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Preface

We live in exciting times. Fifteen years ago, when I was thinking about Rochester bridge, I needed to get hold of a copy of William Lambard’s *Perambulation of Kent* (1576). There was, back then, no easy way for me to do that. What I did was wait until I had a chance to visit Washington; and there I was able to look at two copies of the book, one in the Library of Congress and the other in the Folger Shakespeare Library. Now, in the space of a minute, I can be reading that book in the comfort of my own home, sipping at a cup of coffee meanwhile, if I feel so inclined. The first edition (two variants), the second edition, the third edition (three variants) – all are instantly available through Early English Books Online. There is nothing special about that particular book: almost every book published in England before 1700 can now be found on EEBO. Moreover, a very large number of books published between 1700 and 1800 – but regrettably not the first edition of Hasted’s *History of Kent* (1778–99) – can be found through Eighteenth Century Collections Online. (But sometimes one has to keep trying: though searching for ‘thorpe’ will not find Thorpe (1769), searching for ‘roffense’ will.)

It is strange to be living in a world turned upside down. All at once, old books have become more accessible than new ones. If I want to look at the ‘Laws of King Edward’, the first printed edition (Lambard 1568) is only a few mouse-clicks away; if I want to see the most recent edition, I have to visit a library which owns a copy of the book – or else buy a copy for myself. This situation is absurd, and cannot possibly be endured for long. But how we are going to escape from it is not so easy to predict.

Month by month, more good things are appearing on the web. I have only just discovered, for example, that images of some selected pages from an important Rochester manuscript (Strood, Medway Archives, DRe/R1) can be found online at ttpadd.bl.uk/tpp_software/silverlight/default.html. (The selection includes five pages from the cartulary, the manuscript I call R1: 119r, 116v–7r, 176v–7r, 220v–1r. Since the contents of these last two pages are printed below (pp. 240–2), anyone who wants to develop some skill in reading twelfth-century script has an easy opportunity to do so.)

Four years ago, I expressed the hope that this book might be finished within a year or two. It has taken much longer than that. There are various excuses that I might think of offering for this delay. They sound vaguely convincing to me; but they will not be of any interest to the reader. At all events, the book is finally finished. Here it is, such as it is.

It is a pleasure for me to be able to renew my thanks to two people in particular, Caroline Thorn and Tessa Webber. Both of them gave me the benefit of their advice while I was working on the previous book (Flight 1996); both of them have helped with this book too, and I appreciate their generosity. Once again, I am grateful to David Davison, but for whom the results of ten years’ work would probably have gone unpublished.

Until almost the last moment, I had been thinking that it might be useful, for readers unacquainted with Kent, if I offered some guidance as to the pronunciation of Kentish place-names, the approved spelling of which is,
quite often, either ambiguous or positively misleading. There are two books which deal with this question (Hardman 1933, Glover 1976), but usage changes, and some of the pronunciations reported by those authors have an antiquated sound to me. (I remember a time when my father called Greenwich ‘grinnidge’, but I, to the best of my recollection, have always called it ‘grennitch’.) However, since I understand that the English Place-Name Society is about to start publishing a series of volumes for Kent, beginning with a new dictionary (Cullen, to appear), I have abandoned that intention.

(Besides, I would not wish to pretend to local knowledge which I do not possess. Though I grew up in Rochester, and got to know some parts of the surrounding landscape fairly well, I have spent no part of my adult life in Kent. Large tracts of the county are as much a foreign country to me as they would be to someone from Yorkshire.)

Though I think I may claim to have worked very hard to ensure that this book is accurate, I do not imagine that it is free from error. Though I think I may claim to have made some significant progress, I do not suppose, and would not want others to suppose, that nothing remains to be done. On the contrary, I would draw the reader’s attention to an item in the index, ‘lost places’, which includes a list of more than twenty places which have disappeared from the map, and which I have not been able to locate with adequate precision. I am sure that there are people who know exactly where some of these places were to be found: if any of those people read this, I hope that they may be willing to share their knowledge with me. To echo what I said in the preface to the previous book, corrections, additions, or comments of any kind would always be gratefully received. The e-mail address which I quoted before is defunct; my current address, which with luck will last as long as I do, is colinflight@gmail.com.

The documents printed here are published by permission of the National Archives of the United Kingdom (pp. 78–85, 97–149), the British Library (pp. 214, 218–22, 223, 236–7), Canterbury Cathedral Archives (pp. 47–54, 55–64, 208–11, 228–31), the Dean and Chapter of Rochester (pp. 65, 222–3, 240–2), Lambeth Palace Library (p. 216), and the John Rylands University Library of the University of Manchester (pp. 289–90). Figure 17 is reproduced by permission of the British Library Board.

Some readers may like to know that the PDF files for this book were made with an application called TeXShop – which is not only free (www.texshop.org) but also so good that I cannot see why anyone would think of using anything else.

Green Point, December 2009
Sigla
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For manuscripts in Canterbury, I quote the ‘RefNo’ strings (which are not case-sensitive but otherwise must be exact) to be used for consulting the online catalogue at www.kentarchives.org.uk.
Survey. Domesday Counties showing Little and Great Domesday areas and circuits. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle states that planning for the survey was conducted in 1085, and the book’s colophon states the survey was completed in 1086. It is not known when exactly Domesday Book was compiled, but the entire copy of Great Domesday appears to have been copied out by one person on parchment (prepared sheepskin), although six scribes seem to have been used for Little Domesday. The survey provided the King with information on potential sources of funds when he needed to raise money. It includes sources of income but not expenses, such as castles, unless they needed to be included to explain discrepancies between pre-and post-Conquest holdings of individuals.