

**FRAGMENTS OF THE MIDDLE ENGLISH PROSE *BRUT* IN THE RAYNHAM  
ARCHIVES**

## FRAGMENTS OF THE MIDDLE ENGLISH PROSE *BRUT* IN THE RAYNHAM ARCHIVES

Among the muniments of the Townshend family of Raynham Hall, near Fakenham, in Norfolk, is a small booklet, dating from the late sixteenth century, containing accounts relating to the manors of East and West Rudham, and other properties in the immediate neighbourhood of Raynham.<sup>1</sup> Whoever constructed the booklet decided that its eighteen paper leaves required some protection, and attached to the exterior a sheet of parchment, consisting of a bifolium that had once formed part of a manuscript which was, by that time, well over a century old. About half the text on the parchment bifolium remains legible, and proves to consist of passages from a well-known Middle English text, the long prose chronicle known as the *Brut*, which, from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century, furnished the standard popular account of the history of Britain. The English text, which exists in several recensions, including many versions containing interpolations and continuations, originated in a translation of an Anglo-Norman original, probably composed in the latter half of the fourteenth century. Upwards of 180 complete or fragmentary copies have been enumerated, making it, after the Wycliffite Bible, the second most commonly surviving vernacular text from the later medieval period.<sup>2</sup> The survival of the Raynham fragments, hitherto unnoticed, implies the former existence of yet another copy of this once ubiquitous chronicle. The outward facing sides of the booklet's parchment cover have been heavily abraded and otherwise damaged, and very little of the text they once bore is now legible. By contrast, the text on the other side of the sheet, facing inwards, is mostly well preserved. What little there is enables us to offer a few tentative comments on the manuscript from which it was detached, and on the version of the prose *Brut* that it represents. Before turning

to the text itself however it may be helpful to describe the booklet as a whole in a little more detail.

The leaves carrying the *Brut* fragments are now almost square in shape, approximately 155 mm. in height and 152 mm. in width, the top edge of the bifolium having been trimmed to size to adapt it as the wrapper for the paper booklet, where the dimensions of the leaves are slightly smaller. To judge by the remaining margin at the foot, the original dimension of the leaves was perhaps in the region of 220–30 × 155–60 mm. Since trimming, the tops of the leaves have sustained further wear and tear, but it appears that most of the original text block on the two legible pages has been preserved. The paper booklet enclosed within consists simply of nine sheets folded once, to form eighteen leaves. A narrow parchment guard bearing no writing (possibly part of the strip cut from the top of the protective cover) is sewn into the gutter of the innermost bifolium. The dates 1588 and 1593 are attached to the rentals inscribed within the booklet, giving a general indication of when it was likely to have been made up and used. As we shall see, the text on the inside of the parchment cover facing inwards to f. 1r of the paper booklet, Fragment A in the discussion below, does not read continuously with Fragment B, in the corresponding place at the back (facing f. 18v of the booklet). As we shall also see, the identities of these two discrete passages from the prose *Brut*, and their relative positions within the text as a whole, provide information that enables us tentatively to infer certain other features of the manuscript from which the parchment cover was taken.

Though now much worn and damaged, the parchment sheet forming the cover of the booklet probably came from a manuscript made up of at least medium quality parchment. The leaf forming the front cover is the better preserved, while that at the back has sustained loss of material and other damage at the top, leading to some loss of text. At the foot of the back cover a crescent-shaped section is missing from the lower (blank) margin of the leaf,

probably a defect in the original manufacture. No pricking or ruling appears to be visible, but the lines of writing are accurately spaced, and the overall shape of the text-block is neatly observed. There are 33 lines visible on both pages, around the standard figure for *Brut* manuscripts in this format; this probably represents the extent of the lineation elsewhere in the original manuscript.

