Editors tend to be influenced by one another, and often simply follow the readings offered by their immediate predecessor. As far as the Peterborough Chronicle under the year 1137 is concerned, editors can be categorized into two groups; Emerson (1960), Plummer (1965), Mossé (1968), and Miyabe (1974) form one group in favour of the reading *urythen to $\delta$[at],* and, on the other hand, Dickins & Wilson (1954), Clark (1958), Bennett & Smithers (1982), Burnley (1992), and Burrow & Turnville-Petre (1992) support the reading *urythen it $\delta$[at].* The latter reading simply appears in the later texts without explanation. It seems that the shift of the reading from the former to the latter came with Cecily Clark’s thorough edition and that everybody else has followed her. Of course, it is possible that they simply looked at the original MS and decided that the reading was the latter.

In this article I shall make a paleographic and linguistic approach to this problem. According to Clark (1958, xiii), the last section, 1132 to 1154, is in a hand completely different from the preceding one. So, in order to gain additional information about it, we have every reason to look at and compare the Chronicle entries for both 1137 and 1140, which happen to be available to us in a photographic facsimile.
THE PETERBOROUGH CHRONICLE, 1137
(Bodleian Laud Misc, 636, f. 84v)
... hæued, and uurythen it ðat it gæde to ðe hærnæs. Hi diden heom in quarterne ðar nadres and snakes and pades wæron inne, and drapen heom swa. Sume hi diden in crucethur, ðat is, in an ceste ðat was scort and nareu and undeþ; and dide scærpe stanes ðerinne, and ðrengde ðe man ðærinnne ðat hi bræcon alle ðe limes. In mani of ðe castles wæron lof and grin: ðat wæron rachenteges ðat twa ðeðer thre men hadden onoh to bærøn onne. ðat was sua maced ðat is fæstned to an beon, and diden an scærþ irøn abuton ða þannes throte and his hals, ðat he ne myhte nowiderwardes, ne sitten ne lien ne slepen, oc bærøn al ðat irøn. Mani ðusen hi drapen mid hungær. I ne can ne I ne mai tellen alle ðe wunder ne alle ðe pines ðat hi diden wrecce men on ðis land; and ðat lastede ða xix wintre wile Stephne was king, and ðæure it was uuerse and uuerse. Hi læiden gæeldes on the tunes æure umwile, and clepeden it ‘tenserie’. ða ðe uurecce men ne hadden nammore to gyuen, ða ræueden hi and brendon alle the tunes, ðat wel ðu myhtes faren al a dæis fare, sculdest thu neure vinden man in tune sittende, ne land tiled. ða was corn dære, and flec and caese and butere, for nan ne wæs o ðe land. Wrecce men sturuen of hungær. Sume ieden on ælmes ðe waren sum wile rice men; sume flugen ut of lande. Wes næure gæt mare wrecce hed on land, ne næure hethen men were ne diðen ðan hi diðen. For kÆrsithon ne forbaren hi nouðer circe ne cyrceæerð, oc namen al ðe god ðat ðarinne was, and brenden sythyn ðe cyrce and al tegæedere. Ne hi ne forbaren bispoces land ne abbotes ne preostes, ac ræueden munekes and clerkes, and æuric man other ðe ouermyhte. Gif twa men ðeðer iii coman ridend to an tun, al ðe tunscipe flugæn for heom, wenden ðat hi wæron ræueres. ðe bispoces and lered men heom cursedæ æure, oc was heom naht ðarof, for hi uueron al forcurseed and forsuoren and forloren. War sæ me tilede, ðe erthe ne bar nan corn, for ðe land was al fordon mid suilce dædes, and hi sæden openlice ðat Crist slep, and his halechen. Suilc, and mare ðanne we cunnen sæn, we ðoleden xix wintre for ure sinnes.

