



## Finding the Forger: An Alleged Decree of the 679 Council of Hatfield

Catherine Cubitt

*The English Historical Review*, Vol. 114, No. 459. (Nov., 1999), pp. 1217-1248.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0013-8266%28199911%29114%3A459%3C1217%3AFTFAAD%3E2.0.CO%3B2-X>

*The English Historical Review* is currently published by Oxford University Press.

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/oup.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

### *Finding the Forger: An Alleged Decree of the 679 Council of Hatfield\**

NEW textual evidence for the Anglo-Saxon period is rare and historians have generally looked to archaeologists for new discoveries. However, buried in the pages of Birch's *Cartularium Saxonicum* and in the third volume of Haddan and Stubbs's *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents* lies a document of some significance for the history of the early Anglo-Saxon Church and of royal consecrations. This text (which I shall call the Pseudo-Hatfield) is something of a puzzle.<sup>1</sup> It purports to be a decree of the Council of Hatfield and is dated to the year AD 680, but it betrays a number of anachronistic features. The decree declares that Canterbury should be the seat of the archbishop whose jurisdiction is to extend over twelve suffragans in the regions up to the Humber; York is to have jurisdiction over twelve bishops beyond the Humber. These two archbishoprics alone are to be responsible for the whole ministry in England, including the consecration of bishops and the anointing of kings. It concludes with a reference to a 'retractus' of Pope Agatho, and with an anathema which threatens anyone contravening the decree with canonical punishment, excommunication and separation from the synod's communion. The *terminus ante quem* for the Pseudo-Hatfield's composition is the middle of the twelfth century, when it was copied by two hands into the Winchester cartulary, the *Codex Wintoniensis* (British Library, Add. MS 15350), but its date of concoction is uncertain.<sup>2</sup> It is a difficult document: the Latin is unclear and perhaps garbled by copyists. Moreover, since it survives solely in one manuscript it is hard to distinguish between scribal error, later interpolations and bad composition. The Winchester

\*I am greatly indebted to Julia Barrow, Paul Bibire, Martin Brett, Susan Kelly, Peter Kitson, Jinty Nelson, Andy Orchard, Mark Philpott, Alex Rumble and Matthew Townend for generous discussion and assistance.

1. *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, ed. A. W. Haddan and W. Stubbs (3 vols., Oxford, 1869-79), iii. 152-3; W. de G. Birch, *Cartularium Saxonicum* (3 vols., London, 1885-93), no. 53 [hereafter BCS]. A new edition and translation of the text is given in the appendix; see *infra*, pp. 1244-8. The Pseudo-Hatfield is not listed in P. H. Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated List and Bibliography* (London, 1968) [hereafter cited as S]. N. P. Brooks, *The Early History of the Church of Canterbury* (Leicester, 1984), p. 366, n. 58 suggests a late eleventh- or twelfth-century date. See also the brief discussion in my *Anglo-Saxon Church Councils, c. 650-c. 850* (London, 1995), p. 257.

2. A. R. Rumble, 'The Structure and Reliability of the *Codex Wintoniensis* (British Library Additional MS 15350; The Cartulary of Winchester Cathedral Priory)' (Univ. of London, Ph.D. thesis, 2 vols., 1979), ii. 205-6, and id., 'The Purpose of the *Codex Wintoniensis*', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, iv, ed. R. A. Brown (Woodbridge, 1981), pp. 153-232, at pp. 164-6.

provenance is a further puzzle, since the Pseudo-Hatfield is concerned with the archbishoprics of York and Canterbury and has no obvious connection with Winchester. This study examines possible contexts for the forgery of the decree in both post-Conquest and Anglo-Saxon times, considers the diplomatic and stylistic evidence for the text's composition, and puts forward hypotheses for the date of its composition, the identity of its author and for its eventual preservation at Winchester.

The primary purpose of the Pseudo-Hatfield is to define the separate areas of authority belonging to the archbishoprics of Canterbury and York. The two archbishoprics are assigned parallel prerogatives in the government of their provinces, and there are only slight hints that Canterbury should be seen as the senior of the two. These are contained in the possible description of Canterbury (line 20) as the *principalis civitas*, in the apparent reservation of the honour of the pallium to that see alone (this privilege is not mentioned with regard to York) and in the emphasis upon the antiquity of Canterbury's position, which stretches back to St Augustine himself. All in all, the decree seems more concerned to assert the rights of both sees and their territorial limits than to subordinate one metropolitan to the other. Special historical interest lies in its assertion that the anointing of kings is a prerogative of the metropolitan, particularly since the beginnings of this rite are controversial.

An obvious context for the decree is lacking. Its relative lack of interest in asserting a higher status for Canterbury makes it unlikely to be a document forged to strengthen the claims of Canterbury to authority over York in the great post-Conquest primacy dispute.<sup>1</sup> The hallmarks of other primacy forgeries are absent. The Pseudo-Hatfield contains no clearcut statement of Canterbury's authority over all the churches in England. Its even-handed division of authority between the two metropolitans should be contrasted with, for example, statements from a forged letter of Pope Honorius to Archbishop Honorius of Canterbury which described Canterbury as 'forever the site of the metropolitan and honour of the archiepiscopate and the head of all the churches of the English people'.<sup>2</sup> A further telling difference between the Pseudo-Hatfield and the known corpus of primacy forgeries is that the latter all claim papal authority for the rights asserted, but the Pseudo-Hatfield purports to be an English conciliar decision, a less prestigious parentage

1. See *Hugh the Chanter, the History of the Church of York 1066–1127*, ed. and trans. C. Johnson, revised by M. Brett, C. N. L. Brooke, and M. Winterbottom (Oxford, 1990), pp. xxx–xlv. On the primacy forgeries, see H. Boehmer, *Die Fälschungen Erzbischof Lanfranks von Canterbury* (Leipzig, 1902); the dating of 1121×1123, suggested by R. Southern, 'The Canterbury Forgeries', *ante*, lxxiii (1958), 193–226, is now generally followed, but see M. Gibson, *Lanfranc of Bec* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 231–7, and S. E. Kelly, 'Some Forgeries in the Archive of St Augustine's Canterbury', in *Fälschungen im Mittelalter* (Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica, xxxiii, 1988), iv, 347–69.

2. 'Metropolitanus locus et honor archiepiscopatus et caput omnium ecclesiarum Anglorum populorum semper in posterum . . .', quoted from Boehmer, *Die Fälschungen*, no. 3, p. 149.

for ecclesiastical privileges. Its failure to stress unambiguously Canterbury's primatial standing must rule against its creation as a safeguard against attacks on its authority from dioceses other than York: St Davids, London and Winchester all planned bids in the course of the twelfth century for a grant of the *pallia* and archiepiscopal rank.<sup>1</sup> It is hard to envisage a Canterbury forger responding to such claims by the composition of a document that could easily have undermined Canterbury's arguments for authority over York. Could the Pseudo-Hatfield have been produced by one of Canterbury's opponents? Could it be a Winchester text? The answer must be no, since its ruling that there should be only two metropolitans would hinder and not support attempts to create more. A York origin is perhaps more likely, but here one runs into difficulties over a related issue: York's claims to authority over the dioceses of Lichfield, Worcester and Dorchester and over Scottish sees.<sup>2</sup> The Pseudo-Hatfield's statement that Canterbury's jurisdiction extended up to the bounds of Northumbria would contradict York's position on the Midland sees. Although it might have helped the northern metropolitan's desire to extend its jurisdiction to Scotland, it would have added nothing to the Gregorian scheme and seems curiously weak and clumsy if this was its purpose. Although the eleventh and twelfth centuries were not only the era of disputed primacy claims but also a period when forgery flourished,<sup>3</sup> the Pseudo-Hatfield fails to fit convincingly into any known post-Conquest context.

It is to Anglo-Saxon times that we must turn in search of its origins. Although the contents of the decree can be matched against no actual diocesan organization in pre-Conquest England (since the Northumbrian province never consisted of twelve sees), it is important to explore the history of diocesan organization, and particularly that of the two archbishoprics of Canterbury and York, in order to investigate possible circumstances which could have provoked the decree's concoction. Two questions must be asked: firstly, whether the decree shows some relationship to late seventh-century arrangements and could therefore be a genuine product of that period; and, if not, whether it could have answered the needs of any subsequent time.

The starting point for any discussion of metropolitan and diocesan organization in Anglo-Saxon England must be Gregory the Great's letter of 601 which accompanied the gift of the pallium to Augustine. According to this, the southern metropolitan was to be established at London, with authority over twelve provincial bishops. The holder of the metropolitan dignity was to be granted the pallium from Rome and to be consecrated by his comprovincials. Augustine (envisaged by

1. C. N. L. Brooke, *Gilbert Foliot and his Letters* (Cambridge, 1965), pp. 251–3.

2. *Hugh the Chanter*, ed. Johnson, revised Brett *et al.*, pp. xxxiv, xlv–liv.

3. Brooke, *Gilbert Foliot*, pp. 124–46, 152–3.

Gregory as bishop of London) was to send a bishop to York who, if his mission prospered, would also become metropolitan over twelve bishops and receive the pallium. Augustine was to enjoy superiority over the bishop of York, but on his death seniority between the two metropolitans was to be decided by order of consecration, and the two were to act together in agreement.<sup>1</sup> Gregory's letter remained an influential document in Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical organization (as we shall see below), but his plan was never fulfilled. A pallium for Paulinus as archbishop of York was sent in 634, but the Bishop was forced to flee south after the Northumbrian King Edwin's defeat in 633. Although Stephen's *Life of Wilfrid* reflects a continuing awareness of York's metropolitan status, a pallium was not sent again to York until 735.<sup>2</sup>

The Gregorian plan may also have stood behind Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury's attempts to create more sees in the late seventh century. When Theodore arrived in 669, English diocesan organization was fragmentary; bishoprics numbered only seven in total and virtually all of these were either vacant or filled with irregular candidates. Theodore immediately tried to remedy this by replacing the uncanonical bishops and by establishing new bishoprics. However, Theodore's resolution at the Council of Hertford in 672 to create more sees did not gain unanimous consent. His division of the Northumbrian sees provoked Bishop Wilfrid's appeal to Rome in 678 and a synod was convened there in the spring of 679.<sup>3</sup> Fragments of its *acta* survive which record the Pope's ruling that each Anglo-Saxon kingdom should have bishops *secundum moderaminis mensuram* to the limit of twelve sees (including that of the archbishop) for the whole of the Anglo-Saxon Church.<sup>4</sup> This represented a major modification of the Gregorian plan, virtually halving the numbers of sees, and allowing only for one archbishop endowed with the pallium where Gregory had envisaged two. Pope Agatho's ruling may indeed have been observed, although information concerning the establishment of new sees is scanty and the political vicissitudes of seventh-century England gave a certain fluidity

1. *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, ed. B. Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1969), I. 29 [hereafter *HE*].

2. *HE*, II. 17, 20. For York's metropolitan status, see *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid by Eddius Stephanus*, ed. and trans. B. Colgrave (Cambridge 1927), cc. 10, 16 and T. Charles-Edwards, 'The Pastoral Role of the Church in the Early Irish Laws', in *Pastoral Care before the Parish*, ed. J. Blair and R. Sharpe (Leicester, 1992), p. 66, n. 19. I do not find the arguments of M. Gibbs, 'The Decrees of Agatho and the Gregorian Plan for York', *Speculum*, xlviii (1973), 213–46, convincing; see Brooks, *Early History*, p. 343, n. 26.

3. *HE*. IV. 1–3, 5–6, 12; *Life of Bishop Wilfrid*, ed. Colgrave, cc. 24–33; Brooks, *Early History*, pp. 71–6.

