THE IMMEDIATE SOURCES OF THE EXCHEQUER DOMESDAY

By R. WELLDON FINN, M.A.

NO one who collates even a substantial portion of the Exchequer Domesday for the south-western counties with the Exeter Domesday would ever doubt that the former was derived either from the latter, or from something closely resembling it. But this view has not been universally held. Round, I think with good cause, avoided the problem altogether.[1] Eyton thought that the Exchequer clerks never saw the Exeter text.[2] Dr. Salzmann has also claimed that " a careful examination of the two Domesdays shows no trace . . . of influence of the Exeter Book upon the scribe who drew up the Exchequer abstract . . . and proves them to be independent compilations ".[3] Reichel maintained that the Exeter and Exchequer Domesdays were entirely independent compilations, but that " parts of the Exeter Book were taken from the Exchequer Book ".[4]

Neither of the last two commentators made any attempt to combat the impressive and detailed evidence in favour of the Exchequer Domesday having been constructed from something very like the Exeter Domesday, produced by Baring, and accepted by Whale.[5] The views of Baring have been endorsed, and additional evidence in support of them cited, in recent articles by Professor Galbraith and Mr. Sawyer.[6] To repeat or summarize Baring's arguments is totally unnecessary; they include the

[1] J. H. Round, *Feudal England*, p. 146, n. 265.

[2] R. W. Eyton, *Domesday Studies : Somerset*, p. 5.

[3] *V.C.H. : Cornwall*, Part 8, p. 46.

[4] *V.C.H. : Devonshire*, pp. 377-9.

[5] F. H. Baring, " The Exeter Domesday ", *Eng. Hist. Rev.* xxvii, 309; T.W. Whale, " Analysis of the Devonshire Domesday ", *Trans. Dev. Assn.*, vol. xxviii; ' History of the Exon Domesday " (ibid. xxxvii, 266); " Principles of the Somerset Domesday ", *Proc. Bath Nat. Hist. and Ant. Field Club*, x. 13.

[6] V. H. Galbraith, " The Making of Domesday Book ", *Eng. Hist. Rev.* lvii. 161; P. H. Sawyer, " The ' Original Returns ' and ' Domesday Book ' ", ibid. lxx. 178.

failure of the Exchequer clerks to supply information absent from the Exeter Domesday, their exact reproduction of significant phrases and words (e.g. iiii virgates instead of the more usual one hide), the order of entries in both texts, the unnecessary repetition of duplicated material, and the copying of obvious errors. It is difficult to find an Exchequer entry which gives the smallest suggestion of having been derived from a source which was not ultimately the Exeter text, and in his article Baring provided cogent explanations of the few divergencies which are not obvious errors mentioned by earlier commentators. A scrupulous collation of the two versions continually suggests that the Exchequer clerks had nothing to aid them in their task of compressing, contracting, and rearranging Inquest material except a source of information which was either the surviving Exeter Domesday or a close approximation thereto. For they failed altogether to supplement the deficiencies of the Exeter Domesday, and they never give the smallest suggestion that they had at their disposal any other product of the Domesday Inquest.

But there are indeed a few entries, the Exchequer version of which contains information which is not recorded in the surviving Exeter text. The inference must be either that the Exchequer clerks had at their disposal documents supplementary to the Exeter Domesday (which on the evidence given by Baring seems improbable), or that they were using a copy of the Exeter Domesday which on occasion included improvements on the text we possess, but which also may not have contained certain late additions to the surviving Exeter version.

As early as 1884 the Palaeographical Society suggested that a copy must have been made of the Exeter Domesday. The note to its reproductions of portions thereof points out that occasional phrases are in a handwriting totally unlike anything else found therein, and that since they include *usque hoc scripsit R.*, *hoc scripsit Ricardus*, " it is evident that they cannot refer to the compilation of the present MS., but are probably the memoranda of persons engaged on a fair copy." [1] The fairly frequent appearance of the words *consummatum est* might also indicate the stage a

[1] 2nd ser., vol. ii, part i, II, plates 70, 71. The above phrases are on fols. 414, 316.

copying of the original had reached, rather than that of the checking of the text which, on the evidence of the corrections, interlineations, *marginalia*, postscripts, and underscoring of obvious errors, clearly took place.[1] *Consummatum est* is usually in rough capitals at the foot of a page, and does not look to me as if it was inscribed by any of the clerks who wrote the text of the Exeter Domesday.