The execution of the handwriting, a fairly pure example of the script known as *anglicana formata*, with little or no influence of the alternative secretary model, suggests that the scribe was probably at work sometime in the first half of the fifteenth century.<sup>3</sup> Minims in *m*, *n* and *u* are written separately, and there is no variation from the standard repertoire of *anglicana* letter forms, including two-compartment *a*, ‘reverse’ *e* (beside the conventional graph, and usually in the final position), 8-shaped *g*, long *r*, sigma-shaped final *-s*, and one of the characteristic elaborated forms of *anglicana w*. The letters *b*, *h* and *k* have more or less sweeping hooks to the ascenders, and *d* has a full loop, flattened on the top. The shaft of *t* rises very little above the cross-bar. Thorn is used frequently, often with a sweeping approach stroke towards the shaft, and yogh appears in place of *y* in some words, but not in place of *gh*. Pauses are variously marked with the *punctus*, *punctus elevatus* and *virgula*. The punctuation marks are generally spaced, but the *punctus elevatus* is usually placed closer to the ends of words. Abbreviations are all of conventional types, and their appearance in the Latin quotation in Fragment A is such as to suggest that the scribe was practised in their use. The word *et* is conventionally abbreviated in the Latin quotation, but *and* is not represented by a special sign in the vernacular text. The *mise-en-page* involves chapters beginning with two-line blue *litterae notabiliores* accompanied by red flourishing in a common style, extending up and down the margins. Chapter headings are written in red, and preceded by blue *capitulum* marks. Similar red and blue *capitulum* marks alternate to mark subdivisions in the body of the chapter, superimposed on double *virgulae* previously written by the scribe.

The Latin quotation in Fragment A is given in red, and some (but not all) proper names are underlined in red.

Since the prose *Brut* fragments at Raynham are not conveniently accessible, diplomatic transcriptions may be usefully offered here:<sup>4</sup>

Fragment A (inside front cover):

. . . deth among þe peple For he þat wende to bery þe deed body with þe same deed body was byried ¶ Thei þat might flee; fleden and leften her londes . houses and tenements . as wele for grete hungre and derth of corne; as for þe horrible mortalite / and pestilence in þe londe . and wenten in to other landes for to saven her lives /and left þe londe al deserte and waast . so þat þer was not left eny man to travayle and tile þe londe / ne eren ne sowen . so þat þe lond was bareyne of Tylliers and of cornes ¶ And þis mysaventure dured xj zeere / and more / þat noman might eren ne sowe .

¶ **How Cadwaladre went out of Eng<lan>d in lital britaigne <Cap<sup>o</sup> . . . ><sup>o</sup>**

Cadwaladre saw þe grete hunger and mortalite and þe land al pouere and faylyng coornes and other vitales / and his *perisshid* / and saw þe moost party of his londe al wasted and voyed of peple; he aparayled hym and his folk þat were left on live and passid oure in to Britaigne <with a little navye> vnto kynge Aleyne þat was his kosyne . whom his fadir had moch loved ¶ And as þei seyled in þe see / he made grete <lamentacion> and al þei þat were with hym saying . **Dedisti nos domine tanquam oues escarum et in gentibus dispersisti nos .** ¶ And þan began Cadwaladre <to> compleyne hym to his folk pitously and seide / Allas seide he to vs wrecches or caytiffes . forwhy . for oure grete synnes / of þe which we wolde

nat amend vs while we had space of repentavnce; is now comen vpon vs þis  
mysaventure / which chasied vs oute of oure reaume and <pro>pir land . ¶ Fro  
and out of which londe; somtyme Romaynes . <Sc>otes . and Saxones ne Danes;  
ne might nat exilen vs . But what availeth it now to vs; þat bifore tyme oft sithes  
haue geten and wonnen many other regeouns and londes; sith it is not þe wyll of  
god þat we abide and dwell in oure awn land ¶ God þat is verrey jugge þat al  
þinges knowes be fore þei be done er made; he sethe þat wold nat seesen of oure  
synnes . and þat oure enmyes myght nat vs ne oure lynage out of oure reaume  
exilene; he wold þat we amend vs of oure fo . . .

Fragment B (inside back cover):

. . . honoured stra<nge . . . . . chirche and bynom of holy> chirche al þe tresour  
þ<. . . . .> t haue þat was grete shame and vilany to hym self / and perille <of>  
his sawle / and þerfore god wold nat þat he shuld rei<gne no> l<onger>e þan iiij  
zere and died and lieth at Wynchestre .

**¶ Of king Edgar þat reigned above the kynges of Scotland and of Walys and  
how he was begyled þorough taking of his w<y>f . Capitulo . ii4<sup>o</sup>.**

And after þis Edwyne reigned Edgar his soone aman þat mich loued god and pees  
/ and holy chirche also . and was a worthy lorde bold and myghty / and  
maynteyned wele þis land in pees . And þis Edgar was lorde and king above al þe  
kynges of Scotland and of Walys / fro þe tyme þat Arthur was goone / and neuere  
was sethen kyng of his Power ¶ And þis Edgar was seynte Edwardes fadir / and  
whan Edgares wyf was deede þat was seynt Edwardes Modir and entered . he herd  
speke of þe fayrnes of Estrilde þat was Orgares doughter a barone of devenshire .

