(Woodbridge, 1987), pp. 201–18; P. D. A. Harvey, 'The Manorial Reeve in Twelfth-Century England', in *Lordship and Learning. Studies in Memory of Trevor Aston*, ed. R. Evans (Woodbridge, 2004), pp. 125–38; S. Baxter, *The Earls of Mercia: Lordship and Power in late Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, 2007); A. Williams, *Kingship and Government in pre-Conquest England* (Basingstoke and London, 1999).

PAULINE STAFFORD

REGALIA. The origin and development of formal regalia in Anglo-Saxon England is imperfectly understood. We know that by the tenth century a *coronation ritual was in place, and that kings were by that time traditionally designated by certain physical signs – a crown, a sword and its sword-bearer, and by other symbols derived from Carolingian and classical tradition, such as the orb and sceptre, as shown for example in the *Bayeux Tapestry image of *Harold enthroned, bearing these attributes of kingship. No regalia of the period survive, however, and the dependence on external models of Anglo-Saxon *coin and manuscript depictions of royalty always requires circumspect interpretation.

Nevertheless, something of the stages whereby the outward and visible signs of a king were created can be seen in material from a few graves of the sixth and early seventh century – in particular the great Mound I ship burial at *Sutton Hoo. Here, like some other Germanic *dynasties, the upwardly mobile East Anglian rulers adopted certain high-status Roman objects into a local vocabulary of kingship, presumably to legitimise the claim to authority. The helmet, derived from those worn by late Roman officers, signals exceptional status through its rarity, its Germanic iconographic content and, most of all, its Roman form. In continental contexts, it is clear that helmets played a significant part in the development of the royal crown. Other items of the strictly ceremonial *arms and armour, such as the sword and its belt fittings, and of the formal dress, such as the gold buckle, certainly symbolised power and status, as, in a wider sense, did the deliberately selected nature and geographical range of treasure in the burial. But if anything can be regarded as regalia in this grave, it is undoubtedly the unique stone sceptre, which grafts Germanic images onto a native version of the Roman consul's sceptre topped by a victor's wreath. It seems likely that the origins of Anglo-Saxon regalia lie essentially in a late Roman tradition, subsequently augmented by Christian symbolism and by the powerful example of the Carolingian emperors.

P. Schramm, *Herrschaftzeichen und Staatsymbolik I.* (Stuttgart, 1944); R. L. S. Bruce-Mitford, *The Sutton Hoo Ship Burial*, II. *Arms, Armour and Regalia* (London, 1978); D. M. Wilson, *The Bayeux Tapestry* (London, 1985), pp. 182, 226; L. E. Webster, 'Death's Diplomacy: Sutton Hoo in the Light of other Male Princely Burials', in *Sutton Hoo: Fifty Years After*, ed. R. Farrell and C. Neuman de Vegvar, *American Early Medieval Studies* 2 (1992), 75–82; M. Archibald, M. Brown and L. Webster, 'Heirs of Rome: the Shaping of Britain AD 400–900', *The Transformation of the Roman World AD 400–700*, ed. L. E. Webster and M. P. Brown (London, 1997), pp. 209–11, 221–4; W. Filmer-Sankey, 'The "Roman Emperor" in the Sutton Hoo Ship Burial', *JBAA* 148 (1996), 1–9; A. Scharer, 'Objects of Royal Representation in England and the Continent', in *Anglo-Saxon Traces*, ed. J. Roberts and L. Webster (Tempe, AZ, 2011), pp. 31–45.

LESLIE WEBSTER

REGENBALD was one of several known priests who came from Germany to England in the second and third quarters of the eleventh century, and prospered. He originated probably in Lotharingia, and seems sooner or later to have entered into the service of King *Edward the Confessor. By the early 1060s he was designated in royal circles as the king's seal-keeper (*sigillarius*) or chancellor (*cancellarius*); no less significantly, he was granted the status of a bishop (S 1097). As the king's chancellor, Regenbald would have been involved in the processes behind the production of the king's Latin diplomas and vernacular writs, including King Edward's diploma for Earl Harold's church at *Waltham (S 1036, dated 1062), and the diploma which underlies the so-called 'First' and 'Third' charters of Edward for *Westminster Abbey (S 1043 and S 1041, dated 1066 for 28 December 1065). He continued to hold office as the king's chancellor into the first year of the reign of William the Conqueror, and can be seen by the time of the *Domesday survey, in 1086, to have held a number of churches on royal estates. He was by then, in retirement, most closely associated with a church at Cirencester, where he was buried.

ODNB xlvi.364–5; *Atlas*, table LXVIII (priests); S. Keynes, 'Regenbald the Chancellor (*sic*)', *ANS* 10 (1988), 185–222; M. F. Smith, 'The Preferment of Royal Clerks in the Reign of Edward the Confessor', *HSJ* 9 (1997), 159–73; *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum: the Acta of William I (1066–1087)*, ed. D. Bates (Oxford, 1998), esp. pp. 96–7 and 108.