4. W. Levison, 'Die Akten der römischen Synode von 679', in *Aus rheinischer und fränkischer Frühzeit. Ausgewählte Aufsätze von Wilhelm Levison* (Düsseldorf, 1948), pp. 267–95. Gibbs, 'The Decrees of Agatho', pp. 217–18, argues that this passage has been tampered with, but her emendation fails to take into consideration the fact that there was only one archbishop in England in 679. See also Brooks, *Early History*, pp. 73–4.

to diocesan organization. In 680 there were probably twelve sees including Canterbury.<sup>1</sup>

This then was the situation in 680, the purported date of the Pseudo-Hatfield. How does it square up with the decree? Both correspondences and disagreements can be found. The arrangements of the Pseudo-Hatfield concerning archiepiscopal and metropolitan status are correct for its purported date. Both Canterbury and York are mentioned in the text as metropolitan sees, but only the former is said to be honoured by the pallium. This apparent respect for the nuances of seventh-century metropolitan and archiepiscopal arrangements is certainly suggestive of early origins for the text, but in itself is not conclusive. On the other hand, the ruling of the Pseudo-Hatfield that each metropolitan should have jurisdiction over twelve sees does not fit with the developments of the late seventh century, and directly contradicts Pope Agatho's ruling, to which the Pseudo-Hatfield itself seems to refer. This casual comment seems hardly enough to authorize an English council to disregard completely a papal decision of the previous year. Since the proceedings of the Roman council were preserved in pre-Conquest England, this possible reference to them in the Pseudo-Hatfield is not therefore an indicator of seventh-century origins for the text. Agatho's council was known at Ripon to Wilfrid's biographer, Stephen, who incorporated parts of the *acta* into his *vita*. Moreover, Levison showed that extracts, at least, were preserved at Canterbury, where they were tampered with in connection with the primacy dispute; these include the ruling concerning the number of sees and the rights of the sole archbishop.<sup>2</sup> The proceedings of the papal council could therefore have been known to a later forger. Finally the dating of the decree to 680 provides a powerful indicator of its inauthenticity, since the Council of Hatfield took place in 679 as a preliminary to the papal council of Easter 680 and the Sixth Ecumenical Council at Constantinople in October 680. Bede, however, misdated the English Council to 680, and this error appears in the Pseudo-Hatfield.<sup>3</sup>

The Pseudo-Hatfield cannot be an entirely genuine product of the Council of Hatfield. It is possible that some seventh-century material may have been incorporated into its fabrication (accounting for its

1. The number of Anglo-Saxon sees extant at any given time is based upon the episcopal lists drawn up by S. Keynes in *The Handbook of British Chronology*, ed. E. B. Fryde, D. E. Greenway, S. Porter and I. Roy (3rd edn., London, 1986), pp. 209–24. However, I would not see Putta as first bishop of Hereford: see the note in *Venerabilis Baedae Opera Historica*, ed. C. Plummer (2 vols., Oxford, 1896), ii. 222. The twelve sees in existence were Canterbury, Dunwich, Elmham, Hexham, Lichfield, Lindsey, London, Ripon, Rochester, Winchester, Worcester, York. I have omitted the South Saxon diocese from this list because, although Wilfrid ministered in Sussex as bishop, no see was established until the early eighth century.

2. Levison 'Die Akten', pp. 267–94.

3. *HE*, IV. 17, and see Cubitt, *Church Councils*, pp. 252–6.

apparent awareness of late seventh-century metropolitan and archiepiscopal structure and its reference to the decree of Agatho),<sup>1</sup> but other discrepancies between the decree and contemporary diocesan organization clearly indicate substantial later concoction. It is time now therefore to consider whether the Pseudo-Hatfield could be the product of subsequent changes in diocesan organization. In 735 York's ancient metropolitan status was acknowledged and enhanced by the grant of a pallium to its bishop, Egbert.<sup>2</sup> Thereafter, the bishops of York were archbishops in their own right and Northumbria became a separate ecclesiastical province. Contrary to Bede's expectations, this did not result in the creation of any new sees: Lindisfarne, Hexham and Whithorn continued as York's suffragans.<sup>3</sup> In the south, however, the division and establishment of sees continued under Theodore's successors, with four new sees established by the middle of the eighth century.<sup>4</sup> Diocesan structure in England then stabilized with, in addition to the two archbishoprics, four bishoprics for the province of York and twelve for Canterbury. The Gregorian plan provided the theoretical basis for the creation of a new metropolitan at York, and was indeed cited by Bede in this connection.<sup>5</sup> While the Pseudo-Hatfield is more precise in defining the separate spheres of authority between Canterbury and York, for the Northumbrians it would have added little to Pope Gregory's letter. For Canterbury, its signal advantage would surely have been the substitution of Canterbury for London as the site of the southern metropolitan. Although hallowed by tradition and by the ministry of St Augustine himself, Canterbury possessed no documentary safeguard to counterbalance Pope Gregory's written endorsement of London's claims.

The bestowal of the pallium upon Egbert in 735 thus provides one possible context for the fabrication of the decree. But a closer fit with the aims of the Pseudo-Hatfield lies in the second half of the eighth and in the early ninth centuries, when King Offa of Mercia succeeded in obtaining papal permission to promote the see of Lichfield to the status of an archbishopate, and King Cenwulf, relying upon the Gregorian plan, unsuccessfully attempted to transfer the southern archbishopric to London.<sup>6</sup> Our knowledge of the events concerning the Lichfield crisis is

1. See also *infra*, p. 1237, for an apparently seventh-century spelling of the personal name Chlothere.

2. *Historia Regum* s. a. 735, in *Symeonis Monachi Opera Omnia* ed. T. Arnold (Rolls Ser., 1885), p. 31.

3. See the *Epistola ad Ecgbertum*, cc. 9, 10, in *Baedae Opera Historica*, ed. Plummer, i. 411–13.

4. The new sees were Selsey (*HE*, V.18), Hereford (see *supra*, p. 1221, n. 1), Sherborne (*HE*, V. 18) and Leicester (see the *Historia Regum*, ed. Arnold, s. a. 737, p. 19); cf. Brooks, *Early History*, pp. 79–80. On diocesan arrangements after 735, see F. M. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England* (3rd edn., Oxford, 1971), pp. 145–6.

5. Bede, *Epistola ad Ecgbertum*, cc. 9–10, in *Baedae Opera Historica*, ed. Plummer, i. 412–13.

6. See Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, pp. 217–18, 225–9; C. J. Godfrey, 'The Archbishopric of Lichfield', *Studies in Church History*, i (1964), 145–59; and Brooks, *Early History*, pp. 111–27.

unfortunately sketchy; we know, for example, nothing of the preliminary exchanges which must have taken place between the Pope and the Mercian king. The visit of the papal legates in 786 is generally linked to the elevation of Lichfield, but their decrees make no reference to this.<sup>1</sup> The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* records the division of the province of Canterbury at a 'contentious' synod of 787 and also the anointing of Offa's son Ecgfrith in the same year, but it does not make clear whether there was any connection between the two events.<sup>2</sup> King Offa had argued to the Pope that the new scheme was necessary because of the size of his lands and the increase in his kingdom, but according to a later letter of King Cenwulf, his real motivation was hatred of Archbishop Jænberht of Canterbury and the people of Kent.<sup>3</sup> The plan for a new archbishopric at Lichfield appears to have died with Offa. It had clearly aroused bitter opposition and was presumably one ingredient in the revolt of the Kentish people from Mercian rule following Offa's death in 796. Alcuin, writing in 797/8 to Archbishop Æthelheard (then exiled from Kent), advised him to restore Canterbury to its former dignity, so that 'the unity of the church – which is in part torn asunder . . . – may, if it can be done, be peacefully united and the rent repaired'. Alcuin suggested that Æthelheard should consult with the bishops of the Church, and with Archbishop Eanbald of York, and ensure that the right of consecrating bishops was returned to Canterbury, while leaving Hygeberht of Lichfield still in possession of his pallium.<sup>4</sup>

Cenwulf, Offa's eventual successor, also acted quickly to undo Offa's work: his first petition to Rome, carried by an Abbot Wada, was made in 797. In the following year Cenwulf sent a second legation which argued not only that Lichfield should be demoted but also that the Gregorian scheme should be revived and the Southumbrian metropolitan transferred from Canterbury to London. His proposal did not meet with Pope Leo's approval.<sup>5</sup> Progress was further stalled by the Pope's own problems: in April 799, he was attacked and accused of a number of crimes.<sup>6</sup> Pope Leo's name was not cleared until December 800, but immediately in the following year Archbishop Æthelheard set out to

1. On this mission see Cubitt, *Church Councils*, pp. 153–90.

2. *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle s.a. 785 (r. 787)*, in *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, ed. C. Plummer (2 vols., Oxford, 1892) (hereafter *ASC*).

3. See Cenwulf's letter to Leo III recorded by William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum: The History of the English Kings*, ed. and trans. R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom (Oxford, 1998), i. 88. Leo's reply is preserved not in William's *Gesta Regum* but among Alcuin's correspondence in *Alcuini Epistolae: Epistolae Karolini Aevi II*, ed. E. Dümmler (Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolae IV, Berlin, 1895), no. 127, pp. 187–9.

4. *Alcuini Epistolae*, ed. Dümmler, no. 128, pp. 189–91, quotation at p. 190, translation quoted from D. Whitelock, *English Historical Documents, c. 500–1042* (2nd edn., London, 1979), no. 203, p. 858.

5. For references see *supra*, p. 7, n. 3.

6. On this incident see P. Llewellyn, *Rome in the Dark Ages* (London, 1971), pp. 247–9; T. F. X. Noble, *The Republic of St Peter* (Philadelphia, PA, 1984), pp. 292–3.



Rome to negotiate further.<sup>1</sup> Alcuin's correspondence again fills out the picture: he tells us that Æthelheard had indeed held a preliminary meeting with Archbishop Eanbald, that he made his way to Rome via Charlemagne's court and that he was accompanied by two bishops (one of whom was Bishop Cyneberht of Winchester), by Ceolmund, a former *minister* of King Offa, and by the Northumbrian Torhtmund, who had been a *minister* of King Æthelraed.<sup>2</sup> Æthelheard's mission was successful: he returned with a papal privilege for Canterbury (now surviving only in an adulterated version) and a letter for Cenwulf.<sup>3</sup> Alcuin also sent his congratulations, writing that 'through the workings of divine grace, the unity of the limbs is united to its own head, and priestly dignity enjoys its ancient honour and brotherly peace shines out among the highest pontiffs of Britain, and one desire for piety and harmony flourishes under the two cities of the metropolitans. . . .'<sup>4</sup> The papal documents were dated January 802, but it was not until October 803 that Æthelheard himself promulgated a decree before a Southumbrian synod at *Clofesho*, restoring Canterbury to its former authority.<sup>5</sup>

There are some rather suggestive points of contact between the Lichfield crisis and the Pseudo-Hatfield. In the eighth century the province of Canterbury did indeed consist of twelve bishoprics (although the Northumbrian metropolitan did not). The integrity of the Southumbrian province is singled out in both Pope Leo's letter to Cenwulf of 802, when the Pope specifically mentions that Canterbury's authority over its twelve sees should be returned, and in Archbishop Æthelheard's privilege of 803, which restored Canterbury's position (here, probably echoing Leo's letter). Further, both Æthelheard's 803 decree and the Pseudo-Hatfield refer to the *honor* of St Augustine or of the archbishopric and link this with authority over its suffragans. In both texts, the 'honour' of the see appears to be closely bound up with authority over the constituent bishoprics of the province and with the Gregorian plan. Canterbury's loss of the rights of consecration of certain bishops was a further blow to its power and prestige.<sup>6</sup> The papal letter of

1. *ASC s.a. 799 (r. 801)*.

2. *Alcuini Epistolae*, ed. Dümmler, epp. 230–2. On Cyneberht of Winchester's presence, see *ACS, s. a. 799 (r. 801)*.

3. For Pope Leo's letter to Cenwulf, see William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum*, ed. Mynors *et al.*, i. 89. His letter to Æthelheard is recorded in William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton (Rolls Ser., 1870), p. 37 (also printed in *Councils*, ed. Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 536–7); it survives only in a spurious form – see Boehmer, *Die Fälschungen*, no. 8, pp. 97–98, 155–6. C. N. L. Brooke, 'The Canterbury Forgeries and their Author', *Downside Review*, lxxviii (1950), 462–76, suggests that Leo's letter to Æthelheard was a complete forgery, singling out its similarity to Leo III's letter to Cenwulf and its anathema as suspicious features. However, since Leo was writing to both Cenwulf and Æthelheard on the same subject, it is not surprising that the two letters were similarly worded; the anathema, moreover, is of a common type.

4. *Alcuini Epistolae*, ed. Dümmler, no. 255, pp. 413–13.

5. BCS 310.

6. William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum*, ed. Mynors *et al.*, i. 87 and *Gesta Pontificum*, ed. Hamilton, p. 7, records the exact division of sees between Canterbury and Lichfield. On his testimony see Brooks, *Early History*, p. 119.

