear any obvious relation to the shilling of Norman times, to the mark, or to the Wessex or Mercian units. Although I can pretend to no sort of authority to discuss such questions, this matter of the units is deliberately emphasised because it seems to me suggestive of considerable antiquity and of some radical difference in organisation between the two sees or, perhaps, between the two kingdoms of West and East Kent.

THE ERASURES.

A remarkable feature of this list is the fact that certain names have been completely erased. In one case the name has gone but the amount of the chrism fee—"ix den"—remains. The reason for erasure is fairly obvious, since various annotations assure us that a church paying ninepence might be degraded in status and so come to pay only sixpence. This would justify its erasure from the church part of the list and its inclusion under the chapels. Probably the original list before it was copied into the Textus had been amended from time to time in this way. But the list once copied, could now only be further amended by erasure or by marginal entries, both of which methods are employed, for there was no room in the charter book to add new names since no space had been left for them.

It is interesting to consider what the names were which are now represented by erasures. The Textus is supposed, on good authority, to have been compiled—as regards this section—about the year 1115. The erasures must be of later date and the churches named should have been in existence in 1115 but have ceased to pay chrism fees later. The space covered by the erasures is roughly equivalent to eighty-five letters, which I suggest to mean that about five names have been erased. There are actually four different erasures but one is of twenty-six letters, a whole line, and may cover two names. The other three are of twenty-five, twenty and nineteen letters but the last is inclusive of the words “ix. den” which escaped erasure, so that the church name should have been of about fourteen letters. There are two churches which certainly ought to appear in this list. The first is West Farleigh. This is recorded as existing at the time of Domesday Book (1086) and it may well be doubted if it was built by the then tenant of the manor who was one of the rather wild supporters of Odo, Bishop of Bayeux. Fielding, in his *Records of Rochester Diocese*, a useful if somewhat inaccurate guide, says that “the first stone church appears to have been opened in 1119” but quotes no authority. From these records it seems certain that a church existed before the Textus was written and ought to have been included in this list. But it has also to be admitted that there is nothing in its known history to suggest any reason for its erasure from the list, if it was ever in it. On the whole I am disposed to think that the omission of West Farleigh was an error by the copying scribe. But it is fair to admit that the following letters and the spaces between them would conveniently fill the site of a twenty letter erasure—“East Fearnlega ix den”.

The other church which we should expect to find in this list is that of Longfield. The manor of Langanfelda is mentioned as early as about the year 964 (Birch, *Cart. Sax.* 1132-3) when it passed by will to Rochester diocese. It is returned in Domesday Book as one of the Bishop's manors. No church is mentioned but the tenant is a presbyter, who

Hasted pleasantly assures us was Rector of the church. But in this case also there seems no valid reason for the erasure of this name and I am inclined to attribute its absence to another clerical error.

I should expect to find that the erased names were those of churches of which we have no other record. In one case there is no actual erasure but the name of the chapel is crossed through. This is Thorninduna, a chapel of Frindsbury. Had this name been erased we might never have known that there was once a chapel there, although several earlier and later records would have assured us of the existence of a manor of such importance that it might well have had the usual Saxon manorial chapel. Two hundred years before the Textus was written it was already part of the qualification for the rank of Thane that the aspirant should have a church on his demesnes. Although, therefore, it might seem impossible to recover the names of chapels of which we have no record but an erasure, this impossibility is not absolute. If we can discover a manor which was of importance within one or two hundred years of the conquest, we may be fairly sure that it had a chapel. If this same manor is shown to have decreased in importance after the conquest we should expect its name, if once included in the Textus list, to be now represented by an erasure. It would take us too far afield if we tried to fill all the erasures on these lines, but one instance may be permitted. There exists a tenth century list (the exact date is uncertain) of those manors which were responsible for the repair of Rochester bridge. According to this the fifth pier was to be kept up by Wroteham, Maidstone, Wateringbury, Nettlestead, the two Peckhams, Haeselholte, Mereworth, Leybourne, Swanatuna, Offham, Ditton and Westerham. There are two names in this list which are unfamiliar. The first is Haeselholte which is later herein identified with Hadlow. The second is Swanatuna, represented on the modern one-inch map by Swanton Street in Mereworth. Unless Swanton was decidedly less in importance than the others in the list, and of this there is no suggestion since it