Thirty years after Baring's article appeared, Professor Galbraith advanced the hypothesis that what we inconveniently style " Little Domesday ", the record of Essex, Suffolk, and Norfolk, might be a revised copy of a document parallel to the Exeter Domesday, an improved transcript made in the provinces and sent to Winchester, which, for some reason, was never converted into an Exchequer Domesday for these counties.[2] Why the work of rearrangement and contraction was never done we can only guess ; perhaps before it had begun King William I was dead, and the inspiration of the Inquest and its products had lapsed.[3]

Only the account of twelve Dorset fiefs survives in the *Liber Exoniensis*. But within the appropriate Exchequer folios are two pieces of information which are not given in the Exeter Domesday. Long Bredy is said to have land for nine teams ; the Exeter text does not say how many teams can plough this land.[4] But this in no way proves that the manuscript used by the Exchequer clerk

[1] These words appear on fols. 209b (209 is blank), and 490 (which ends the Devonshire material) ; and at the end of Somerset fiefs on fols. 155, 370b (370 blank), 387b (386b-7 blank), 449b, 451b (451 blank), 474b (474 blank), 476b, and 494b, which completes the Exeter Domesday proper. All, except 155, are the final folios of booklets. In the margin of 316 is the word *probatio*.

[2] Op. cit. p. 165. See p. 64 below.

[3] Additional suggestions of this are possibly afforded by the fact that the Exchequer version is obviously incomplete—the Dorset record ends in the middle of an entry—and that while it contains numerous marginal memoranda made with a view to the blanks being filled in, practically none of these was. The theory that, when the Winchester authorities saw what a bulky volume these counties made, they ordered the compression of the remainder in the form of the Exchequer text, is surely untenable.

[4] *Langebride* (78ai), *Langebridia* (37b). References to the text of the Exchequer Domesday are distinguished from those to the Exeter or to " Little " Domesday, where the distinction is not obvious, by the inclusion of 1 or 2 to indicate the column in which they appear.

contained this statement. On numerous occasions it seems as if the Exchequer clerks were of the opinion that there should be a team for each ploughland (and by implication, therefore, a ploughland for each team). Over and over again they write *terra est i caruca, et ibi est.* Not infrequently they record that there is land for so many teams, but that there are in fact more teams than ploughlands.[1] They may, indeed, noticing that there were nine teams at Long Bredy, and though their source, as fol. 37b does not, perhaps did not give the number of ploughlands, have argued that there should so be nine ploughlands, and wrote down that there were this number there rather than note marginally that this piece of information must be sought out.[2]

But the second case they could not have deduced. At Spettisbury pasture is twice mentioned, and the second instance of it is said to be *in alio loco.* The Exchequer version says also that this is *super aquam*—a statement unrecorded in the Exeter Domesday.[3]

The Cornish Domesdays provide rather more examples of discrepancies between the two texts. The Exchequer version records a team not mentioned in the Exeter text, and the phrase *ibi est i car.* is hardly likely to have been inserted in error, for seven ploughlands are mentioned.[4] It also (on the second occasion as an interlineation) tells us, which the Exeter text does not, that two manors never gelded.[5] Twice the Exchequer version has *silva minuta* where the Exeter Domesday has *nemus*; the latter's term for coppice or underwood is *nemusculus.*[6] It is

[1] E.g. *Terra est dimid car. In dominio tamen est i car.* (*Colforde*, 93b2); *Terra est dim. car. Hanc habet ibi i villanus* (*Strengestone*, 97a2).

[2] Perhaps the best example of marginal *memoranda* is that against *Tingdene* (220ai), where there is in the margin, in red (suggesting it is late work), *rq. hid. num.*, and between the xx and the vii is a gap, suggesting that the vii was added later. Incidentally, the figure could have been obtained by adding up the details given later in the entry. At *Otritone* (104a2), *r car.* is written in the margin against what must have been a blank for the teams or ploughlands. See also 247ai.

[3] *Spehtesberie* (82ai), *Speftesberia* (47b).

[4] *Lannachebran* (121a2, 205b).

[5] *Heglosenuder* (121ai), *Hecglosenuda* (203); *Langoroch* (121a2), *Langorroc* (206).

[6] *Torleberg* (124ai), *Tirlebera* (233b); *Forchetestane* (125a2), *Forchetestana* (334b). Exchequer and Exeter place-name forms often differ widely—see P. H. Sawyer, " The Place-Names of the Domesday Manuscripts ", BULLETIN OF THE

unlikely that this is due to miscopying by the Exchequer clerk ; it seems far more probable that the " Exeter " text at his disposal had been corrected.