(Transcription in modern type by Burnley 1992)
On Jun greip role he king stepp tacen Boclere coel of glou-
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THE PETERBOROUGH CHRONICLE, 1140

(Bodleian Laud Misc. 626 f. 90v)
MCXL On ðis gær wolde ðe king Stephne tæcen Rodbert eorl of gloucestre ðe kinges sune Henries. ac he ne myyte for he wart it war. Per eftir in ðe lengeth ðestrede ðe sunne 7 te dæl abuton non tid daeies. ða men eten. ðat me lihtede candles to æten bi. 7 ðat was 5 xiii kalend April, wærôn men suythe owundred. Per eftir fordseorde Willelm ærcebiscop of Cantwarberi. 7 te king makede Teodbalæ ærcebiscop ðe was abbot in the ðec. Per eftir wæx suythe micel uuerre betuyx ðe king 7 Randolf eorl of casestre noht for ði ðat he ne iaf him al ðat he cuthe axen him. also he dide alle othre. oc æfre ðe mare 10 he iaf heom, ðe wærse hi wærôn him. ðe eorl heold lincol agenes ðe king. 7 benam him al ðat he ahte to hauen. 7 te king for ðider 7 besætte him 7 his brother Willelm de Romare in ðe castel. 7 ðe æorl stæl ut 7 ferde eftir Rodbert eorl of gloucestre. 7 brohte him ðider mid micel ferd. 7 fuhten suythe on Candelmasse dæi agenes 15 heore lauerd. 7 namen him for his men him suyken 7 flugæn. 7 læd him to Bristowe 7 diden ðar in prisun 7 feteres. ða was al engleland styred mar ðan ær was. 7 al yuel wæs in lande. Per eftir com ðe kinges dohter henries ðe hefde emperice in alamanie 7 nu wæs cuntesse in Angou. 7 com to lundene 7 te lundenisse folc hire wolde tæcen. 20 7 sceæ fleh forles ðar micel. Per eftir ðe bispoc of Wincestre henri ðe kinges brother Stephnes spac wid Rodbert eorl 7 wid ðepermerice 7 suor heom athas ðat he neure ma mid te king his brother wolde hal den. 7 cursede alle ðe men ðe mid him heoldon. 7 sæde heom ðat he uuol de iuen heom up Wincestte. 7 dide heom cumen ðider. ða hi ðær inne wærern. ða com ðe kinges cuen mid al hire strengthe. 7 besæt heom, ðat ðer wæs inne micel hungær. ða he ne leng ne muhten ðolen ða stali hi ut 7 flugen. 7 hi wurthen war wid uten 7 folcheden heom. 7 namen Rodbert eorl of gloucestre. 7 ledden him to Roue cestre. 7 diden him ðare in prisun. 7 te emperice fleh into an minstre. (Leaflets on Historical Linguistics, p.15)
II

First and foremost, let us look closely at MS 1. The word which we are concerned with is the fourth word on the first line. (All examples of 'it' and 'to' are marked in both MS 1 and MS 2 and written down in the margin of each page to facilitate detailed comparison.) We can see why it might read 'to' instead of 'it', since there do seem to be marks which might suggest the roundness of an 'o'. But, if we compare it with the three other examples of 'it' (11.1, 12 & 13) and contrast it with the very firm 'o's in the examples of 'to' (11.1, 6, 7, 13, 25), we have to agree with Clark that it is an 'it'. The same is true for all examples of 'it' and 'to' in MS 2.

There is, in addition, a serious and linguistic difficulty with the reading 'to'. The expression to that, meaning 'until', is not recorded by the OED before 1460 — a full three hundred years later than the passage in the Chronicle. (See OEDs.v. To, prep., conj., adv., Clb.) This does not of course make the reading impossible (the form 'til that' is found in Havelok), but makes it much less likely.

Note:
1. See my article 'CRUCETHUR: IS IT STILL A MYSTERIOUS WORD' (Humanities, Bulletin of Faculty of Education, Nagasaki University, 1995, pp.71-76)
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