is thought worth naming, it presumably had a chapel. In Hasted's day the mansion house was only a "mean cottage" and he mentions no chapel, nor, so far as I am aware, has a Swanton chapel ever been recorded. Nevertheless, it seems quite likely that one of the erasures in the Textus has removed from our sight a record of a church of Swanatuna. One further note is necessary on the subject of erasures. There are one or two names which appear only as marginal annotations, for example Seal as a chapel of Kemsing. It is possible that Seal was once an independent church but later degraded to chapel rank; that it was once included in the church list but was erased and a marginal entry substituted. Unfortunately for this view, the marginal entry of Seal seems to be of the same date as the list itself while the erasures are presumably later. Moreover, the very short name of Seal, even in the older form of La Sela, would scarcely fill any of the spaces from which names have been erased.

THE MARGINAL ANNOTATIONS WITH ASTERISKS.

That useful symbol, the asterisk, had not reached its present form when the Textus was written. We find instead no less than twenty-one different designs in black and red. Each appears twice, once against the name of a church and secondly against the name of a chapel set in the margin opposite that of the church. Although it is not so stated, it is an irresistible inference that these chapels were subordinate to the churches in question; this view is borne out by other considerations and may be accepted without hesitation. It is obviously important to know whether these marginal names were written at the same time as the list itself. When studying the original I copied these names and made a note which (as expressing my then newly formed opinion) I now reproduce—"The marginal names vary considerably in style so that it is difficult to date them. On the whole, I believe that the greater number of them are contemporary (with the list itself) and that the differences in style are only such as one might expect between

44 SAXON CHURCHES IN THE TEXTUS ROFFENSIS.

a formal hand suitable for the main book and the freer hand which the same clerk might use for less formal matters, e.g. annotations. The marginal names are very much smaller and must have been written with a finer quill." It may be added that these marginal names are in ink of the same shade as the original and are ornamented with the same casual splashes of red ink, also of the same shade, as distinguish the church names.

These marginal names are especially important because they are the only evidence we have of the particular churches to which the chapels were subordinate at this early date.

OTHER ANNOTATIONS.

These are in no case distinguished by an asterisk. They will be mentioned later as occasion requires, but it may here be noted that they afford evidence of continued amendment of this list for at least two hundred years after it was first written in the Textus. We pass now to the names of the churches. These have been numbered for ease in reference but there are no numbers in the original.

1. Tonebrigga—Tonbridge.
2. Barindena—Barden, in Bidborough. In a report of the perambulation of the Lowy of Tonbridge in 1280 (Ch. Ch. Cant. MS. T. 32) it is recorded that Peter of Baridenne held Baridenn as one knight's fee. The borough of Baridenne is also mentioned. The fact that this place is mentioned immediately after Tonbridge supports the suggested identification but I know of no other mention of a church at Barden.
3. Ealdinga—Yalding.
4. Beantesteda—Bensted manor in Hunton. Entered as a chapel to last. The second of the two Domesday churches of Yalding.
5. Lega—Leigh.
6. Bitteberga—Bidborough. The marginal entry shows it as a chapel to Leigh from which, according to Fielding (*Records of Rochester Diocese*, p. 32) it was

separated in 1218. The chrism payment was then increased, as appears from a late annotation on this list of the words "but now ix".

7. Braencesle—Brenchley.
8. Horsbundenne—Horsmonden.
9. Theudelei—Tudeley.
10. Lamburherste—Lamberhurst.
11. Peppingeberia—Pembury.
12. Speldherste—Speldhurst.
13. Wotringaberia—Wateringbury.
14. Eastpecham—East Peckham.
15. Westpecham—West Peckham.
16. East Fearnlega—East Farleigh.
17. Lilintuna—Linton. Entered as a chapel to last.
18. Becceham—Beckenham.
19. Trottescliui—Trotterscliffe.
20. A marginal entry mentions as a chapel of Trotterscliffe "cap. Anfridi". This does not appear in the chapel list itself. I have not been able to identify it.
21. Ciselherste—Chislehurst.
22. Cudena—Cowden.
23. Aeischerste—Ashurst.
24. Aeilesford—Aylesford.
25. Cusintuna—Cozenton. Entered as a chapel of last. A manor, in Rainham according to Kelly's Directory but mentioned as in Eylesforde parish in the *Registrum Roffense*, p. 151. This chapel was dedicated to S. Michael.
26. Berlingis—Birling.
27. Paedlesuurtha—Paddlesworth in Snodland. In a recent history of Snodland, the Rev. C. de R. Wall says of it that "It is used as a barn chiefly but lately a family have curtained off the chancel and used it as a house. There is a very fine old red brick fireplace where the altar stood." See *Arch. Cant.*, Vol. XXI, 260 also.