802 to Cenwulf demanded that this should be reinstated and it is specifically singled out by Alcuin as a privilege which Canterbury had lost and which should be restored to it. The reference in the *Chronicle* to Ecgfrith's anointing in 787 may hint at some association with Lichfield's new archiepiscopal status. Both the consecration of bishops and the anointing of kings are cited in the Pseudo-Hatfield as archiepiscopal prerogatives. Moreover, one feature of the Pseudo-Hatfield is its concern to assert the rights of the archbishops of both Canterbury and York, an emphasis perhaps matched by the Northumbrian elements in the proceedings to demote Lichfield – Æthelheard's consultation with Eanbald of York and the place of the Northumbrian layman, Torhtmund, on the journey to Rome in 801.

Moreover, Cenwulf's attempt to have the site of the southern archbishopric moved to London in accordance with the Gregorian plan might well have left Canterbury feeling insecure. The Pseudo-Hatfield follows the Gregorian plan in general outline, laying down that the two metropolitans should have authority over twelve suffragans, but includes the important modification that Canterbury should be the head of the southern province, emphasizing this by referring to the antiquity of this tradition, which dated back to St Augustine (also stressed by Pope Leo in refusing Cenwulf's request). The Lichfield crisis of the late eighth and early ninth centuries is therefore the most likely context for the creation of the Pseudo-Hatfield. My discussion of the diplomatic and linguistic evidence of the decree strengthens this conclusion and provides strong indications that it was forged in the aftermath of the events of 803, during the archbishopric of Wulfred. However, before turning to this evidence, two further problems have to be discussed: firstly, the question of how the decree came to be preserved in Winchester, and, secondly, the issue of royal anointing.

There is no indication in the text of any links with the see of Winchester: its Winchester provenance is therefore an enigma. Rumble suggested that the Pseudo-Hatfield might have been part of a 'dossier of evidence' assembled for Henry of Blois in his two attempts to obtain metropolitan status for Winchester.<sup>1</sup> This remains a possibility (although the contents of the Pseudo-Hatfield would tend to weaken its case rather than to support it). However, it is possible that the Pseudo-Hatfield travelled from Canterbury to Winchester in pre-Conquest times as part of an attempt by the archbishop to strengthen his authority in the creation of new West Saxon sees. The Pseudo-Hatfield is immediately followed in the *Codex Wintoniensis* by a text generally known as the 'Plegmund Narrative', which appears to have been copied

1. Rumble, 'The Purposes', p. 165. I am grateful to Dr Rumble for further discussion on this point.

into the *Codex* at the same time.<sup>1</sup> This also discusses Anglo-Saxon diocesan arrangements – the division of the West Saxon dioceses in the tenth century – and it may provide a clue to how the Pseudo-Hatfield came to be preserved in the Winchester archive. It appears to represent tenth-century tradition concerning the division; whatever its factual basis, it contains a number of major errors.<sup>2</sup> It purports to record how the three new sees – Crediton, Wells and Ramsbury – were established out of the dioceses of Winchester and Sherborne by King Edward the Elder and Archbishop Plegmund of Canterbury at the command of Pope Formosus, who was angered by the vacancies in Anglo-Saxon sees. It claims that seven bishops were consecrated by Plegmund on one day, five for the West Saxons and two for the sees of Sussex and Mercia. In the course of listing the new bishops, it records the donation of three Cornish estates to the new see of Crediton. A papal anathema concludes the whole document.<sup>3</sup>

A number of versions of this account are known. The earliest witness to it, British Library, Add. MS 7138 (possibly a Canterbury manuscript), was copied in the mid to late tenth century.<sup>4</sup> It is this version which is found in the *Codex Wintoniensis* and it is also recorded in a number of other manuscripts from Canterbury and Exeter.<sup>5</sup> Either the ‘Plegmund Narrative’, or something very like it, was known to Archbishop Dunstan, who drew upon it in a letter of 981×988 to King Æthelred, in which he gave an account of the history of the three Cornish estates granted to Crediton at the division of the sees. Dunstan recorded how these estates had subsequently passed to the new see of Cornwall and gave his opinion that they should continue to be held by its bishop. It is clear from his account that the ownership of these three had been questioned on at least two occasions in the tenth century.<sup>6</sup> The ‘Plegmund Narrative’ is generally supposed to have been composed to defend Crediton’s claims to these three Cornish estates. But this explanation can be questioned.<sup>7</sup> The ‘Narrative’ only mentions the three

1. Rumble, ‘Structure and Reliability’, i. 337–42, ii. 206. The ‘Plegmund Narrative’ is copied in a hand contemporary with those of the Pseudo-Hatfield.

2. Brooks, *Early History*, pp. 210–13.

3. *Councils and Synods with Other Documents Relating to the English Church*. Vol. I: A.D. 871–1204, ed. D. Whitelock, M. Brett and C. N. L. Brooke (2 vols., Oxford, 1981), i. 165–9.

4. See *Facsimiles of Anglo-Saxon Charters*, ed. S. Keynes (Oxford, 1991), p. 5, no. 9. Keynes suggests a Canterbury origin but P. W. Conner, *Anglo-Saxon Exeter: A Tenth-Century Cultural History* (Woodbridge, 1993), pp. 215–16, n. 1, argues for an Exeter origin.

5. For an abbreviated version see *Councils*, ed. Whitelock *et al.*, i. 165.

6. S 1296, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley MS Eng. Hist. a. 2, no. xiv, a contemporary copy from Exeter Cathedral archives. See P. Chaplais, ‘The Authenticity of the Royal Anglo-Saxon Diplomas of Exeter’, *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, xxxix (1966), 16–17. Printed and translated by A. S. Napier and W. H. Stevenson, *The Crawford Collection of Early Charters and Documents* (Oxford, 1895), pp. 18–19, 102–10, and in *Councils*, ed. Whitelock *et al.*, i. 169–73.

7. See J. Armitage Robinson, *The Saxon Bishops of Wells* (British Academy, Supplemental Papers, no. v, 1918), pp. 18–24, esp. p. 23. R. R. Darlington, ‘Ecclesiastical Reform in the Late Old English Period’, *ante*, li (1936), 385–428, at 424, challenged Armitage Robinson’s interpretation, asking why Formosus was introduced if the purpose of the text was to protect Crediton’s property.

estates in passing, and is more concerned with the creation of the new sees and consecration of the seven bishops. It stands in contrast to Dunstan's letter, where the myth of the Formosan origin of the dioceses forms a minor part of his report, which is focused upon the history of the estates. If Crediton had wished to substantiate its property claims, one might have expected the see to have produced a more streamlined document, like Dunstan's letter. Moreover, Dunstan's letter takes off from the 'Plegmund Narrative' and recounts the ownership of the three estates after their initial grant to Crediton. The 'Plegmund Narrative' surely cannot be a riposte to Cornwall's claim to have received the estates subsequent to this donation, since it does not take their history any later than the donation. Armitage Robinson saw the anathema which concludes the text as a sure indication that its purpose was to secure Crediton's case.<sup>1</sup> However, the anathema does not only refer to the donation of the estates but to all the new arrangements outlined in the text, and it is therefore suggestive that the purpose of the 'Narrative' may have been wider than claims to these particular estates. At a date subsequent to their creation, the 'Plegmund Narrative' was perhaps composed to safeguard the newly created sees.

The three new sees at Crediton, Wells and Ramsbury were carved out of the dioceses of Sherborne and Winchester.<sup>2</sup> It is possible that, like the earlier division of Anglo-Saxon sees in the seventh and eighth centuries, the diminution of Winchester and Sherborne provoked some resistance, since it could have involved a loss not only of prestige, but also perhaps of revenue and lands. Darlington remarked on the poverty of these sees in the eleventh century and suggested that the amalgamation of Crediton and the Cornish see, and of Sherborne and Ramsbury, was the result of their impoverishment.<sup>3</sup> It is interesting to note in this connection that a number of forgeries of Winchester charters purport to date from the reorganization, and claim that Bishop Frithestan asked King Edward to reconfirm Winchester's charters. This may hint that, at a later date, the reorganization of the dioceses was seen to threaten Winchester's possessions.<sup>4</sup>

In these circumstances, Canterbury may have felt the need to reinforce its authority to create new sees. The 'Plegmund Narrative' would have served this purpose. So would the Pseudo-Hatfield since the number of Southumbrian dioceses after the Danish raids had shrunk;<sup>5</sup> its claim that Canterbury should have authority over twelve sees would

1. Robinson, *Saxon Bishops*, p. 23.

2. Brooks, *Early History*, pp. 210–13; J. Barrow, 'English Cathedral Communities and Reform in the Late Tenth and Eleventh Centuries', in *Anglo-Norman Durham, 1093–1139*, ed. D. Rollason, M. Harvey and M. Prestwich (Woodbridge, 1994), pp. 25–39, at p. 26; Robinson, *Saxon Bishops*, pp. 7–28; Darlington, 'Ecclesiastical Reform', 423–6.

3. Darlington, 'Ecclesiastical Reform', 426.

4. S 375–77.

5. Barrow, 'English Cathedral Communities', pp. 26–9.

surely strengthen the case for the creation of new ones. It is possible that the two texts were preserved at Winchester as a result of this common purpose, and that both derived from Canterbury, since wherever it was composed, the 'Plegmund Narrative' was clearly known at Canterbury in the tenth century.

This is not the place to outline all the changes in diocesan organization which took place in Anglo-Saxon England. Only those most relevant to the interests of the Pseudo-Hatfield have been highlighted. It may be that the disruption of sees in Northumbria, Mercia and East Anglia, with the demise of some and transference of others, or the eleventh-century changes in which a number of sees were held by bishops in plurality, could have occasioned the fabrication of this decree.<sup>1</sup> However, none of these episodes provide such marked correspondences to it as the late eighth- and early ninth-century Lichfield crisis.

One final feature of the content of the Pseudo-Hatfield must be considered before turning to its diplomatic and linguistic aspects. Does the reference to the *unctio regum* as a metropolitan prerogative agree with a late eighth- or early ninth-century date? The origins of this rite are so controversial and unclear that it is difficult to be definite.<sup>2</sup> There is certainly plenty of evidence that royal consecrations were established in England by the early ninth century, but it is unclear whether holy oil was involved. The earliest evidence for royal anointing comes from late seventh-century Spain, but it is not at all certain that this Visigothic practice was responsible for its adoption elsewhere. The next unambiguous evidence comes from Francia, when, in 751, the Pope anointed Pippin the first Carolingian king of the Franks and in 754 anointed Pippin and his sons. But the practice does not seem to have caught on among the Franks until Charles the Bald's anointing in 848. Eighth-century Frankish royal anointings are all associated with papal relations, and (according to Angenendt) chiefly owed their genesis to a marriage of baptismal anointing and Byzantine imperial ideology.<sup>3</sup> The Franks appear to have been remarkably uninterested in royal unction before the ninth century, but the contrary is perhaps true for the Celts and Anglo-Saxons: the teasingly ambiguous references to unction in Gildas's

1. On the reorganization of the sees, see Darlington, 'Ecclesiastical Reform', 422-3, 25-6; F. Barlow, *The English Church, 1000-1066* (2nd edn., London, 1979), pp. 162-7.

2. For the history of royal consecrations and anointings, see C. A. Boumann, *Sacring and Crowning: The Development of the Latin Ritual for the Anointing of Kings and the Coronation of an Emperor before the Eleventh Century* (Groningen, 1966); G. Ellard, *Ordination Anointings in the Western Church before 1000 AD* (Cambridge, Mass., 1933); P. E. Schramm, *A History of the English Coronation*, trans. L. Wickham Legg (Oxford, 1937); J. Nelson, 'Inauguration Rituals' and 'The Earliest Surviving Royal Ordo: Some Liturgical and Historical Aspects', both in her collected papers, *Politics and Ritual in Early Medieval Europe* (London, 1986), pp. 283-307, 341-60.

3. A. Angenendt, '“Rex et sacerdos”'. Zur Genese der Königssalbung', in *Tradition als historische Kraft. Interdisziplinäre Forschungen zur Geschichte des früheren Mittelalters*, ed. N. Knapp and J. Wollasch (Berlin, 1982), pp. 19-57.