SIMON KEYNES

REGNAL LISTS. Regnal or 'king' lists are lists of the successive kings of a kingdom, often supplying their respective reign-lengths and also very occasionally additional information, such as *genealogies. Though often grouped together with genealogies

(both in medieval manuscripts and by modern scholars), they constitute a separate medium with characteristic features and problems of their own, and should be treated separately. For Anglo-Saxon England, the earliest direct evidence of regnal lists comes from the early eighth century. *Bede appears to have had access to regnal lists for *Northumbria, *Essex and *Kent and (possibly) *Mercia. Furthermore, in a famous passage (*HE* iii.1), he stated that those calculating the reigns of kings agreed to 'expunge the memory' of the apostate successors of *Edwin and to assign that year (633–4) to the reign of *Oswald. Other eighth-century regnal lists include the Northumbrian and Mercian lists in the 'Anglian' collection of genealogies (765×774) and the Northumbrian list in the Moore Memoranda (737). Updated versions of these regnal lists survive from the ninth and tenth centuries. There is also a Kentish regnal list up to Æthelberht II (d. 762) which omits reign-lengths. These early lists pale to some extent when compared with the so-called 'West Saxon Genealogical Regnal List', composed in its present form during the reign of *Alfred, which describes the succession to the kingship of *Wessex from the arrival of *Cerdic and Cynric (dated here AD 494) to the late ninth century. It provides additional information for many of the kings, including genealogical details and some full patrilines. A later continuation of this 'List' survives in three versions: one, extending to *Edward the Martyr, is appended to *ASC* MS B; another, to *Æthelred the Unready, in the 'Textus Roffensis'; and a third version, to *Cnut, in the *Liber Vitae* of the New Minster, *Winchester. This continuation is of historical interest in that in many cases it recounts the specific reign-lengths (including the number of months, weeks and days) from the coronation to death of each king. There are also two versions of a 'tabular abstract' of the West Saxon Regnal List, originating in the reign of *Edgar but now extending to Æthelred the Unready. The New Minster *Liber Vitae* also contains an interesting, but selective, list of kings' sons or *æthelings to the late tenth century.

Although regnal lists may have performed an originally chronological function, their form and content made them perfect means of expressing political claims. Like genealogies (though probably to a lesser extent), they are prone to ideological manipulation and consequently are not necessarily reliable historical accounts of the kingdoms from the fifth and sixth centuries onwards. Indeed, by their very form, regnal lists can simplify political relations and ignore changes in kingship over time, implying continuous lineal succession. The names of kings could be omitted for a variety of reasons – the Bedan example of Edwin's apostate successors being a case in point. Similarly, rulers regarded (retrospectively at least) as usurpers could be omitted, as could periods of external rule and interregnum. All these factors might cause cumulative chronological problems, though, in the case cited by Bede, the relevant year was duly assigned to the next reign. On a larger scale regnal lists were manipulated to project into the past the political circumstances which prevailed at the time of composition. For example, the Northumbrian list in the Moore Memoranda is a confused and difficult document, but seems to be implying that seventh-century Bernician control of Northumbria had also obtained in the sixth. Similarly, the West Saxon 'List' seeks to demonstrate that the ninth-century monarchy of Wessex had existed continuously since Cerdic and Cynric in the fifth century, whereas evidence for the seventh century indicates it had then constituted a confederacy of petty kingdoms under an overlord. Explicit statements of Cerdicing ancestry no doubt reinforced the legitimacy of individual kings; and in fact analysis of the accompanying patriline of *Æthelwulf shows that none of his direct ancestors since Ceawlin (grandson of Cerdic) were included in the 'List' as kings.

D. N. Dumville, 'Kingship, Genealogies and Regnal Lists', in *Early Medieval Kingship*, ed. P. H. Sawyer and I. N. Wood (Leeds, 1977), pp. 72–104; idem, 'The Anglian Collection of Royal Genealogies and Regnal Lists', *ASE* (1976), 23–50; idem, The West-Saxon Genealogical Regnal List: Manuscripts and Texts', *Anglia* 104 (1986), 1–32; idem, 'The West-Saxon Genealogical Regnal List and the Chronology of early Wessex', *Peritia* 4 (1985), 21–66; *The Liber Vitae of the New Minster and Hyde Abbey, Winchester*, ed. S. Keynes, EEMF 26 (Copenhagen, 1996).

DAVID E. THORNTON

REGULARIS CONCORDIA, the customary sanctioned by the Council of *Winchester (*c*.973), constitutes the major document of the Benedictine Reform in England. As indicated by its programmatic title – *Regularis concordia Anglicae nationis monachorum sanctimonialiumque* – it was intended to establish a uniform observance for monks and nuns throughout the country on the basis of the *Regula S. Benedicti* and to consolidate the achievements of the monastic revival. The work was traditionally attributed to *Dunstan, yet there is compelling evidence that this largely derivative compilation was drawn up by *Æthelwold. The text is preserved in two loosely related copies, both of which were most probably produced at Christ Church, *Canterbury, around the middle of the eleventh century: in BL, Cotton Tiberius A.iii, a full