28. Meallingis—East Malling.
29. Codeham—Cudham.
30. Reiersce—Ryarsh.
31. Offeham—Offham.
32. Dictuna—Ditton, near Maidstone.
33. Huntintune—Hunton.
34. Netlesteda—Nettlestead.
35. Burcham—Burham.
36. Wldeham—Wouldham.
37. Sancta Margarita—S. Margaret in Rochester. Included the lands at Borstal which belonged to Rochester.
38. Hescindena—Nashenden manor. Entered as chapel to last, and was situated in the same parish.
39. Caetham—Chatham.
40. Sanctus Clemens—S. Clement in Rochester.
41. Cuclestena—Cuxton.
42. Hallingis—Halling.
43. Snodilande—Snodland.
44. Wroteham—Wrotham.
45. Stanteda—Stansted. Entered as chapel to last.
46. Meapeham—Meopham.
47. Pennes herst—Penshurst.
48. Ehteham—Ightham.
49. Eadintuna—Addington (of the Fallen Stones).
50. Lisna—Erith.
51. Leueseham—Lewisham. (Here follows an erasure of about twenty-five letters.)
52. Erde—Crayford. Above Erde is written "l'earhethe" in a later hand. This is, in fact, an earlier form of the name which is written "Earhyth" in a charter of 695 (Birch, 87).
53. There is a marginal entry of a chapel of Erde which does not appear in the chapel list. The words seem to be "Cay. Ho." There is an obvious temptation to read "Cap. Ho."—a reading which the original

fails to justify—but I cannot pretend to explain what place or chapel is meant.

54. Wilmentuna—Wilmington.
55. Lullingestuna—Church of S. Botolph at Lullingstone.
56. Lullingestann (but query -stana)—Church, now vanished, of S. John the Baptist at Lullingstone. This was probably (as the writer thinks) in the Domesday manor of Lolingeston held by Osbern Pastforeire, and S. Botolph's in Lolingestone Ros.
57. Le—Lee.
58. Maeruurtha—Mereworth.
59. Westerham—Westerham.
60. Watlande—Woodlands.
61. Ciuilinga—Chevening.
62. Aeinesford—Eynesford.
63. Cimisinga—Kemsing.
64. Sela—Seal. Entered as chapel of last in the margin, but it is not in list of chapels.
65. Wicham—West Wickham.
66. Bradesteda—Brasted.
67. Faerningeham—Farningham.
68. Haeselholte—Hadlow. This place has been variously identified as Hilthe Manor in Nettlestead (*Statutes Concerning Rochester Bridge*, London, 1733) and as Hazel Hall in West Peckham (*Kentish Place Names*, Wallenberg, p. 293). But neither identification was very confident and I therefore offer my own views on the matter. Haeselholte appears, as already quoted, amongst the manors responsible for the repair of Rochester bridge and again in the will, also quoted above, by which Longfield was given to Rochester. In both cases it is associated with the neighbourhood which we may call that of the Medway bridges. It next appears in Domesday book in which we are told that "Edid of Aisiholte" had rights of sac and soc in various places in the