*De Excidio* and Adamnan's interest in royal ordinations, metaphorical or otherwise, do not establish the actual practice of unction or royal inaugurations but they are surely suggestive of an intellectual and cultural environment in which, once imported, royal anointing could have taken root quickly and securely.<sup>1</sup> The 'hallowing' (almost certainly anointing) of Ecgfrith in 787 imitated the papal unction in 781 of Charlemagne's sons, Carloman and Louis. This precedent may have set the pattern for future royal inaugurations. The sources record the consecration of Kings Eardwulf of Northumbria and Ceolwulf of Mercia in 796 and 822 respectively, indicating that, even if oil was not used, royal inauguration ceremonies may have been well established. Nelson has stressed that there is more evidence in England than in Francia for an indigenous tradition of royal consecrations and has suggested that King Æthelwulf of Wessex may have been anointed in 839.<sup>2</sup> By the late tenth century royal consecrations involving anointing were clearly established in England. The best recorded of these, Edgar's coronation in 973, was performed at Bath by two archbishops, Dunstan of Canterbury and Oswald of York.<sup>3</sup> The presence of both archbishops seems to have been customary after Eadred's coronation in 946; it is probable that the leading role was taken by the Archbishop of Canterbury.<sup>4</sup>

The statement in the Pseudo-Hatfield that the two metropolitans of York and Canterbury should have separate rights of royal consecration is an important pointer to the date of its concoction. The political transformation of Anglo-Saxon England in the tenth century would almost certainly have made such a claim unpopular. Up until the late

1. *Gildas: The Ruin of Britain and Other Works*, ed. and trans. M. Winterbottom (Chichester, 1978), pp. 19; *Adomnan's Life of St Columba*, ed. and trans. A. O. and M. O. Anderson (2nd edn., Oxford, 1991), paras. 36b, 107a–108a. See Nelson, 'Inauguration Rituals', pp. 85–6. M. J. Enright, *Iona, Tara, Soissons. The Origin of Royal Anointing* (Berlin, 1985), argues for the insular origins of anointing, but the evidence will not bear his weight of interpretation. For insular biblical 'fundamentalism' see R. Kottje, *Studien zum Einfluss des Alten Testament auf Recht und Liturgie des frühen Mittelalters* (Bonn, 1964).

2. Eardwulf's and Ceolwulf's inaugurations: *ASC*, s.a. 795 (D, E); *Historia Regum*, s.a. 796, ed. Arnold, ii. 57–8; S 186, in which Ceolwulf made gifts to Wulfred for his consecration. See also my comments in *Church Councils*, pp. 185–6, on Northumbrian inaugurations and the evidence of the 786 legatine canons. J. L. Nelson, 'The Earliest Surviving Royal *Ordo*' argues for a ninth-century date (or earlier?) and Anglo-Saxon origin for the earliest surviving royal *ordo*.

3. Nelson, 'Inauguration Rituals', pp. 295–300, and see 'The Second English *Ordo*', in her *Politics and Ritual*, pp. 361–74; *ASC*, s.a. 973, *Vita Sancti Oswaldi* by Byrhtferth of Ramsey in *Historians of the Church of York and its Archbishops*, ed. J. Raine (Rolls Ser., 1879), pp. 399–475, at p. 437, on which see M. Lapidge, 'Byrhtferth and Oswald', in *St Oswald of Worcester: Life and Influence*, ed. N. Brooks and C. Cubitt (London, 1996), pp. 64–83, at pp. 70–73.

4. For Eadred's coronation see S 520, which is witnessed by both archbishops and records the gifts the king made on his consecration in 946. Both were also present at the consecration of Æthelred the Unready in 979 (*ASC*, s.a. 979 ('C')). P. Stafford, *Unification and Conquest* (London, 1989), pp. 83–4, states that this was also usual in the eleventh century but evidence is scanty. The *ordines* and other evidence for English consecrations are listed with full references to printed texts in Schramm, *A History of the English Coronation*; it is unclear from the extant *ordines* what parts the two archbishops played but the Archbishop of Canterbury appears to have been more prominent.

ninth century, the kings of North- and Southumbria were not consecrated by the two archbishops: these would have carried out consecrations separately, since Northumbria and the constituent kingdoms of Southumbria were politically distinct. In the tenth century the West Saxon kings brought the former kingdoms of Mercia and Northumbria (then subsumed into the Danelaw) under their control, ousting the Viking kings of York. The subjugation of the north was not easily achieved: Northumbria continued to have separatist tendencies into the eleventh century. It was important for the West Saxons to appoint loyal archbishops to the see of York, and it was frequently held in plurality with that of Worcester. The West Saxon kings may well have feared that too independent an archbishop might consecrate a rival ruler for the north.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, this fear may have continued into the eleventh century. Hugh the Chanter claimed that Archbishop Lanfranc was able to persuade William the Conqueror to coerce the Archbishop of York into professing obedience to Canterbury by arguing 'that it was expedient for the union and solidarity of the kingdom that all Britain should be subject to one man; otherwise it might happen, in the king's time or that of one of his successors, that some one of the Danes, Norwegians, or Scots, who used to sail up to York in their attacks on the realm, might be made king by the archbishop of York and the fickle and treacherous Yorkshiremen, and the kingdom disturbed and divided'.<sup>2</sup> Such anxieties almost certainly rule out a tenth-century date of composition for the Pseudo-Hatfield and render an eleventh- or twelfth-century one improbable.<sup>3</sup>

It seems likely that royal anointings were practised in England in the early ninth century and that English custom foreshadowed the later development of the rite in Francia.<sup>4</sup> The assertion of the Pseudo-Hatfield that episcopal consecrations and royal unction were the prerogative of the metropolitan could also anticipate Frankish custom of the later ninth century when Archbishop Hincmar strengthened the authority of the archbishop in the anointing of kings by linking it with his right to consecrate bishops.<sup>5</sup> Ecgrith's consecration may be associated with the creation of the Lichfield metropolitan, suggesting that already royal hallowing was seen as an archiepiscopal privilege.

1. See D. Whitelock, 'The Dealings of the Kings of England with Northumbria in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries', in *The Anglo-Saxons*, ed. P. Clemoes (Cambridge, 1959), pp. 70–88, at p. 88; and J. Cooper, *The Last Four Anglo-Saxon Archbishops of York* (York, 1970), pp. 1–2. On northern separatism, see W. E. Kapelle, *The Norman Conquest of the North: The Region and its Transformation, 1000–1135* (London, 1979).

2. *Hugh the Chanter*, ed. Johnson, pp. 4–5.

3. Ealdred of York consecrated William the Conqueror and possibly Harold Godwinsson without the Archbishop of Canterbury, Stigand, since the latter's legitimacy was doubtful: see Barlow, *English Church*, pp. 60, 302–7, with further references cited there.

4. Nelson, 'Earliest Surviving Royal *Ordo*'.

5. Nelson, 'Kingship, Law and Liturgy in the Political Thought of Hincmar of Rheims', *Politics and Ritual*, pp. 133–71, reprinted from *ante*, xcii (1977), 241–79.

Moreover, Ceolwulf's inauguration may have been delayed until the appropriate archbishop could administer it, since it took place in 822, a year after his accession and the probable date of Archbishop Wulfred's reinstatement after his suspension.<sup>1</sup> In a region like Southumbria, where kingdoms possessed their own bishops but were subject to the archbishop of another kingdom, the early establishment of the principle that royal unction could only be performed by an archbishop would not be a surprising development. The Southumbrian archbishopric was peculiarly vulnerable in this respect.

The first part of this study has examined possible historical contexts for the Pseudo-Hatfield in order to try to uncover its date of creation. This second section approaches the same problem from a different angle by analysing the evidence of the text's diplomatic and latinity. Comparison with the diplomatic and style of Anglo-Saxon charters and conciliar proceedings provides an important means of locating and dating the Pseudo-Hatfield's composition which is also independent of any speculations about its historical significance.

The first question to be broached is whether the Pseudo-Hatfield could be a genuine decree of the Council of Hatfield. Examination of its formulae does not turn up any authentic features, but rather reveals a number of suspicious characteristics. The dating clause, list of those attending and witness-list are clearly derived from the account of the Council in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Bede gives an edited version of the *acta*, omitting the witness list; he also assigns it in his chronological summary in V. 24 to the year AD 680, an incarnational date, which he must have calculated (erroneously) for himself since the genuine *acta* are dated by the indiction and by the regnal years of Kings Ecgrith of Northumbria, Æthelred of Mercia, Aldwulf of East Anglia and Hlothere of Kent (none of whom are recorded in the authentic *acta* as attending the council).<sup>2</sup> Incarnational dating was used in neither of the genuine Theodoran conciliar proceedings nor in any extant seventh-century Canterbury document.<sup>3</sup> Thus the presence of the incarnational date in the Pseudo-Hatfield is not only anachronistic but also an indicator of its debt to the *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Moreover, Ecgrith, Æthelred, Aldwulf and Hlothere all appear in the Pseudo-Hatfield as attending the council and attesting the decree; no other individuals, apart from Archbishop Theodore, are named. The failure of the Pseudo-Hatfield to record the name of any other bishop is indeed suspicious, since the presence and consent of the bishops would have been vital for the validation of its

1. See Brooks, *Early History*, p. 135. The links between this episode and the Pseudo-Hatfield are discussed *infra*, pp. 1240–1.

2. *HE*, V. 17.

3. Although it may have been employed elsewhere in England at this date: see K. Harrison, *The Framework of Anglo-Saxon History to A.D. 900* (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 52–75; P. Sims-Williams, 'St Wilfrid and Two Charters dated AD 676 and 680', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, xxxix (1988), 163–83.



purpose of defining metropolitan authority. The forger, at a loss for a witness-list since Bede recorded none, lifted the names of the four kings from the dating clause of the genuine *acta* and used them to create it. The inclusion at the beginning of the Pseudo-Hatfield of the names of the archbishop and kings in attendance is a further suspicious feature: secular figures are not usually recorded in the protocols of seventh-century synods except in the witness lists.<sup>1</sup> The Pseudo-Hatfield stands closer to ninth-century English synodal texts which state at the opening the name of the archbishop presiding and the Mercian king present, but then refer generally to the presence of other unnamed bishops.

Diplomatic and textual analysis therefore suggests that the Pseudo-Hatfield cannot be an authentic seventh-century text. Can it be used to date the text more precisely? The diplomatic elements can be broken down into the following – the invocation, the introductory clauses giving details of the council at which it was published, and the anathema. These will be discussed first, followed by other features of its composition and its Latinity.

Firstly, the invocation. The document opens with an extended form of *Regnante* clause, lengthened by the addition of a number of clauses introduced by the pronoun *qui*. Simple *Regnante* invocations are found in early Anglo-Saxon documents, but do not become common among Anglo-Saxon charters until the ninth century. Extended forms were employed more sparingly, particularly in the early period. Two conciliar texts – the decrees of the Councils of *Clofesho* and of Chelsea, held in 747 and 816 respectively – provide the earliest and closest parallels to the invocation of the Pseudo-Hatfield decree.<sup>2</sup>

‘Regnante in perpetuum Deo et domino nostro Iesu Christo qui cęlestia simul et terrestria imperio patris cuncta quę sancti spiritus gratia in ęquitate disponit’.

747

*Regnante in perpetuum  
Domino nostro Jhesu Christo,  
qui cuncta Patris imperio,  
ac pariter Sancti Spiritus  
gratia vivificante disponit*

816

*Regnante ac gubernante Deo et  
Domino nostro Jesu Christo, qui dis-  
pensat orbem terrarum in ęquitate,  
quique et omnem creaturam suo vir-  
tute penetravit, necnon cuncta Patris  
imperio ac pariter Sancti Spiritus gra-  
tia sursum atque deorsum mirabile in  
modum perficiet atque discernit*

1. See Cubitt, *Church Councils*, p. 77–80. King Egfrith of Northumbria’s presence at the Council of Hertford is recorded in *HE*, V.24 but is not recorded in the Council’s proceedings.

2. *Councils*, ed. Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 362, 579. The extended form is, however, rare (especially starting with *qui*): S 229, S 27, S 43, S 105, S 263, S 129. Examples from the ninth century include three Canterbury charters given in 814 (S 175–7) and S 270a, S 283, S 1433, S 275, S 285, S 284, S 188, S 320, S 217. S 286 (dated 838) and S 1279 (dated 899) are relatively close parallels. See too four tenth-century charters which extend, rather than interrupt, the formula: S 409, S 583, S 757, S 754.