þat was so faire a womman þat al men speken þer of . so at þe last / he callid oone  
 of his knyghtes þat he mich loved and trust vpon and told hym . Go *quod* he to  
 þe noble Barone Orgar of Devenshire and se if his doughter be so fayre as men  
 spekyn of / and if it be sothe; I wyll have hir to my wyf . ¶ This kyng þat men  
 callid Edelwold went forthe his wey and com þere þat þe lady was and whan he  
 sawe her so fayre ; he thought to have her hym self to wyf / and þer of spake to  
 Orgar her fadir / And orgar was an olde man and had no mo children but her oone  
 . and saw þat Edelwold was a faire yonge knyght and worthy and riche and was  
 wele with þe kyng / and þoughte his dowghter shuld be wele maryed / and wele  
 beset vpon hym / and grauntid hym his doughter if þe goode lorde þe kyng wold  
 concent þere to . ¶ Thus Edelwode come aȝen to þe kyng and told hym þat she  
 was fayre enogh vpon to se / but of body she was wonder lothly / þo aunswerd þe  
 kyng and seide þat he toke of hir litill charge . ¶ Sir *quod* Edelwolde þo . she  
 <i>s for sothe her fadres . . .

Of these two fragments of the *Brut*, B is the more readily identifiable. It corresponds, in Brie's edition, to the last few lines of Chapter 111, dealing with the era of Athelstan and his brothers Edmund, Eldred and Edwin, and about the first two thirds of Chapter 112, which narrates an episode in the reign of Edgar, Edwin's son.<sup>5</sup> It will be seen that though the text of Fragment B corresponds in general to the substantive readings in Brie's copy text, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson B. 171, it often (but not always) shares the variants he prints at the foot of the page from Bodleian MS Douce 323 and Dublin, Trinity College, MS 490.

Fragment A is of interest since it represents parts of two chapters that appeared as an early interpolation in the original prose *Brut*. Together known as the Cadwallader episode, they are far from uncommon, being found in 115 manuscripts of the *Brut*, as it survives in its varied forms.<sup>6</sup> These two chapters did not form part of the Anglo-Norman *Brut*, and hence did not feature in the manuscripts reflecting the earliest form of the Middle English translation, printed in Brie's edition. They have however recently been included as an appendix in Matheson's monograph on the *Brut*, and (as C. W. Marx had pointed out) were derived from a narrative near the end of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae*.<sup>7</sup> Of the two early manuscripts of the Cadwallader episode consulted by Matheson, the text of Raynham Fragment A conforms more closely to that of his copy text, Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek MS 98 in scriin., rather than to the selected variants in his collations from New York, Columbia University Library MS Plimpton 262.<sup>8</sup> Neither of these manuscripts however gives separate chapter numbers to the two elements in the interpolated episode. What appears to have been a number for the second chapter, which was appended to the rubricated heading in Fragment A, is not now legible. It seems one cannot be certain as to whether a number was inserted, and on second thoughts erased, or whether it has been lost to damage. It should however be noted that the chapter number in Fragment B (112) conforms with Brie's text, having not, apparently, been thrown out by any renumbering of preceding chapters. It thus remains uncertain how the lost copy of the *Brut* from which the Raynham fragments were taken might have related to the many later *Brut* manuscripts in which the numbering of the two Cadwallader chapters is assimilated to the general sequence.<sup>9</sup>