time of Edward the Confessor. The Domesday book scribes were not men of Kent and their place name efforts are deplorable. Fortunately we have an independent extract from the returns on which Domesday book was based (P.R.O. Misc. Books, K.R. 27), made by a clerk of St. Augustine's Abbey, and in this the lady (for it was a lady) appears as "Edgeth of Eselholte". This was Queen Edith, wife of the Confessor and sister of King Harold. Clearly, the next step in identifying Haeselholte should be an attempt to identify Queen Edith with some place in the Medway bridges district, preferably with a place whose name is similar to Haeselholte. Domesday book tells us that she owned Hadlow. This would be a welcome solution of the difficulty because Hadlow is not apparently mentioned in our church list although it was obviously an important manor and presumably had a church. But Hadlow is not very like Haeselholte. However, if we turn to our Domesday returns we find that it is there spelt with an "s"—Haslou. It has, I suppose, been concluded by those inclined to consider the matter that this was an error on the part of the before-mentioned deplorable clerk. But in this case his view is corroborated by the gentleman from S. Augustine's who writes "Haslow". And there was also a monk of Christ Church who made separate extracts from the original returns (in the Domesday Monachorum) and he wrote "Haslo". This makes it clear that the name as taken down locally from the pronunciation of the inhabitants was Haslow with an "s" and not Hadlow as it is today. This gets us perceptibly nearer to Haes'lho' (a not at all unlikely local shortening of Haeselholte). But, it will be asked, how came the same record, namely Domesday book, to enter the name in two different ways? This also can be explained. The local form of the name was entered after enquiry

made locally. The official form of Haeselholte came from quite a different source. It is part of a Saxon record entered on the returns by the Shire Moot (I think at Canterbury) and entered as an old record of what rights the King enjoyed, and what his Thanes enjoyed, in the county of Kent. What should any such record know of the lingual laziness of the good men of Hadlow? Do not the learned members of our Society today write of Trotterscliffe which many of its inhabitants call Trosley? So it was, I believe, in the case of Haeselholte and Hadlow. In conclusion, I should perhaps say that Fielding states that he finds the name of Hadlow in this church list. Hearn could not find it there, nor could I, except as Haeselholte.

69. Readlega—Ridley.
70. Aeisce—Ash, near Ridley.
71. Herclei—Hartley.
72. Sunderersce—Sundridge.
73. Mapeldreskampe—Maplescombe chapel of which the ruins remain in Kingsdown parish.
74. Heure—Hever.
75. Scorham—Shoreham.
76. Hludesdune—Luddesdown.
77. Otteford—Otford.
78. Rokesle—Ruxley in North Cray. The church was for long used as a barn.
79. Leleburna—Leybourne.
80. Culinga—Cowling.
81. Iuelda—Ifield.
82. Cidingstane—Chiddingstone.
83. Terstana—Teston.
84. Aeilentune—Allington (with the castle).
85. Freondesbyri—Frindsbury. The three following places are entered in the margin as chapels of Frindsbury.
86. Strodes—Strood.

87. Aeslingeham—the manor of this name in Frindsbury, now Islingham farm. Fielding says of it, “the ruin of the old church may still be traced in the lower part of the walls of an oast and cottage on a farm going by the name.”
88. Thorndun. So written in the margin but “Thorninduna” in the chapel list in which this name is crossed through. Thorndun is mentioned as the southern boundary of lands in Cowling in a charter of 808 (Birch, 326) and so was presumably in the northern part of Frindsbury parish.
89. Lilecirce—Lillechurch in Higham. This is not the abbey of Lillechurch which was not founded until 1151.
90. Heahham—Higham.
91. Cobbeham—Cobham.
92. Scorene—Shorne.
93. Merestune—Merston in Shorne. Entered in chapel list as Mersctuna. Kelly’s Directory (1922) says, “There is neither church, nor any kind of building, nor inhabitant in this place.” There were no inhabitants as long ago as 1455 but the church was then standing. It was dedicated to S. Giles and is the Melestun of Domesday book.
94. Halgesto—High Halstow.
95. Hnutstede—Nurstead.
96. Sancta Wereburh de Hoo—Hoo.
97. Dereuoldes treow (see later).
98. Ordmaeres circe de Hou (see later).
99. Dodes circe—Dode in Luddesdown. This has been described in *Dode in Kent* by G. M. Arnold, who purchased and restored it.
100. Deremannes circe de Hou. This and numbers 97 and 98 above were apparently all in the Hundred of Hoo (which forms part only of the peninsula) and with Halstow, All Saints and Hoo S. Werburgh made up

the six churches given in the Domesday account of Hoo. One of them is, no doubt, the church of S. Mary. The other two seem to have vanished although the curious area known as the Meneparish and shared by Halstow and S. Mary may be a relic of the jurisdiction of one of them. But this is no more than a guess.