Although the anathema of the Pseudo-Hatfield with its triple penalty, appears to be elaborate, in basic outline it consists of a common and simple type of anathema, to which more impressive phrases have been added:

*si quis uero quod non optamus obstinata contumacia his salubris statutis obpugnando contraire temptauerit quisquis ille sit sciat cononica subiacere sententia et a synodali huius communione esse damnatum uel a participatione corporis et sanguinis domini nostri Iesu Christi separatum.*

This is a not uncommon Anglo-Saxon type of anathema, found from the late seventh century on, but more numerous in the late eighth and early ninth centuries.<sup>1</sup> The opening phrase 'si quis uero quod non optamus' is not found in seventh-century Anglo-Saxon documents, but first appears in the extant records in the mid-eighth century.<sup>2</sup> This style of opening (more commonly with *autem* for *uero*) is found frequently in the anathemas of ninth-century Kentish charters and becomes part of the standard Canterbury style.<sup>3</sup> The penalties threatened in the anathema – subjection to a canonical sentence, synodal condemnation and excommunication – can be paralleled in some ninth-century charters which also refer to synodal and canonical sentences.<sup>4</sup>

The text of the Pseudo-Hatfield takes care to record when and where the council met, and who presided, and to include the details of those in attendance; this information is stated in a diplomatic format peculiar to ecclesiastical conciliar proceedings which was adopted and modified in England in Anglo-Saxon times.<sup>5</sup> Examples survive from the seventh, eighth and ninth centuries, but not from the tenth and eleventh centuries, when this style seems to have been abandoned. The Pseudo-Hatfield very closely resembles the conciliar texts produced at Canterbury in the first quarter of the ninth century, which include not only contemporary conciliar proceedings (the canons of the Council of Chelsea in 816, and two dispute settlements of 824 and 825, S 1434 and S 1436 respectively) but also forged texts. These purport to be a privilege granted by the Kentish King, Wihtred, before a Council of Bapchild at the end of the seventh century and later confirmed in 716 by a Council of *Clofesho* (S 22), and a regrant of this privilege made by King Æthelbald at a Council of *Clofesho* in 742 (S 90). Both can be associated with Archbishop Wulfred of Canterbury's dispute with King Cenwulf of Mercia over the lordship of Kentish monasteries.<sup>6</sup>

There are close parallels between the Pseudo-Hatfield and, for example, Æthelbald's privilege (S 90); these similarities also link it to

1. Seventh-century examples: S 15 and S 16. Eighth- and ninth-century: S 123, S 128–9, S 131, S 34, S 1266, S 271. S 177, a grant to Archbishop Wulfred in 814, has similarities to the Pseudo-Hatfield in both its invocation and anathema.

2. S 58, dated 767.

3. See Brooks, *Early History*, p. 329.

4. S 1439 (AD 810/844), S 1433 (AD 824) and S 22.

5. Cubitt, *Church Councils*, pp. 77–87.

6. Brooks, *Early History*, pp. 191–7.

other ninth-century Canterbury conciliar texts which use the same set of standard formulae. For example, both texts record the name of the presiding cleric by an ablative absolute construction, including the word *autem*, and both give the details of the others present in the ablative and include the phrase *ceterisque episcopis*. These features are found in each of the other Canterbury conciliar texts. The importance of these parallels is underlined by the fact that conciliar texts composed by the Worcester Cathedral scriptorium at this time conform to the same general pattern but employ their own set of distinctive phrases and constructions.<sup>1</sup> One considerable difference in style between Worcester and Canterbury protocols lies in the prefatory phrases used to introduce the subject of the document, which indicate that this was just one among many items of business on the agenda. These preliminaries are perhaps not strictly diplomatic, but they form part of the regular synodal style and can also serve as an introduction to wider stylistic aspects of the Pseudo-Hatfield. The Worcester texts all state 'ibi inter alia plura aliqua contentio facta . . .',<sup>2</sup> where at Canterbury a more discursive phrasing is employed. This section is not absolutely identical in all five synodal proceedings from early ninth-century Canterbury, but all five passages are very closely related, being composed in the same way from the same phrases and vocabulary. These invariably consist of a participle in the nominative plural (*tractantes, examinantes, scrutantes*) with *de*, and the object of consideration is one or two of the following nouns – *necessitas, utilitas, status*, usually followed by *ecclesiarum*.<sup>3</sup> Exactly the same structure and phrasing is found in the Pseudo-Hatfield, which bears particularly close resemblance to the corresponding passages in the canons of the Council of Chelsea in 816 and in S 22, the purported decree of King Wihtried. The latter shares further structural and lexicographical parallels with the Pseudo-Hatfield.

S 22 (*BCS* 91)

pariter *tractantes*. anxie *examinantes de statu ecclesiarum Dei* vel monasterium intra Cantiam. *quae* a fidelibus regibus prodecessoribus meis. et propinquis. Deo omnipotenti in propriam hereditatem condonata fuerent. *quomodo. vel qualiter secundum normam aequitatis* stare. quidve *servare* amodo et usque ad finem saeculi *constituimus*.

*Pseudo-Hatfield*

*tractantes maxime de statu ecclesiarum Dei. quorum* abolitanis temporibus in primordia Christianitatis tocius Britannie constituta atque firmata noscuntur. *quomodo uel qualiter secundum normam rectitudinis* his temporibus uel futuris ad *seruandum disposuimus*

1. See P. Wormald, 'A Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Lawsuits', *Anglo-Saxon England*, xvii (1987), 247–81, at 274.

2. See, for example, S 1430, S 1431, and S 1433.

3. Compare the similar phrases in the 816 Chelsea canons (*Councils*, ed. Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 579–85), S 90, S 1434, and S 1436.

There are therefore very strong links between conciliar texts from early ninth-century Canterbury, and these extend further to shared vocabulary. Certain words and phrases reoccur not only in the texts discussed but also in charters from early ninth-century Canterbury. For example, the Pseudo-Hatfield and the forged privilege of King Æthelbald of 742 (S 90/BCS 162) both contain the phrase *in primordia* (sic), in the former with *Christianitatis* and in the latter with *nascentis ecclesiae*; this turns up in the conciliar dispute settlement of 824 (S 1434, BCS 378) with *reconciliationis*, and with *Christianae religionis* in a grant of 814 to Archbishop Wulfred (S 177/BCS 348, a charter whose invocation and anathema also show parallels to the Pseudo-Hatfield). In all but the last text, the feminine ablative singular ending *-a* is erroneously employed instead of the neuter ablative singular *-o*. This fondness for the word *primordium* is further reflected in the use of its adjectival form *primordialis*, which appears in a dispute settlement of 825 (S 1436/BCS 384) and in the canons of the Council of Chelsea.

These similarities between the Pseudo-Hatfield and early ninth-century Canterbury texts indicate a common method of composition. It is a method which relied not so much upon an understanding of the syntax of Latin prose as upon a pool of familiar vocabulary and phrasing from which texts might be built up.<sup>1</sup> For example, the invocation and anathema essentially reproduce standard diplomatic formulae, but vary these by the addition of new phrases which add little to the meaning of those formulae but which heap on further resonant verbiage. The addition of *celestia simul et terrestria* in the invocation of the Pseudo-Hatfield is an elaboration of *cuncta* in its model which in fact confuses the grammatical structure of the original. This technique is typical of the document as a whole which is composed of discrete phrases, piled onto one another with little or no sense of overall structure and scant attention to grammatical requirements. The Pseudo-Hatfield breaks down not into sentences but into a series of groups of words whose connection with one another is not clearly established.<sup>2</sup> Virtually no understanding of complex sentence structure and of the device of clausal subordination is shown, or perhaps even of the need for main verb, subject and object. The incoherence exhibited by the Pseudo-Hatfield is but an extreme example of the general weakness of ninth-century Canterbury Latinity.<sup>3</sup> It should be compared with sections of the conciliar texts, like the forged privilege of Wihtrud (S 22) and the dispute

1. On ninth-century standards of Latin see Brooks, *Early History*, pp. 164–74, and id., 'England in the Ninth Century: The Crucible of Defeat', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., xxv (1979), 1–20, at 14–16. J. Morrish, 'King Alfred's Letter as a Source on Learning in England', in *Studies in Earlier English Prose*, ed. P. Szarmach (Albany, NY, 1986), pp. 87–107, at pp. 91–7, takes a more positive view, but see the critique by M. Lapidge, 'Latin Learning in Ninth-Century England', in his *Anglo-Latin Literature, 600–899* (London, 1996), pp. 409–39, especially pp. 433–7, 446–9.

2. See, for example, the section from *Prima ut in Dorouernia to ad confinia Norðanhumbroborum*.

3. On ninth-century Latin see *supra*, p. 1235, n. 1.

settlement of 825 (S 1436), which are also written in this cumulative fashion but where there is a clearer sense of grammar. Analysis of S 1436, for example, shows the same heavy reliance on participles and tendency to pile phrases one upon another.<sup>1</sup>

The grammatical mistakes of the Pseudo-Hatfield are so numerous that in places the decree nearly descends into incomprehensibility. Some probably arose through miscopying, but others can also be paralleled in ninth-century Canterbury texts and therefore are more likely to have arisen through authorial error. The phrase *in primordia Christianitatis*, discussed above, is a case in point; and another example can be seen in the opening preamble, which errs in construing *synodus* as a neuter noun and also by following the ablative absolute of its opening by the nominative plural participle *tractantes*. Both these faults occur in each of the five Canterbury conciliar texts discussed above. A further apparent error which can be closely paralleled in synodal texts from ninth-century Canterbury is the form *regi* (in line 10) presumably for the ablative *rege*: precisely the same mistake occurs in the Wihtrud forgery and the settlements of 824–5 (S 22/BCS 91, S 1434/BCS 378, S 1436/BCS 384).

There are three types of grammatical error in the Pseudo-Hatfield which are also common to the early ninth-century Canterbury texts and are characteristic of them. Firstly, in the attendance list of the Pseudo-Hatfield, the name of King Hlothere is given in the ablative when the author probably intended that it should agree with the previous subscription of King Aldwulf. This failure in consistency may be compared to the attendance list of the Council of Chelsea, where the names of the bishops oscillate between the nominative and ablative cases.<sup>2</sup> Secondly, lack of agreement between adjectives and nouns is a frequent mistake in these texts. This probably arose through ignorance of noun genders and cases and in some instances through a tendency to select the first declension feminine accusative plural ending in *-as* in inappropriate situations: for example, the Pseudo-Hatfield's phrase *canonicas institutiones* (where *canonicas* is in the accusative rather than the nominative), which can be compared to the *precepta canonicas* of the Chelsea canons of 816.<sup>3</sup> Thirdly, both the Pseudo-Hatfield and the Canterbury texts display ignorance of the declension of adjectives ending in *-alis*. The error of the Pseudo-Hatfield shown in the phrase *in australis partibus* is matched by the *australiis episcopis* of the Chelsea canons, and less precisely by other errors with adjectives of the same

1. BCS 384; for example, the section from *Tandundem vero inter aliarum allocutionum verba . . . to hoc est vero quod*, which restarts the already overburdened sentence.

2. *Councils*, ed. Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 579. See also S 90 (BCS 162), *presistente . . . Athelbaldus*.

3. For errors resulting from gender confusion, see *infra*, pp. 1245, n. 4, 1246, nn. 5, 6, 1247, nn. 5, 6, 10. In texts from ninth-century Canterbury: the canons of the Council of Chelsea in 816 *ecclesias . . . subactos* (c. 10); *suarum episcoporum* (c. 11) (*Councils*, ed. Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 583–4); S 22 (BCS 91), *liberas eos esse . . . suo spontanea voluntate*; S 1434 (BCS 378), *in illa famosa monasterio*; S 1268 (BCS 380), *pro nostrorum animarum*; S 1434 (BCS 378), *ecclesiasticas . . . mores* (a phrase which should probably be in the ablative).

type.<sup>1</sup> In the phrase *a sinodali huius communionē*, found in the anathema of the Pseudo-Hatfield, the adjective, *synodalis*, appears to be used as a noun,<sup>2</sup> just as it is in the anathema of a dispute settlement dated 825 (S 1436/BCS 384).<sup>3</sup> Three other Canterbury charters, grants to Archbishop Wulfred, contain similar usages. S 177 (BCS 348) contains the phrase *summo pontificalis apice decorato*, where *pontificalis* appears to be a noun; *venerabile archiepiscopo* can be seen in S 186 (BCS 370), and S 187 (BCS 373) uses the adjective form *australe* as ablative form of a noun for 'south'. These two latter texts have particular significance: both are grants to Archbishop Wulfred himself from King Ceolwulf of Mercia (dated 822 and 823 respectively) and both survive in contemporary copies almost certainly in the archbishop's own hand.<sup>4</sup> Both display other idiosyncracies in their Latin common to the Pseudo-Hatfield.