Whether numbered or not, the two chapters constituting the Cadwallader episode, parts of both of which are present in Fragment A, were usually interpolated between Chapters 101 and 102 in the early chapter sequence of the *Brut*, as refelected in Brie's edition; and Fragment B, as indictated above, preserves parts of Chapters 111 and 112. As we have also



seen, the scribe of the manuscript from which the fragments came probably wrote 33 lines to the page; and a count of the two legible pages extant suggests that he would have averaged around 370 words to each page. At this rate, the quantity of text that would have stood between Fragments A and B would have occupied approximately twelve pages. It is impossible to establish the extent of the quire from which the bifolium bearing the fragments was derived. Were it, however, to have contained four sheets (the commonest size for membrane manuscripts of this character at the time) one might posit that the fragments are written on what was once the outermost bifolium of a quire of eight leaves. If this were the case, Fragment A would have been the back of its first leaf (f. 1v), and Fragment B the front of its last (f. 8r). This is of course but one hypothesis: the Raynham bifolium may alternatively have been the second sheet of a ten-leaf quire, or the third of a twelve. Nonetheless, the re-use of the outermost sheet of a loose quire of eight seems the likeliest codicological scenario to account for the survival of the Raynham fragments, assuming they were removed from a larger body of material, rather than sourced when already in fragmentary form

As is well known, the re-use of fragments of earlier manuscripts written on membrane, for a wide variety of purposes, was widespread during the early modern period. ‘Waste’ parchment or vellum taken from discarded manuscripts was easily obtainable, being in particular demand among professional bookbinders, or others who wished to create protective wrappers or covers for paper documents, as in the present case.<sup>10</sup> However, continuing on the assumption that the Raynham fragments came from a discarded manuscript of the *Brut*, all or parts of which the maker of the booklet had to hand in the latter part of the sixteenth century, it is legitimate to speculate briefly as to whether its original home might have lain that locality. Other copies of the prose *Brut* certainly did survive in the neighbourhood of Raynham into the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Master William Lunnor,

gentleman, of Sharrington (near Holt), in, or not long after 1558, marked his ownership of the copy that is now Free Library of Philadelphia MS Lewis E 238, adding at the same time an angry note about the surrender of Calais to the French, which had occurred on 1 January of that year.<sup>11</sup> A few miles west, at Hunstanton, the extensive manuscript library of Sir Henry Spelman included what seem likely to have been three copies of the *Brut*.<sup>12</sup> It was probably from one of them that he compiled the extracts that now constitute Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Rawlinson C. 155 in 1606.<sup>13</sup>

One obvious possibility, therefore, is that the copy of the *Brut* from which the Raynham fragments were derived had formerly been among the books once owned by the Townshend family themselves. The prose *Brut* is well known to have appealed to English gentry families in the fifteenth century, it and would not be surprising to learn that the household at Raynham harboured a copy.<sup>14</sup> The noted lawyer Sir Roger Townshend (d. 1493), its most prominent member during the relevant period, is known to have been a bookish man, and inventories of the books that he owned have survived.<sup>15</sup> They enumerate over forty volumes, and describe both manuscripts and printed books, including items in all three languages used widely at the time, Latin, French and English.<sup>16</sup> As is to be expected, a fair number of them contain legal texts directly related to the owner's professional concerns, but others consist of religious works of various kinds (sermons, hagiographies, biblical commentaries etc.). At least one chronicle is mentioned, but other entries specify only the appearance of the book, not its contents. Entries for several items are only partially legible, so their contents must likewise remain unknown; and there may of course have been other books in the household at Raynham not mentioned in the inventories.

Another possibility is that the manuscript from which the Raynham fragments came once belonged to a religious house nearby, in which case the obvious candidate would be that of the Augustinian canons of Coxford Priory, whose few remaining ruins today stand about

two and a half miles northwest of Raynham Hall. Other houses of Augustinian canons elsewhere had certainly owned copies of the prose *Brut* in the fifteenth century.<sup>17</sup> Coxford was well-endowed, and links with the successive inhabitants of the manor were close—indeed, during the mid-1440s Sir Roger Townshend’s father John (d. 1466) acted on behalf of the bishop of Norwich as an accountant for the income and expenditure of the priory.<sup>18</sup> Unfortunately, no manuscripts of the kind normally found in monastic libraries have so far been identified as having come from from Coxford.<sup>19</sup> On the other hand, however, subsequent to its dissolution in 1536, several cartularies, together with various other manorial documents did survive.<sup>20</sup> Some or all of the documents may have passed into the possession of Thomas, Duke of Norfolk, when Coxford and its associated properties were granted to him in 1537. The Townshends acquired the Coxford estate in 1578–9 from Edward, Earl of Oxford (to whom it had recently been granted by Elizabeth I, long after, but as a consequence of Norfolk’s attainder in 1548), and they soon seem to have set about collecting evidences pertaining to the properties.<sup>21</sup> The booklet dated 1588×1593 within which the *Brut* fragments are wrapped pertains in part to manors that had formerly belonged to the priory, and other late sixteenth century collections of estate records in the Raynham archives also have similar wrappers made from fragments of much older manuscripts; but these remain to be identified and studied.<sup>22</sup>