The Exeter version says that *Polhal* was held T.R.E. by " Win ", which in the Exchequer text becomes Vluuin.[1] We have three explanations from which to choose : either " Win " was correct, and the Exchequer clerk, unfamiliar with the name but used to that of " Ulwin ", made an unnecessary correction of it, or he knew " Win " must be wrong, and changed it, or the original of the manuscript he was using had been altered.[2] Wulfwine, as a name, is of frequent occurrence. Exchequer clerks occasionally made unfortunate improvements ; e.g. one turned *Incrintona*, which is the modern Ilkerton, into *in Crintone*, postulating a holding " in "the non-existent Crinton.[3] The " Juhell " of the cross-heading on 334b is " Judhel de Totenais " in that of 125a2, but the Exchequer clerk may have been familiar with the influential Breton's style and title. But either he knew that the " Bluhid Brito " who was holding *Treuithel* of Robert of Mortain was the " Blohin " who in the Exchequer Domesday holds this manor, and four other manors in both Exeter (where he is usually " Blohin ") and Exchequer Domesdays, and with whose holdings he brigades that of " Bluhid Brito ", or there was an intermediate text from which he derived the information.[4]

The Exchequer Domesday for Somerset, in its account of Taunton, says *de moneta l solidis*. No mint is mentioned within the long passage about borough and manor in the Exeter version, and the probability is that the clerk found the information in a corrected copy he was using, and not in some extraneous source.[5] In the account of the sub-tenancy at Crewkerne, the Exchequer

JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, vol. 38, no. 2—but it has been considered unnecessary here always to give both forms. No adequate suggestion has yet been made as to how the Exchequer conversion of name-forms was effected.

[1] 124b2, 261b.

[2] " Win " (Wine ?) does not appear as a proper name elsewhere in Domesday Book, except on fols. 231b, 123a2 (*Clunewic*), though a name such as Winegodus does (*Bodeslega*, 164).

[3] 402, 110bi. The *Clintona* of the *Inq. Com. Cant.* (97b) is *Ichelintone* in Domesday Book (198ai) ; this is the modern Ickleton.

[4] 125ai ; 258b, 263.

[5] 87bi, 173b-5b.

text includes a *servus* who is not recorded in the Exeter version.[1] The value of one of the Chinnock manors is given in the Exeter text as £12 for both relevant dates; the Exchequer clerk gives this sum for the value in 1086, but a hundred shillings for the earlier value (*Cinioc;* 274, 92bi.)

A further suggestion that the Exeter Domesday was copied is possibly contained in the Woodspring entry. This states that 4 hides 3 virgates are in demesne, but does not mention any demesne teams. The Exchequer clerk wrote *in dominio*, but then left a blank. Was the information missing in his copy of the Exeter Domesday, or, since he rarely records the hidage of the demesne, did he hope elsewhere to discover the number of demesne teams?[2]

In the Exeter Domesday, Pitney is described in the penultimate entry under *Terra Regis*, followed by a separate entry for an anonymous *i mansio*. The Exchequer clerk combined these into a single entry for Pitney. Whether he was altogether wrong to do so, or whether his source or some auxiliary document told him that the second manor was also called Pitney (it is quite possible that it *was* a Pitney manor), we cannot tell.[3] The Exeter text does not say that the four demesne teams at Shapwick were " elsewhere " (*alibi*), though it does make it clear that the twelve teams of the *villani* were on the *terra ad xx carrucas* which had never gelded. All the Exeter text says of the second of Roger of Courseulles's sub-tenancies in the manor of Doulting is *inde tenet*; both versions agree that the first was at Charlton, but the Exchequer clerk either knew or deduced that the pair were *in Cerletone et alibi*, which the surviving Exeter text would not have told him.[4]

About a number of words and phrases which appear in the Exchequer text but are not to be found in the Exeter Domesday there may well remain an element of doubt. They might, but with no great justification, be considered to be evidence of the availability to the Exchequer clerks of a source of information which was not the Exeter Domesday or a copy thereof, but with greater reason to be derived from improvements in this copy, or

[1] *Cruche*, 91a2, 197.
[2] *Worsprinca*; 369b, 96b2.
[3] 116, 116b; 87a2.
[4] 90ai, 161b; 90bi, 167b.