Finally, the Pseudo-Hatfield contains a number of curious spellings of Latin words and Old English proper names which can be analysed philologically and thus provide some clues to its dating.<sup>5</sup> Some of its orthographic anomalies are impossible to resolve while others seem to show the influence of vernacular pronunciation upon Latin. One baffling spelling is the name of the Kentish king Hlothere, *Clotherio*. The substitution of *Cl-* for *Hl-* is rare and can be paralleled in two seventh-century charters from Kent and Wessex.<sup>6</sup> It may therefore perhaps be taken from a copy of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* which contained a seventh-century spelling of this name in its text of the proceedings of the Council of Hatfield. The name is, however, very rare and may have caused confusion; it may be unwise to build too much on this form.<sup>7</sup> Other spellings, however, point to a later date. The Pseudo-Hatfield contains two clear instances where *a* and *o* have been interchanged through confusion of close unstressed vowels, the spellings *metropolitanus* and *cononica* (lines 18 and 35). This type of error can happen at any time but in the vernacular is more commonly found in Kentish than elsewhere in Old English.<sup>8</sup> It can be paralleled in the form

1. For other similar errors in the Pseudo-Hatfield see *infra*, pp. 1246, nn. 12, 17, 1247, nn. 8, 10; in other ninth-century Canterbury texts, see the 816 Council of Chelsea *synodale decreta, firma et inrefragabilis* (Councils, ed. Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 581); S 22 (BCS 91), *manente tamen hac kartula inrefragabilis*; S 168 (BCS 341), *in australe parte*; S 169 (BCS 162), *in partibus australi*; S 90 (BCS 162), *venerabiles archiepiscopus*.

2. See *infra*, p. 1247, n. 10.

3. S 1436 (BCS 384), 'Haec sunt autem nomina illorum quae ex alia parte conscribuntur qui cum totius synodalis auctoritate huius reconciliationis testes adfuerunt . . .'

4. British Library, MS Cotton Augustus ii. 93 and ii. 75. On Wulfred's hand see Brooks, *Early History*, p. 168.

5. In the following analyses, I have drawn heavily upon the generous advice of Paul Bibire, Peter Kitson and Matthew Townend.

6. S 9, S 1245. See *infra*, p. 1246, n. 3.

7. H. Ström, *Old English Personal Names in Bede's History. An Etymological-Phonological Investigation* (Lund, 1939), pp. 23–4.

8. Peter Kitson, pers. comm; see also A. Campbell, *Old English Grammar* (Oxford, 1959), c. 377; R. Hogg, *A Grammar of Old English*. Vol. I: *Phonology* (Oxford, 1992), c. 6.60.

*porochia* in a Canterbury settlement of 844 (S 1439/BCS 445).<sup>1</sup> A strong pointer to a ninth-century date for the decree is the form *Heðfeld*, in line 6. If this is an Old English form rather than a later Middle English intrusion, then it must be either Mercian (showing raising of  $\text{æ}^2$  to  $\bar{\text{e}}$  before dental consonants) or a ninth-century Kentish form ( $\bar{\text{e}}$  for  $\text{æ}^2$ ).<sup>2</sup> Finally the spelling *paleg* (line 21), where *g* has been written for *i*, is very difficult to explain according to the rules of Old English philology but it is paralleled in S 186, a charter probably from Wulfred's own hand, in the spelling *meg* for *mei*.<sup>3</sup>

This philological evidence coupled with that of the grammatical errors, therefore, is especially revealing for the date and authorship of the Pseudo-Hatfield. Both show forms which can be paralleled in documents from ninth-century Canterbury; but two significant features – mistakes in declining adjectives ending in *-alis* and the inexplicable *g* for *i* – can be found in two early ninth-century charters almost certainly in Archbishop Wulfred's own hand. The combination of these features in the Pseudo-Hatfield and in documents so closely linked to Wulfred can hardly be coincidental.

This evidence thus corroborates the striking parallels between the Pseudo-Hatfield and the conciliar texts from the Archbishop's pontificate. While the particular style of diplomatic employed for conciliar proceedings had been used since the days of Theodore and the beginnings of synodal convocation in Anglo-Saxon England, it was particularly adopted and extended by Wulfred. It was employed in the proceedings of the Councils at Hertford and Hatfield, and in the canons of 747 Council of *Clofesho*,<sup>4</sup> but none of these three texts display such close links with the style of the Pseudo-Hatfield. Nor do the documents of Wulfred's two predecessors, Æthelheard and Jænberht, show such striking correspondences with the Pseudo-Hatfield, although both would have had strong motives for concocting such a forgery. The latinity of documents from their pontificates, for example, is generally somewhat less faulty,<sup>5</sup> and neither appears to have adopted the synodal diplomatic style as wholeheartedly as Wulfred did. Documents from Jænberht's Canterbury do not employ synodal styles (although these do not include dispute settlements, the documents in which the style is

1. Brooks, *Early History*, pp. 131, 141–2. If the stress fell on the first syllable of *cononica*, then the spelling would show *o* for *a* before a nasal consonant, a ninth-century Mercian feature, paralleled in *Contwariorum* in S 186.

2. Hogg, *Grammar*, c. 5.79, n. 1.

3. See also the similar form *regni meg* in S 212 (BCS 513), a Mercian charter of 866. S 186 (BCS 370) and S 187 (BCS 373) also contain the forms *magioribus* for *maioribus* and S 187 (BCS 373) the spelling *magiorum* for *maiorum*, which may show the influence of vernacular pronunciation in the palatization of *g* in the vicinity of front vowels.

4. See Cubitt, *Church Councils*, pp. 77–87.

5. For an analysis of BCS 310, see J. Morrish, 'An Examination of Literacy and Learning in England in the Ninth Century' (Univ. of Oxford, D. Phil. thesis, 1982), p. 79, pointing to clumsy sentence structure rather than crass grammatical errors.

most evident in the early ninth century), nor do they contain any phrasing or vocabulary close to those found in the Pseudo-Hatfield. Archbishop Æthelheard, on the other hand, did utilize synodal diplomatic but not in the form which became standard under Wulfred. Although there is only a small sample of texts from the time of Æthelheard, they do give some impression of favoured formulae and phrasing, which can be distinguished from those of the Pseudo-Hatfield.<sup>1</sup> Generally these begin with a brief invocation, followed by a statement by the Archbishop in the first person, declaring that he had convened the synod. A settlement of 798 incorporates the reply of the assembled synod to Æthelheard's questioning, a passage which is echoed by the reported speech of the council of another synodal text (S 132) which has been tampered with by later forgers. BCS 312, Æthelheard's ban on the lay lordship of monasteries, is couched as a direct notification from the Archbishop to the monasteries of his province, not as a conciliar decision. Synodal protocols are not used in this, providing a contrast to the regularity with which the synodal model was applied to conciliar legislation under Wulfred. Moreover, as with Jænberht's documents, there are virtually no common turns of style which associate these texts with the Pseudo-Hatfield, a marked contrast with the numerous links outlined above.

Nor is the Pseudo-Hatfield likely to be a twelfth-century forgery based upon the characteristic protocols of ninth-century conciliar texts. One clear example of such a fabrication exists in the archive of Christ Church, Canterbury. This – the Pseudo-Bapchild (BCS 92) – differs notably from the Pseudo-Hatfield in its barefaced assertions of the primacy of the Canterbury metropolitan: Archbishop Berhtwald is described as the 'venerando patre primate tocius Britaniæ'. The grammar of the original is also tidied up: where S 22, like the Pseudo-Hatfield, gives *regi*, the Pseudo-Bapchild corrects this to the correct ablative form *rege*. It also displays a tell-tale sign of post-Conquest tampering in its use of the word *Anglia* where S 22 has *Cantia*. The Pseudo-Hatfield, by contrast, displays no such obvious signs of post-Conquest composition or tampering. It is consistently closer in style, vocabulary and substance to the ninth-century compositions of Christ Church, Canterbury, than to the late eleventh- or twelfth-century ones.

The diplomatic, style, latinity and language all converge in pointing to Canterbury as the place of the Pseudo-Hatfield's fabrication and to Wulfred as its forger. It displays strong similarities to charters closely linked to the Archbishop himself and to the two other forgeries attributed to his archiepiscopate. This is seen not only in its diplomatic and style but also in the forger's desire to associate the rights claimed with the authority of earlier English synods. But there is one significant difference between the forged conciliar decrees of Kings Wihtred and

1. S 1258, S 1259, S 132 (a suspect text) and the decrees of 803 – BCS 310 and BCS 312.



Æthelbald and the Pseudo-Hatfield: the former have an established context and purpose and the latter does not. This does not, however, pose an insuperable obstacle to accepting Wulfred as the author of the Pseudo-Hatfield. The context of the concoction of the Wihtried and Æthelbald forgeries attributed to Kings Wihtried and Æthelbald – Cenwulf's dispute from c. 816 until 821 with Archbishop Wulfred over the lordship of the Kentish minsters – was only recently uncovered by Nicholas Brooks, and records survived concerning it because it involved financial and property rights which it was customary to enshrine in written documentation.<sup>1</sup>

Is it possible to find a plausible context for Wulfred's creation of the decree? Perhaps it was composed in 803 or earlier, when Wulfred was an archdeacon at Christ Church, Canterbury, during Æthelheard's pontificate.<sup>2</sup> If the Pseudo-Hatfield was an early foray into the forger's art on the part of Wulfred, this might go some way to explaining why its latinity is worse, perhaps less experienced, than that of his later texts. However, there is no evidence of its use in the conflict over the Mercian metropolitan and the 803 decree, in fact, relied upon the Gregorian plan. Another possible context may reside in an episode only recorded by a few enigmatic sentences in the correspondence of Charlemagne with Pope Leo in 808. Leo referred, in the course of a letter which discusses the flight of King Eardwulf of Northumbria, to a dissension between Cenwulf, Archbishop Wulfred, the Northumbrian archbishop, Eanbald II and an Abbot Wado.<sup>3</sup> The cause of the quarrel between Cenwulf and the archbishops is not known, nor is it clear whether it was linked in some way to King Eardwulf's flight. The conjunction of the two archbishops and their kings in some sort of dispute may perhaps have links with the Pseudo-Hatfield where both the South- and the Northumbrian metropolitans were included in the decree.

But perhaps a stronger case can be made for linking the Pseudo-Hatfield with Wulfred's dispute with the Mercian kings, and in particular to his restoration in 822. Evidence for the first of these suggestions can be seen in the forged privilege of King Æthelbald which contains a possible allusion to the diminution of Canterbury's archiepiscopal rights in its claim that 'the honour and authority and security of Christ Church on this side of the river Humber is to be denied by no

1. Brooks, *Early History*, pp. 132–42, 174–206.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 132.

3. *Epistolae Carolinae Aevi III*, ed. E. Dümmler and K. Hampe (MGH *Epistolae* V, Berlin, 1899), nos. 2, 3, pp. 89–92; *Annales Regni Francorum*, ed. F. Kurze (MGH, *Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum*), s.a. 808, 809, pp. 126–8. Leo tells Charlemagne that he has received letters of Archbishop Eanbald II of York, of a certain Wado, and of King Cenwulf of Mercia, and that he is saddened by the 'dolositatem, quam inter se habent'. On this episode, see J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, 'Charlemagne and England', in his *Early Medieval History* (Oxford, 1975), pp. 155–80, at pp. 170–1, and Brooks, *Early History*, p. 133.

one'.<sup>1</sup> Further, Wulfred's return to office was marked by a charter dated 17 September 822 recording King Ceolwulf's payment of 75 mancuses as a reward for his consecration by the Archbishop.<sup>2</sup> It seems likely that Wulfred's restoration and Ceolwulf's consecration were linked, the result of hard bargaining in which perhaps the Pseudo-Hatfield played a part. Together with the forged privilege of King Æthelbald, the Pseudo-Hatfield indicates that Canterbury continued to be vulnerable to attempts to diminish its archiepiscopal powers. The Gregorian plan's designation of London rather than Canterbury may have remained a threat.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, the evidence of the Southumbrian episcopal professions (a practice possibly inaugurated in the aftermath of the Lichfield affair) suggests that Canterbury felt it necessary to continue to assert its authority over its twelve suffragan sees and its rights of episcopal consecration.<sup>4</sup> These were an integral part of its authority over its suffragans, and must have been an important source of political power. The fact that no Southumbrian bishop could be consecrated without the archbishop's co-operation may have given the latter an important bargaining piece in any conflict with the king: Brooks has noted that seven of the twelve Southumbrian sees fell vacant between 816 and 824, and the professions to Archbishop Wulfred of three of the newly elected bishops survive.<sup>5</sup> Unfortunately it is not possible to date the exact length of these vacancies but they suggest another link between the circumstances of the Pseudo-Hatfield's creation and the restoration of Wulfred.