RICHARD BEADLE

University of Cambridge, UK

ANTHONY SMITH

University of East Anglia, UK

---

<sup>1</sup> Raynham Archive, RAW Cellar Box 9, cited by kind permission of the Eighth Marquess Townshend, and first noted by one of us (AS) in the course of cataloguing. The present Raynham Hall dates from the seventeenth century; its medieval predecessor stood nearby on a different site, close to East Raynham church; see N. Pevsner and B. Wilson *The Buildings of England. Norfolk 2: North-West and South* (New Haven and London, 1999), 600–09.

<sup>2</sup> F. W. D. Brie (ed.), *The Brut, or The Chronicles of England*, 2 vols, Part I, Early English Text Society, OS 131 (1906), Part II, EETS OS 136 (1908). Recent listings of the manuscripts include A. E. Hartung (ed.), *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English*, VIII, E. D. Kennedy, ‘Chronicles and Other Historical Writing’ (Hamden, Conn., 1989), 2629–37, 2818–33, and L. M. Matheson, *The Prose Brut: The Development of a Middle English Chronicle* (Tempe, AZ, 1998), 67–338, the latter supplemented and corrected by the same author in ‘Contextualizing the Dartmouth *Brut*’, *Digital Philology*, iii (2014), 215–39 (232–36).

<sup>3</sup> The palaeographical terminology used here derives from M. B. Parkes, *English Cursive Book Hands 1250–1500* (Oxford, 1969; repr. with corrections London, 1979, and Aldershot, 2008).

<sup>4</sup> The following conventions are observed: abbreviations are expanded, and shown in italic type; rubricated chapter headings, litterae notabiliores, and the Latin quotation in red are shown in bold type; underlining signifies that a word is underlined in red; ¶ is used to represent MS capitulum signs; a semi-colon is used to represent the MS punctus elevatus (which resembles an inverted semi-colon); illegible passages are shown by suspension marks within angle brackets, < . . >; letters and words that are only partially legible are also shown within angle brackets. Otherwise, the text is transcribed as it stands, except that MS lineation is not followed.

<sup>5</sup> Brie (ed.), *The Brut*, I, 113, line 3, to p. 114, line 4.

---

<sup>6</sup> Texts of the *Brut* that include the Cadwallader episode are identified in Matheson's descriptive enumeration of the manuscripts in *The Prose Brut*, *passim*.

<sup>7</sup> *The Prose Brut*, 57–61; the Cadwallader episode occurs in Book XII Geoffrey's *Historia*, and the interpolator to the *Brut* included the Biblical quotation (Ps. 43:12) which appears in the Raynham fragment. C. W. Marx, 'Middle English Manuscripts of the Brut in the National Library of Wales', *National Library of Wales Journal*, 27 (1991–2), 361–82, also discusses some possible political and ideological reasons for the later inclusion of the Cadwallader episode in the *Brut* (377–80).

<sup>8</sup> Matheson's text of the Cadwallader episode is not lineated. The Raynham fragment corresponds to line 9 from the foot of p. 58 (beginning with 'deth among . . .') to lines 13–14 from the foot of p. 59 (ending with 'of oure fo . . .').

<sup>9</sup> See Matheson, *The Prose Brut*, 58. Marx, 'Middle English Manuscripts of the Brut', 378–9, describes how the scribes of some *Brut* manuscripts dealt with the numbering of the interpolated chapters.

<sup>10</sup> A full and well-illustrated account of the phenomenon is given by Nicholas Pickwoad, 'The Use of Fragments of Medieval Manuscripts in the Construction and Covering of Bindings on Printed Books', in L. L. Brownrigg and M. M. Smith (eds), *Interpreting and Collecting Fragments of Medieval Books* (London, 2000), 1–20; he identifies the second half of the sixteenth century as 'a time when the consumption of medieval manuscript waste by English binders was at an all-time high' (3).