101. Clive—Cliffe-at-Hoo.
102. Westclive. Entered as a chapel to last. Possibly at Westcourt in Cliffe.
103. Falkenham—Fawkham.
104. Denituna—Denton, near Gravesend.
105. Meletuna—Milton, by Gravesend.
106. Grausaende—Gravesend.
107. Eadelmesbregge—Edenbridge.
108. Stokes—Stoke in Hoo.
109. Grean—Isle of Grain.
110. Cilesfeld—Chelsfield.
111. Faernberga—Farnborough. Entered as chapel to last.
112. Celca—Chalk.
113. Northcraei—North Cray.
114. Rodulfes craei—S. Paul's Cray.
115. Fotescraei—Foots Cray.
116. Northfleotes—Northfleet.
117. Suthfleotes—Southfleet.
118. Bixle—Bexley.
119. Suaneskampe—Swanscombe.
120. Haltesteda—Halstead.
121. Gretenersce. Entered as a chapel to last. The vanished chapel of Greatness in Sevenoaks. Dedicated to S. John. It was considerably to the north of the present church of S. John, being where the main Riverhead-Seal and Sevenoaks-Otford roads cross.

122. Derente—Darenth. (Here follows a space of about twenty letters.)
123. Helle—The chapel of S. Margaret at Hilles. Bagshaw's Directory (1847) says, "The ruins of it are still to be seen in a field a little south-west of the manor house (of Darenth); in the building are many Roman bricks, part of an arch is entirely turned with them."
124. Derteford—Dartford.
125. Suthderente—South Darenth, a hamlet north of Horton Kirby. In 1847, according to Bagshaw, there remained "some portions of a flint building, most probably the church."
126. Suthtuna—Sutton-at-Hone.
127. In the margin opposite this name is written in a much later hand "Craie" but there is no asterisk to connect it with Sutton, nor anything to show which of the Crays may have been intended. It occurs also in the chapel list, perhaps S. Mary Cray.
128. Stanes—Stone, near Dartford.
129. Orpintuna—Orpington.
130. Hortune—Horton Kirby.
131. Plumstede—Plumstead.
132. Bromlega—Bromley.
133. Aeltheham—Eltham.
134. Wicham—East Wickham.
135. Cerlentune—Charlton.
136. Chitebroc—Kidbrook. Entered as a chapel to last. According to the authors of the Hundred of Blackheath the last of its walls were demolished in 1882. They stood a little south-east of the present church.
137. Greneuic—Greenwich.
138. Comba. A chapel to last. According to the authors above quoted there is of this chapel "no material trace beyond the entry in the Textus Roffensis."

139. West Greneuic—Deptford.
140. Wleuic—Woolwich.
141. Gillingeham—Gillingham.
142. Grenic—the chapel of Grange Manor in Gillingham.
Hearn was in error in printing this as if it were a chapel to Greenwich. The chapel is well known and Grange itself was a limb of the Cinque Port of Hastings. It is here entered as a chapel to Gillingham.
143. Lidisinga—Lidsing. Entered as a chapel of Gillingham.
144. Bearmlinges—East Barming. (Here follows erasure of about fourteen letters.)
145. Bearmlingetes—West Barming, *alias* Barnjet. Bagshaw (1847) says, "Part of the walls of it remained in the next field westward of Barnjet for many years but no remains of it are now left." Fielding however, in 1910, notes "traces of the lower courses of the wall may still be found in an oast house." One of these entries may refer to the manor house of Barnjet, the other to the chapel.
146. Seouenaca—Sevenoaks.
147. Meallingetes—West Malling.
148. Sanctus Leonardus—chapel of S. Leonard in West Malling. This is the end of the list of churches and the section headed "De capellis" follows. Of these, only four have escaped mention above.
149. Capella de Hou—All Saints in Hoo. (Here is erasure of about twenty-six letters.)
150. Halgelei—Hawley, between Wilmington and Darent and in the northern part of Sutton-at-Hone parish.
151. Sciburna—Shipbourne.
152. Sancta Maria de Castello—presumably a chapel in Rochester Castle.

THE ORIGIN AND DATE OF THIS LIST.