The Pseudo-Hatfield reveals the deep insecurity of Wulfred and of the see of Canterbury when faced with the hostility of the Mercian kings and shows the complex range of issues involved. Wulfred's weapons were, however, formidable: his defence of the archbishop's sole right to anoint kings is suggestive of a sophisticated ideology of kingship, particularly in using royal consecration as a means of buttressing the archbishop's position (rather than the king's).<sup>6</sup> It is yet another piece of evidence for the liveliness of archiepiscopal aspirations at this time, an assertiveness demonstrated by Wulfred's clash with Cenwulf and the production of the *Wihrtred* and *Æthelbald* privileges. However, the elevated rhetorical claims of the Pseudo-Hatfield concerning archiepiscopal authority are rather vitiated in modern eyes by the author's ignorance of Latin

1. S 90/BCS 162, discussed by Brooks, *Early History*, p. 193. I am most grateful to the anonymous reader for alerting me to this possible link between S 90 and the Pseudo-Hatfield and to its connections to Ceolwulf's consecration.

2. S 186.

3. For the special significance of London in Anglo-Saxon times, see Cubitt, *Church Councils*, pp. 27–32, 235–7. J. Nelson suggests that Alfred the Great may have revived the metropolitan scheme: see 'The Political Ideas of Alfred of Wessex', in *Kings and Kingship in Medieval Europe*, ed. A. J. Duggan (London, 1993), pp. 125–58, at pp. 154–6.

4. *Canterbury Professions*, ed. M. Richter (Canterbury and York Soc., lxxvii, 1973); Brooks, *Early History*, pp. 164–7, who is cautious over when this practice started.

5. Brooks, *Early History*, p. 134.

6. J. Nelson, 'National Synods, Kingship as Office, and Royal Anointing: An Early Medieval Syndrome', in her *Politics and Ritual*, pp. 239–57, esp. at pp. 247–57.

grammar, but both may be symptoms of the growing importance of literacy. The production of forgeries (like Wulfred's conciliar decrees) may be a sign of a new emphasis upon the written word as a means of proof. This is also suggested by another Canterbury document, the canons of the 816 Council of Chelsea, which required that the judgements of synods should be fully recorded in writing and emphasized the authoritative status of such charters, canons which probably sought to protect not only contemporary charters but also the Canterbury forgeries.<sup>1</sup> These new demands for written proof seem to have outstripped the grammatical resources of Canterbury scholars, whose Latin productions were no longer confined to routinely formulaic charters which disposed of land and its appurtenances; they were now required to define and defend the ancient privileges of their see. The author of these forgeries was able to put together documents the message of whose high-flown verbiage was perhaps clearer than its meaning. The impressive rhetoric of the Canterbury forgeries is the literary equivalent of the new calligraphic script developed there at this time, visual and aural symbols of the prestige of the written word.<sup>2</sup>

The three Canterbury forgeries form a corpus of evidence which can tell us not only about the political struggles of the archbishopric but also about its understanding of the past and the present. All three derive their authority from their claim to represent the proceedings of Anglo-Saxon councils. The Pseudo-Hatfield claims to be a decree of a synod of the whole Anglo-Saxon church meeting under the presidency of Archbishop Theodore; the privilege of the Kentish King, Wihtred, was supposedly made before an assembly of Kentish clerics, including Archbishop Berhtwald of Canterbury, and confirmed in 716 by a synod at *Clofesho* attended by very many bishops. According to S 90, it was ratified for a second time by a Council of *Clofesho*, meeting in 742 under the presidency of King Æthelbald and Archbishop Cuthbert. The Bapchild privilege is the only one of the three forgeries not to have been made before a synod of the whole Anglo-Saxon or Southumbrian church, and it was given subsequent spurious confirmation at a Council of *Clofesho*. To a ninth-century mind, therefore, the best defence of the Church's privileges lay in ancient agreements made between kings and archbishops, publicly witnessed and accepted by assemblies of bishops and churchmen. This is a legalistic conception of the archbishopric's past, in which the significant developments were shaped by royal grants and archiepiscopal decrees in harmony with the rulings of canon law and buttressed by the spiritual threat of anathemas. It is interesting that synodal forgeries were preferred to, for example, the concoction of papal

1. *Councils*, ed. Haddan and Stubbs, c. 6, 9, iii.581, 583; on these decrees see Cubitt, *Church Councils*, pp. 77–80.

2. M. P. Brown, 'Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 10861 and the Scriptorium of Christ Church, Canterbury', *Anglo-Saxon England*, xv (1985), 119–37.

letters or privileges, or to the invocation of the power of Canterbury's founding saints. Why did not the forger produce a set of *miracula* setting out in vivid detail the terrible punishments awaiting those who attacked Canterbury's rights?<sup>1</sup> The importance attached by the creator of Canterbury's forgeries to synodal agreements must reflect contemporary concerns, since great ecclesiastical assemblies meeting under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury and attended by the Mercian king, his magnates and many bishops, played a significant role in the politics of the Mercian Supremacy. It was at the council of *Clofesho* in 803 that Archbishop Æthelheard chose to announce the papal restoration of Canterbury's metropolitan province, and other synods adjudicated disputes often between kings and bishops over ecclesiastical rights and property.<sup>2</sup> The Canterbury forgeries recreate the past in the image of the present: the Council of Hatfield was transformed from a council apparently concerned with purely doctrinal matters and attended only by clerics into a major assembly of kings and bishops which promulgated ecclesiastical privileges for the English Church.

Antiquity itself was a further guardian of present rights. It was not enough to make King Æthelbald of Mercia issue a grant of privileges to the Church: his grant was but one link in a chain of confirmations which reached back to Wihtrud's original decree, which itself protected earlier church custom and the donations of his predecessors. In the Pseudo-Hatfield, it is ancient tradition derived from Canterbury's founding father, Augustine, and reaffirmed in the decree itself by the seventh-century archbishop, Theodore, that forms the real safeguard of Canterbury's archiepiscopal authority. Moreover the very form of the forgeries was a sign of continuity with the past. The Pseudo-Hatfield, like the canons of the Council of Chelsea, reworked an invocation used in the proceedings of the council of *Clofesho* in 747, and was structured according to a modified version of the diplomatic format of seventh-century Anglo-Saxon synods. It was also the style of the proceedings of papal and ecumenical councils. This use of previous textual traditions asserted that Anglo-Saxon synods belonged to a venerable series of councils stretching back to the Council of Nicaea, and derived authority from them.<sup>3</sup> The creation of a continuous tradition was made necessary by the recent discontinuities of Kentish history.<sup>4</sup> Subject to Mercian overlordship in the course of the eighth century, the church of Canterbury had seen native Kentish royal dynasties removed from power

1. Compare with the range of material concocted by the Le Mans forger in the ninth century, which included not only charters, but also poems and falsifications of hagiography and the episcopal *acta*. On this material, see W. Goffart, *The Le Mans Forgeries: A Chapter from the History of Church Property in the Ninth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1966).

2. Cubitt, *Church Councils*, pp. 205–34.

3. On conciliar diplomatic see *ibid.*, pp. 77–87.

4. For the history of Kent in this period see Brooks, *Early History*, pp. 111–206, and S. Keynes, 'The Control of Kent in the Ninth Century', *Early Medieval Europe*, ii (1993), 111–31.

and found itself subject to Mercian rulers who were unable to maintain an equilibrium with the Church. Moreover, in the course of attempting to throw off Mercian rule, the archive of Christ Church, Canterbury, had been destroyed.<sup>1</sup> Documentary safeguards were needed. But the Canterbury forgeries focus not upon the installation of the new Mercian kings as a force of disruption but rather their failure to respect ancient Kentish traditions. The forgeries attempt to link past and present by creating a past in which the Mercian rulers, represented by Æthelbald, respected and renewed the pronouncements of their native king, Wihtried.

The Pseudo-Hatfield betrays all the signs of Archbishop Wulfred's own hand – his faulty Latin, contaminated spellings, and his reliance upon conciliar authority and ancient indigenous tradition. The exact circumstances which provoked its creation are obscure but the document is yet another clear testimony to the pretensions and genuine vitality of Canterbury in the early ninth century.

*University of York*

CATHERINE CUBITT

## Appendix

### *The Pseudo-Hatfield*

The Pseudo-Hatfield poses special problems for its editor: its numerous errors of latinity and spelling require correction in order to produce an intelligible text. On the other hand, to tidy up the decree in order to produce comprehensibility seriously distorts the original. I have reproduced the manuscript text as closely as possible, including spelling and grammatical errors, to enable the reader to form his or her own judgement of the text. The capitalization and punctuation follow that of the manuscript but abbreviations have been expanded. The few corrections, annotations and lacunae of the manuscript itself are noted in the following paragraph. Discussion of difficult textual problems and suggested emendations of the manuscript have been reserved for the notes which accompany the edition of the decree. I have appended a translation of the text which I hope makes best sense of it; it is, however, in places necessarily speculative owing to the obscurity of the Latin.

The decree is found on folio 112<sup>r</sup> of the *Codex Wintoniensis*, the cartulary of Winchester Cathedral. The cartulary is copied in a number of twelfth-century hands. The rubric and first two lines of the text are copied by Rumble's scribe 'd' (as far as *congregatum*); the rest of the text

1. Brooks, *Early History*, pp. 100, 121.

is the hand of Rumble's scribe 'e'.<sup>1</sup> The tironian note is used in the manuscript for *et* except in the rubric which employs '7'. In line 26, *predecessoribus* has been corrected in the manuscript to *predecessoribus* and, opposite lines 28–9, a marginal note by a fifteenth-century annotator (Rumble's annotator 10) has been added '*Episcoporum ordinatio ad quos spectat et vnctio regum et cetera vt hic*'. The Winchester copyist has left gaps in the subscriptions for the names of all the kings, apart from Aldwulf of East Anglia.

## DE AUCTORITATE DUORUM METROPOLITANUM<sup>2</sup> DOROUERNIA ET EBORIIACA<sup>3</sup> CIUITATIBUS.

10 REGNANTE in perpetuum Deo et domino nostro Iesu Christo qui cęlestia simul et terrestria imperio patris cuncta quę sancti spiritus gratia in ęquitate disponit . atque per eiusdem Dei predestinationem hoc synodus<sup>4</sup> congregatum fuerat in loco celeberrimo ubi nominatur Heðfeld<sup>5</sup> . anno uero dominice incarnationis d . c . lxxx . Indictio<sup>6</sup> . ix . presidente autem Theodoro gratia Dei episcopo episcopo<sup>7</sup> ceterisque episcopis et Dei sacerdotibus per uniuersam Britanniam pariter cum regibus Anglorum Ægfrido regi<sup>8</sup> Humbrontium<sup>9</sup> et Atheldredo regi Marcentium<sup>10</sup> cum consensu

1. Rumble, 'Structure and Reliability', ii. 205–6.

2. I am most grateful to Andy Orchard for his advice on the latinity of this document. *Metropolitanum* from *metropolitanus-i* m., 'a metropolitan bishop', apparently accusative singular for genitive plural *metropolitanorum*, an error which might have arisen either from scribal failure to expand an abbreviation or mistaken use of third declension endings instead of first.

3. *Dorouernia et Eboriaca* are probably ablative adjectives. The curious form, *Eboriaca*, probably results from the displacement of the vowel *i* in the more usual adjective *Eboracius*. In line 24 the spelling *Eboraiaca* may derive from the same sort of error. Note the inconsistencies in the spelling of this adjective.

4. *Synodus*, feminine noun, here construed as neuter in gender, as witness *hoc* and *congregatum*.

5. For the spelling *Heðfeld* see *supra* p. 1238. Literally 'where it is called', a phrase paralleled in ninth-century Canterbury texts (for example, S 90).

6. The ms reads *indictio*, presumably for *indictione*, possibly a failure by a copyist to expand properly *indict-*, a common abbreviation, or perhaps another mistaken declension, first for third this time.

7. Corrected from the manuscript's *epc episcopo*, which is presumably a misunderstanding of the abbreviation *arc* as *epc*. This could have arisen through a misreading of Anglo-Saxon minuscule long *r* as *p*. For similar errors see pp. 1246, n. 7, 1247, nn. 11, 12.