<sup>11</sup> Philadelphia PA, Free Library of Philadelphia, MS Lewis E 238, back flyleaf ii recto. Lumnor appears to have died in 1593, to judge by his probate inventory of that date (Norwich, Norfolk Record Office, DN/INV/10/283); Matheson, *The Prose Brut*, p. 89, erroneously gives his surname as 'Vmnor'.

---

<sup>12</sup> The various listings of Spelman's manuscript collections (including one in his own hand) remain to be studied in detail; we are indebted to Professor Ralph Hanna for information about them. In the printed sale catalogue *Bibliotheca selectissima: being the library of the late Sir Edmund King . . . Also the library of . . . Sir H[enry] S[pelman]* (London: John Harding, 1707) there were three items among the folios which may have been copies of the *Brut*: 29 'History of *England*, from *Brute* to the End of the reign of *Henry V*'; 63 'History of England, from its first Original, to the end of the Reign of King Henry III'; and 93 'English chronicle, from Brute to Henry V'. Humphrey Wanley inspected Spelman's collection before the sale, and made notes giving further details about these and other manuscripts; see London, British Library, MS Harley 7055, ff. 232, 234–5.

<sup>13</sup> Matheson, *The Prose Brut*, 82–3. Matheson did not note the possible existence of Spelman's older copies of the *Brut*, as detailed in the preceding note, in his list of unlocated manuscripts of the work (xxxii–xxxiii).

<sup>14</sup> Some of the evidence for gentry ownership of prose *Brut* manuscripts is set out in R. Radulescu, *The Gentry Context for Malory's Morte Darthur* (Cambridge, 2003), 54–60, and more will be found, *passim*, in some of the essays published in two more recent collections on the text: W. Marx and R. Radulescu, *Readers and Writers of the Prose Brut*, *Trivium* 36 (Lampeter, 2006), and J. Rajsic *et al.*, *The Prose Brut and other Late Medieval Chronicles* (Woodbridge, 2016). For the Townshends in this period, see C. E. Moreton, *The Townshends and their World: Gentry, Law, and Land in Norfolk c. 1450–1551* (Oxford, 1992)

<sup>15</sup> C. E. Moreton, 'The "Library" of a Late Fifteenth-Century Lawyer', *The Library*, 6th Ser., xiii (1991), 338–46.

<sup>16</sup> Two lists of Townshend's collection of books are in fact known: Norwich, Norfolk Record Office, MS1503, I D2 (dating from 1494/5, just after his death) and another compiled somewhat later by his son and heir, Roger II (d. 1551), London, British Library Additional

---

MS 41139. The latter mentions fewer books than the earlier list, but includes five volumes that are not on it (Moreton, 339).

<sup>17</sup> For example those of St Mary de Pre, Leicester (London, British Library MS 7333), and St Bartholomew, Smithfield, London (BL MS Royal 17D.xxi); Matheson, *The Prose Brut*, 109–10, 269. The latter copy was made at the priory.

<sup>18</sup> William Page (ed.), *VCH: A History of the County of Norfolk*, II, (London, 1906), 378–80. The priory was in fact founded, in the late twelfth century, in St Mary's church East Rudham, adjacent to the Raynham estate, before being moved to its present site nearby in the early thirteenth. For John Townshend's association with Coxford see Moreton, *The Townshends and their World*, 8–9.

<sup>19</sup> No Coxford books are listed in N. R. Ker (ed.), *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books*, 2nd. ed. (London, 1964), or its *Supplement*, ed. A. G. Watson (London, 1987).

<sup>20</sup> G. R. C. Davis (ed.), rev. by C. Breay et al., *Medieval Cartularies of Great Britain and Ireland* (London 2010), #280–283.1.

<sup>21</sup> Raynham Archive, RL 37/1, for example, includes an East and West Rudham and Houghton (formerly Coxford Priory) estate rental and memoranda book dating from the 1590s (endorsed as being the 'Roughebook' of John Goodwynne, gentleman); its cover consists of coloured pages from a fifteenth century service book, with musical notation.

<sup>22</sup> For example, there are two items of this kind in Raynham Archive RL 47/1. One is a manorial court book for some of the Coxford Priory manors (mainly 26–29 Henry VIII), including the first courts of the Duke of Norfolk in 1537–38, which is bound with some pages of an earlier liturgical manuscript. The other is a volume of late fifteenth century rentals, apparently including some Coxford properties, bound in a re-used sheet from an older Latin manuscript, possibly a biblical commentary.