appearing as a result of conversion, by copyist or Exchequer clerk, of an implication into a different mode of expression. For example, it is said of Frome that Rainbald *ibi est presbyter*, a phrase which does not appear in the Exeter text, though he is mentioned as holding the church of St. John's, Frome, both before and after the Conquest. Two tenants are said to hold two manors added to the manor of Taunton, *per concessione regis W.*, which again is not in the Exeter Domesday, and nor is the statement that they hold them from the Bishop of Winchester.[1] Again, four manors which had been Glastonbury Abbey thegnland and which the Bishop of Coutances now holds are said to be worth *c solidos et amplius*. In the Exeter Domesday these are also separately described in four distinct entries, and the total values amount to £11 10*s*. 0*d*. ; of the pair whose values are given in the entry corresponding to the above, the value is given as 90*s*.[2]

Obviously it is impossible to determine, when Exeter and Exchequer versions differ, whether the Exchequer clerk was at fault, or the copy he was using had been altered, purposely or accidentally, when the surviving Exeter text was copied. On the whole the character and volume of the differences suggest that most cases of discrepancy are due to mistakes by an Exchequer clerk, and, unless the guilt is that of the copyists of the Exeter Domesday, the Exchequer writers certainly show a large number of omissions.[3] As regards changes, Alnod becomes Alwold, and Alward, Alwald, for example.[4] The Exchequer writer styles Glastonbury, *villa*—a term not applied to it by the Exeter clerk, but this may have been no more than the employment of a commonplace term. The Devonshire sheriff is simply Baldwin on fol. 315, *Balduinus de Execestre* on 93ai, but presumably an Exchequer clerk would be familiar with this description of him.

[1] 86bi, 90b ; 87bi, 175.

[2] 91ai, 172. There is discrepancy in the accounts in the Glastonbury and Coutances fiefs ; e.g. Stratton is said to be worth 40*s*. on 172b, £4 on 146, but Hescumbe 50*s*. on both 172b and 136b.

[3] In the Exchequer Domesday for Somerset there are over 120 statistical differences with the Exeter text, and almost one hundred cases of omission of material which it was no part of the set plan should be ignored. A complete list is to be given in vol. v. of the *Domesday Geography of England* (C.U.P.)

[4] *Liteltone* ; 89ai, 149 ; *Sewelle* ; 92ai, 268.

Instances of divergencies between the two versions drawn from the concluding folios of an Exchequer text need to be considered with reserve, for it is plain that the clerk or clerks became less scrupulous and detailed towards the end of the account of a shire. Thus, when we find three teams recorded for the three ploughlands of *Newetone* in the Exchequer text, but no demesne team and only two tenants' teams in the Exeter record, it may be unsafe to presume that a demesne team appeared in a corrected Exeter copy.[1] The Exchequer clerk may have decided that there must have been one demesne team, to make three for the three teamlands. The change from Goric to Godric could well be intelligent deduction, not a correction in the copy.[2]

To the manor of Wellington had been added a hide which, according to the Exchequer text, had been held *pro manerio*. The Exeter Domesday merely says that it had been held *pariter*. Now collation of the very large number of entries appropriate, including those of *Terrae Occupatae*, strongly suggests that to an Inquest clerk *pro manerio*, *pariter*, and *libere* were virtually interchangeable terms.[3] The Exchequer clerks, "revelling in synonym and paraphrase", may merely, on many occasions where their text and that of the Exeter version diverge, have changed the vocabulary while preserving the implication—and it may be that they felt free to add an occasional phrase, such as has been indicated above, provided the sense and meaning were not impaired. It is extremely obvious that the inclusion of such terms, and varying phrases regarding a man's freedom or reverse to "go with his land to what lordship he would" were derived from an aspect of the Inquest which was of major importance in the execution of its intentions.

The Devonshire texts are perhaps less revealing. But the case of the figures for Sidbury is a puzzling one. The Exchequer text gives it 5 hides, not 3 as in the Exeter version, 30 ploughlands

[1] 98b2, 478. There is a parallel case at *Mideltone* on 98b2, 479.

[2] *Tatewiche*; 99a2, 465.