8. *Regi*, dative of *rex*, for the more usual ablative, *rege*; see *supra*, p. 1236.

9. *Humbrontium* is a slightly unusual term for the Northumbrians. It can be paralleled in a number of texts: see P. Hunter Blair, 'The Northumbrians and their Southern Frontier', in his *Anglo-Saxon Northumbria*, ed. M. Lapidge and P. Hunter Blair (Basingstoke, 1984), IV, pp. 98–104. In this instance it is probably taken from the Hatfield proceedings in *HE*, IV. 17 where the form there has medial *s* instead of the *t* of the Pseudo-Hatfield. The change in the Pseudo-Hatfield is probably the result of confusion of the participle ending *-entes* with the ending *-enses*, used to denote origin. Note the inconsistencies with which the toponymic adjective is treated – in line 24 *Nordanhumbroorum* is used and in the subscriptions (line 38), *Humbrensium*.

10. *Marcentium*, again an unusual form but not derived from the Hatfield *acta*. It is only paralleled in S 57, a Worcester charter dated 756 for 777×779. *Marcentium* must be a variant of a more usual word *Mercensium* (with similar confusion of ending as the form *Humbrontium*), which is most commonly found in Worcester charters from the first half of the eighth century (S 102, S 84, S 85, S 1429, S 94, S 99). The subscription of the Mercian king appended to the Pseudo-Hatfield has the more usual form *Merciorum*.

Haldulfi<sup>1</sup> regis Aesteranglorum<sup>2</sup> atque Clotherio regi Cantuariorum<sup>3</sup>. de multis necessitatibus tractantes<sup>4</sup> maxime de statu ecclesiarum Dei. quorum<sup>5</sup> abolitans temporibus in primordia<sup>6</sup> Christianitatis totius Britannie constituta atque firmata noscuntur. quomodo uel qualiter secundum normam rectitudinis his temporibus uel futuris ad seruandum disposuimus cum communi consilio omnium nostrorum regum episcoporum uel etiam totius gentis Anglorum hanc discretionem statuimus atque decreuimus. nostrisque successoribus id ipsum in posterium<sup>7</sup> precipimus huic<sup>8</sup> duobus metropolitans<sup>9</sup> a primitibus<sup>10</sup> locis que sunt uniuerse Britannie capita constituta. Prima<sup>11</sup> ut in Dorouernia ciuitate principali honor archiepiscopi<sup>12</sup> et indumento<sup>13</sup> paleg<sup>14</sup> habeatur. sicut archiepiscopo AVGVSTINO priscis iam temporibus at nunc usque detenta est<sup>15</sup>. a sui iuris ditioni per singula loca. xii. episcopi seu omnis<sup>16</sup> nationes Anglorum et Brittonum in australis<sup>17</sup> partibus usque ad confinia Norðanhumbroorum. Alia<sup>18</sup> uero in Eborica ciuitate fundata<sup>19</sup>

1. Note the discrepancy in the spelling of Aldwulf – *Haldulfi* in the text, and *Aldulf* in the subscriptions.

2. Note *Ae* for *Ea*. Confusion between *æ*, *ae* and *e* can be seen in the spellings *Ægfrido* (line 9) for *Ecgfrith*, and *Aesteranglorum*/*Æstranglorum* (lines 11, 42) for *Estranglorum*. This can be paralleled in ninth-century charters from Kent and Mercia, but these interchanges are also found much later in the Middle Ages. See, for example, S 1434 (BCS 378), *præsentia* and *obnixæque*, and see also Morrish, 'An Examination', p. 74.

3. Hlothere of Kent's name is given in the ablative case when one would expect another genitive after *cum consensu*. The spelling *Clotherius* is unusual: an initial *Cbl-* or *Hl-* is more usual: see O. S. Anderson, *Old English Material in the Leningrad Manuscript of Bede's Ecclesiastical History* (Lund, 1941). This *Cl-* spelling could be an early seventh-century feature: see M. T. Morlet, *Les noms de personne sur le territoire de l'ancienne Gaule du vi<sup>e</sup> au xii<sup>e</sup> siècle* (3 vols., Paris, 1968–85), i. 132–4 (132b, 133b). It is paralleled in spellings in two seventh-century charters (kindly brought to my attention by Susan Kelly), S 9 and S 1245.

4. *Tractantes*, a hanging nominative depending on the preceding ablatives, perhaps going with following the verb *disposuimus*. But constructions in similar texts (discussed *supra*, p. 1236) suggest that it is supposed to agree with the list of those present.

5. *Quorum*, neuter or masculine genitive plural, but which may be intended to agree with the feminine *ecclesia*.

6. *Primordia* apparently from *primordium*, *-i*, neuter; an error of the feminine, singular ablative ending for the neuter ablative singular.

7. *Posterium*, probably a mistake for *posterum* as result of misreading Anglo-Saxon long *r* as *ri* (see *supra*, p. 1245, n. 7, and *infra*, 1247, nn. 11, 12).

8. *Huic* is perhaps a misreading of *hinc*, used here temporally to mean 'henceforth'.

9. *Metra*, with *a* for *o*, see *supra*, pp. 1237–8.

10. *Primitibus* should be amended to *primatibus* 'of first rank'.

11. *Prima* for *primo*? See also *supra*, p. 1237, n. 8.

12. It is unclear with what *principali* should agree. Although grammatically *principalis* agrees with *civitas*, the adjective has probably been wrongly declined (see *infra*, pp. 1246, n. 17, 1247, nn. 8, 10). It probably agrees with either *honor* or with *archiepiscopi*.

13. *Indumento*, ablative or dative singular, probably a mistake since it should agree with the nominative *honor*.

14. The manuscript spelling of *paleg* for *palei*, where *i* and *g* have been interchanged, discussed *supra*, p. 1238.

15. *Detenta est* the feminine ending perhaps to be construed with *honor* if this word was conceived as a feminine noun, perhaps on the model of feminine nouns in *-or* like *arbor*.

16. *Omnis* for *omnes*, nominative singular for nominative plural.

17. *Australis* for *australibus*, another mistake with adjectives of this sort (see *supra*, p. 1246, n. 12, and *infra*, 1247, nn. 8, 10).

18. *Alia* may have been intended to refer to *honor* in line 20 if this was regarded as a feminine noun (see *supra*, p. 1236, n. 3).

19. The main verb here is *fundata*, with *est* understood.

similiterque sui iuris dicioni . xii . episcopi semper in futurum subiugati . et partes aquilones sicut disposuit predecessoribus nostris pater noster Gregorius illi duobus sedibus<sup>1</sup> ad seruandum imperpetuum . Vt ex illis prememoratis ciuitatibus omnis ordo ecclesiastici officii seruat atque inde ministratur tam<sup>2</sup> ordinatio episcoporum uel etiam unctio regum : Quamque canonicas institutiones<sup>3</sup>  
 30 que suis exortacionibus et assiduis sollicitudinibus ad regimen Christianitatis pertineant . Et nunc ergo iterum ad memoriam retracti<sup>4</sup> per domnum apostolicum Agathonem papam ita inrefragabilis et inuiolabilis a nobis nostrique successoribus utrorumque prenominatorum ciuitatum<sup>5</sup> perpetuo stabilitate<sup>6</sup> firmavi<sup>7</sup> . Si quis uero quod non optamus obstinata contumacia his salubris statutis<sup>8</sup> obpugnando contraire temptauerit quisque ille sit sciat cononica<sup>9</sup> subiacere sententia . et a sinodali huius communionem<sup>10</sup> esse damnatum . uel a participatione corporis et sanguinis domini nostri Iesu Christi separatum.

Ego rex Humbrensiū his sinodalibus et canonicis constitutis consentiens subscribo;  
 40 Ego rex Merciorum his sinodalibus et canonicis constitutis consentiens subscribo;  
 Ego Alduulf rex Æstranglorum his sinodalibus et canonicis constitutis consentiens subscribo;  
 Ego rex Cantuariorum his sinodalibus et canonicis constitutis consentiens subscribo;  
 Ego THEODORIVS<sup>11</sup> gratia Dei archiepiscopus Britannie et ciuitatibus<sup>12</sup> Dorouernie consentiens subscribo

### Translation

## CONCERNING THE AUTHORITY OF THE TWO METROPOLITANS IN THE CITIES OF CANTERBURY AND YORK

1. *Duobus sedibus*: note the lack of agreement between the feminine noun and masculine adjective.

2. The construction *tam . . . uel etiam . . . quamque* is somewhat unusual.

3. This lack of agreement in *canonicas institutiones* (where the accusative of the adjective has been given for the nominative) is discussed *supra*, p. 1236.

4. *Retractus*, perhaps the past participle of *retraho*, meaning 'withdrawn'. See the discussion, *supra*, pp. 1220–1.

5. Note the lack of agreement between the masculine adjective and feminine noun *ciuitas* in *utrorumque prenominatorum ciuitatum*. See next note *infra*.

6. Note again lack of agreement between the masculine adjective and feminine noun in *perpetuo stabilitate*. See previous note. It seems unlikely that *perpetuo* should be construed as an adverb.

7. Note the shift from the third person plural to the first person singular in the verb *firmavi*.

8. *Salubris statutis* – another error in the use of a third declension: see *supra*, p. 1246, nn. 12, 17, and *infra*, p. 1247, n. 10.

9. *Cononica* displays *o* for *a* in unstressed syllables. See discussion *supra*, pp. 1237–8 and p. 1246, n. 9.

10. *Sinodali* is probably a mistake for the genitive of a first declension noun. See also *supra*, p. 1246, nn. 12, 17, p. 1247, n. 8.

11. *Theodorus* probably a misreading of Anglo-Saxon long *r* with a ticked up end as *ri* rather than *r*. See also *supra*, pp. 1245, n. 7, and 1246, nn. 7, 11; and note *infra*.

12. The MS reads *ciuitatibus* a possible misunderstanding of the Anglo-Saxon minuscule *tis* ligature (see also *supra*, pp. 1245, n. 7, 1246, n. 7, and 1247, n. 11).



As God reigns for ever with our Lord Jesus Christ, who orders heavenly and earthly things together through the authority of the Father and governs all things in balance by the grace of the Holy Spirit. And through the predestination of the same God this synod had been convened in the very famous place which is called Hatfield, in the year of our Lord's incarnation 680, in the ninth indiction, under the presidency of Theodore, archbishop by the grace of God and with other bishops and priests of God through the whole of Britain together with the kings of the English, Ægfrith King of the Northumbrians, Athelred King of the Mercians, with the consent of Haldwulf King of the East Angles and of Clothere, King of Kent. They discussed many items of business, especially the state of the churches of God whose constitutions and affirmations are known from the ancient times in the beginning of Christianity of the whole of Britain. We have ordered how and in what way [these?] should be served according to the rule of righteousness in these and future times. We have established and decreed this decision with the common counsel of all our kings, bishops and of the whole race of the English, and we command our successors likewise in the future henceforth with respect to the two metropolitans from the foremost places which are the established heads of the whole of Britain. First that the office of the archbishop and the wearing of the pallium is to be kept in the chief city of Canterbury, just as it has been maintained by Archbishop Augustine in ancient times and up to now by its jurisdiction over the individual places: twelve bishops and all the nations of the English and of the Britons in the southern parts as far as the boundaries of the Northumbrians. The other [archiepiscopal office] is established in the city of York with likewise twelve bishops and the northern parts subjugated to its jurisdiction for ever in the future; just as our father Gregory arranged for our predecessors should be served in these two sees for ever, as the whole order of ecclesiastical office is served and ministered thence from these aforementioned cities, not only the ordination of bishops and the anointing of kings but also the canonical institutions which by their exhortations and continual care belong to the realm of Christianity. And now therefore again I have strengthened in perpetual stability the memory of the reserved [judgement] by the apostolic lord Pope Agatho as unbreakable and inviolable by us and our successors of both aforementioned cities. If anyone, which indeed we do not hope, with stubborn contumacy shall have tried, by their opposition, to go against these beneficial decrees, let him know whoever he may be that he is subject to a canonical sentence and damned from the communion of this synod and cut off from participation in the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.

I, King of the Northumbrians, consent and subscribe to these synodal and canonical constitutions

I, King of the Mercians, consent and subscribe to these synodal and canonical constitutions

I, Aldwulf, King of the East Angles, consent and subscribe to these synodal and canonical constitutions

I, King of Kent, consent and subscribe to these synodal and canonical constitutions

I, THEODORE, by the grace of God, Archbishop of Britain and of the city of Canterbury consent and subscribe