It is theoretically possible that this list was newly made up when it was first written in the Textus, that is about the year 1115. The alternative possibility is that it was a copy of, or adaptation of, some older list. I think the latter view is correct. It appears in the Textus amongst records many of which were first made long before 1115. Nor does the appearance of certain churches in the margin alone, and yet entered in 1115, suggest that the list was then newly made. There is a feature of these charter books which is of some significance in this connection. A great many of the earlier pages, often enough the greater part of the book, are in a single hand which is clearly that of some clerk instructed to enter all available records into the one book. When this hand comes to an end, the records are often less formally written and in many hands. These later records are clearly made to keep in sight such contemporary charters as the monastery deemed of most importance. This church list is amongst the first entered records and is therefore likely to be a copy of one earlier in date.

We can approach the question from another point of view by asking what occasion there might be for drawing up such a list as this and keeping a formal record of it. Every year these chrism dues were paid and the payment was presumably checked on some manuscript list made for the purpose. These yearly lists have not survived; we should hardly expect them to have done. But here is one list which was kept and which was considered so authoritative that it was corrected and kept up to date for years afterwards. This fact becomes still more significant when we find that the two other great religious centres of Kent, Christ Church Priory and S. Augustine's Abbey, possessed similar lists. The Christ Church list (D. Mon.) was possibly entered as late as 1095 but probably a year or two earlier. It shows no amendments. The S. Augustine's list was not entered in its charter book (K.R. 27) before 1160 for it mentions a church founded in 1157, namely, that of Saint Laurence

Hospital. But there are sufficient reasons for supposing that it is founded on an earlier list which had been brought up to date (at least, so I believe). These East Kent lists both use the sevenpence unit of assessment already mentioned. It seems reasonable to consider that all three lists are in some way related, that they have, perhaps, the same origin.

Now it happens that in the case of the Christ Church list the origin is not in doubt. The chrism dues named therein are specifically stated to have been "constituted and ordained" by Lanfranc and to have replaced in part the older payments in cheese, mutton, etc. But, be it noted, even amongst the dues which Lanfranc abolished in favour of the list mentioned we still find the sevenpence unit "ad oleum", that is, for the (chrism) oil. This fact tells us that although Lanfranc reapportioned the dues he continued to use the old unit of payment.

It does not necessarily follow (although it is obviously likely) that, because the Christ Church list is to be attributed to Lanfranc, the Rochester list must have a similar origin. But we have excellent reasons for supposing that to have been the case. Lanfranc was brought to this country in 1070, rather against his will, in order to resettle the church which was much disorganised by the fact that Stigand, the last Saxon archbishop, had been virtually powerless for some years. On his coming the Abbot of S. Augustine's, who had been grievously wasting its revenues, promptly fled abroad and was replaced by Abbot Scotland, a personal friend of Lanfranc. Rochester waited a little longer for the new influence. Bishop Syward died in 1076, his successor almost as soon as he was appointed. In 1077 Bishop Gundulf was consecrated and he also was an old friend of Lanfranc. There can be little doubt that both Abbot Scotland and Bishop Gundulf were appointed for the very purpose of backing up Lanfranc in his reformation of the church. This again suggests that if Lanfranc rearranged the chrism fees due to Christ Church, Scotland and Gundulf were likely to do the same in their own jurisdictions.

We have further evidence in the fact that certain other steps were taken and recorded by the three bodies. It may be convenient to list these :

- (a) Christ Church and S. Augustine's recorded Romescot lists. The Christ Church list can be dated not later than 1094 and is probably earlier. There is no comparable list in the Textus.
- (b) All three recorded the knight's fees into which their lands were divided. The Christ Church list can be dated to about the year 1094. The others about the same date.
- (c) All three recorded extracts from the Domesday returns. Rochester copied its returns from those of Christ Church.
- (d) Christ Church recorded the division of its revenues between the Archbishop and the monks. The Archbishop's portion is in the Domesday Monachorum, the monks' share, noted as being apportioned by Lanfranc, is in Lambeth, 1212, on pages 344-5. Rochester recorded only the monks' share. I have found no formal record for S. Augustine's but there is evidence that the division was made.

It is probable that research might carry the matter further but enough has been said to show that the three bodies were working on the same lines and that these were inspired by Lanfranc. Lanfranc died in 1089. I assume on the evidence at present produced that the Textus list of churches was drawn up in his lifetime, and accordingly date it back from 1115 to not later than 1089.

But the question does not end there. Although all three institutions (and probably many in other counties) were working on the same lines, the occasions for uniformity of action did not all arise at the same date. The allotment of knight's fees possibly was not, and could not, be settled until Domesday book was completed and available. But

such a matter as chrim dues could be settled at a much earlier date. Lanfranc's greatest effort with respect to church property was in Michaelmas, 1072 (the date is from a little known record at Canterbury), when he recovered from Odo, Bishop of Bayeux and Earl of Kent, the many manors which he had taken from the church—not, indeed, without some show of justice, but that is another story. It seems likely that the lesser reform, the change of dues paid in mutton to the more easily managed cash, took place before that, since cash was most needed for such matters as the suit against Odo. This is in some sort special pleading rather than clear evidence, but I think that all considerations allow us to date back the chrim dues list of Christ Church to not later than the end of 1072. It may even be earlier for it includes all those churches which the Conqueror gave to St. Augustine, it is said, in 1071. The Rochester list may have had to await the coming of Gundulf in 1077, but it is quite possible that Lanfranc decreed this also; the Saxon bishop of Rochester approving of the change, or, rather, of the codification of old custom.

However these things may be, it seems most unlikely that there was any new foundation of churches within ten years of the conquest. Some may have been rebuilt but the occasion for a new church would hardly arise unless a Norman manor centred itself upon some Saxon residence which was of so little importance that it had no church. This can hardly have happened in more than one or two instances at the most. The conclusion is that these lists of chrim payments were based on lists of Saxon churches.

I hope I may be pardoned for pressing this point. There are reasons for so doing. Most of our older county historians, even those who have made close study of the matter, speak as if the Weald of Kent was an uninhabited waste at the time of the conquest. This list, if it is one of Saxon churches, absolutely forbids that view. Many of our present day ecclesiologists speak (or I have not understood them aright) as if the likelihood of there having been a Saxon church on any particular site is one that can be

disregarded when considering the development of ground plans, unless there are actual tangible remains. I find myself unsympathetic to any view which tacitly assumes that the Norman influence in church architecture was only felt after the conquest, and should like to hear authoritative discussion of the possibility that some of our "early-Norman" churches were built by francophile thanes of Saxon kings. If we can make sure that the churches in this list were of Saxon foundation we shall be nearer to bridging the great gulf now fixed between Saxon and Norman church architecture. I therefore propose to adduce two further reasons for supposing that the churches in the Textus list were of Saxon foundation.

The first of these is the simple fact that in point of numbers they accord very well with what we ought to expect. No one suggests that the parish was a Norman innovation, nor, I believe, does anyone suppose that the parish existed without a church at so late a date as 1066. The number of churches in this list, 152, accords very well with the number of parishes in West Kent. The number in all three lists is something over 400 which accords well with the Domesday record of those counties in which every church seems to have been enumerated, for example, 243 in Norfolk and 364 in Suffolk.

My second further reason for supposing that this is a list of Saxon foundations is the very significant fact that in both this and the Christ Church list several churches are spoken of as belonging to individual Saxons. In the Christ Church list we have Aelsiescire on the manor of Alsi, the Saxon tenant of Eastbridge in Romney Marsh, and Blacmannes church which was certainly the church of Blackman of Blackmanstone who is also mentioned in Domesday book as the tenant in the time of King Edward. In the Textus list we find Ordmaeres, Dodes and Deremannes churches. Of all such names only one survived the conquest as applied to a church. That one is Dodes, and it probably survived for the sufficient reason that it was not a personal name or, if it was, was that of a person who died more than a hundred

years before the conquest. Dudeslande was one of those areas which, as mentioned above, were responsible for the repair of Rochester bridge. It was not the Norman habit to name churches in this way. Siwoldes church in the marsh became, I believe, Saint Mary's, and Mertumnes church Hope All Saints. One of these Hoo churches also became S. Mary's in accordance with Norman sentiment in such matters.

And now this paper ends. It is admittedly the product of imperfect knowledge and of very restricted opportunities for the consultation of books and manuscripts. But nevertheless, it seems to me to justify the title given to it—a list of Saxon churches. If any man disagree, let him say on. No one shall listen more gratefully than myself.