[3] E.g. Belluton; 87a2 *pro uno manerio*, 114, *libere*: or Staunton in Minehead (95b2, 359b), or Tickenham (96bi, 438b). But, especially where the Exeter text says that two estates are now held as one manor (e.g. Badgworth, 95ai, 351, or Horsington, 96b2, 386), the Exchequer clerk could deduce that they had been held *pro ii maneriis*.

against 20, 25 tenants' teams against 18. The figure 18 is written over an erasure. Frequently though the Exchequer clerks made mistakes in their statistics, we can hardly visualize three of this character in a single entry. *T.R.E.* there had been two holdings, and it may be that the Exeter text gives us the figures for one of them only. Since the figures for classes of population and appurtenances are identical, whence did the Exchequer clerk derive his information?—from a corrected copy or from extraneous material? [1]

Another puzzle is that of a Buckland entry. The Exeter Domesday mentions that a slave dwells (*manet*) on the ferling which is not in demesne, but the Exchequer clerk records a second slave and also a villein. This certainly suggests either adequate editing of a copy of the Exchequer Domesday or independent material.[2]

But most of the relevant material of the Devonshire Domesday leaves us in doubt whether the Exchequer clerks derived certain material from additions to a copy of the Exeter text, or included words and phrases which, though not before them, they felt should be supplied. Colaton Raleigh in the Exeter version is said to have *xl agros et xvi agros prati.* The Exchequer clerk did not combine these as 56 acres of meadow; perhaps, noticing that pasture was separately recorded, he guessed and wrote down that the 40 acres were woodland, which normally precedes meadow and pasture in the Exeter version.[3] That the "two acres" at South Brent are of woodland is not said on fol. 183b; perhaps the clerk writing 104ai deduced that since meadow and pasture were separately mentioned, they must be woodland. There are three other cases where the Exchequer clerk mentions that some quantity was of woodland or meadow or pasture when the Exeter text does not, but in each this is implied by the details of the Exeter Domesday. An acre of wood at *Holebema* in the Exeter version becomes one of meadow in the Exchequer text; no pasture is recorded in either, and probably, as the Exeter version had already mentioned ten acres of wood, the Exchequer clerk assumed it must have meant pasture.[4] Twice the Exchequer

[1] 118b, 102ai.
[2] 129b, 102b2.
[3] 96b, 101ai.
[4] 471, 117a2.

clerk adds " acres " though these are not mentioned in the Exeter Domesday. But as the quantities are 20 and 40, they would hardly be furlongs or leagues.[1]

The Exeter Domesday does not record any ploughlands for Warcombe. The Exchequer clerk wrote *terra est ii car.*, but since there was a demesne team and a tenants' team, he may have argued that two teams necessitated two ploughlands.[2]

There are several further cases where the Exchequer clerk records teams which do not appear in the Exeter Domesday. At Romansleigh the former notes five tenants' teams, but in the Exeter version Nigel's land has three only, and none is attributed to Robert's share of the manor ; a demesne team at Upexe is not to be found in the Exeter text.[3] In the first entry for *Bihede*, the Exchequer text says that there is land for one team, and that this (*hanc*) four bordars have. It might be thought to imply the presence of a team, which the Exeter version does not mention, but it may well be read to mean that the bordars have the ploughland.[4] At Poughill, where there are two ploughlands, the Exeter Domesday simply says, *in eam sunt carr(ucae)*. The Exchequer clerk says " there is land for two teams, which are there ", but here, too, seeing that there *were* teams noted, he may have worked on the principle that every teamland should normally have its team.[5]

It looks as if the Exchequer clerks may from their own knowledge have added style and title. As in Cornwall, Juhell becomes Judhel of Totnes.[6] Ansger is not " of Montaigu " in the Exeter version, but the Exchequer scribe (113ai) could have derived the title from the foot of fol. 456, where some of the *franci milites* are listed, if this list was in the copy (it is not printed in the Record Commission text).

[1] *Chentesberia*, 299b, 107ai ; *Willedenna*, 377, 116bi.

[2] 129, 102b2.

[3] *Liege* ; 103b2, 179b ; *Vlpesse*, 103ai, 132. There is a similar case at *Morceth*, 103ai, 132b.

[4] 112a2, 395.

[5] 414b, 115a2. Frequently, when the number of teamlands and teams do not coincide, the Exchequer says that there is land for so many teams but that, however (*tamen*), there is a different number of teams there.

[6] 316, 108bi.

Twice the Exchequer text says that an estate 'gelded' for so many hides and virgates when the Exeter version does not.[1] But we cannot say that the expression must have been in the copy; the Exchequer clerk may have included it because it was the customary phrase. He states that *Duueltona*, added to Brictric's land, was done so *injuste*: the term is not in the Exeter version, though commonly it is in similar entries; it may even in some way equate with the Exeter statement that a man could "go with his land to what lord he would".[2]

In the marginal entry about the customary rights of the manor of Ermington, the Exeter text mentions separately the two manors each known as *Dunitona*. It gives no suggestion of the Exchequer's *altera Dunitona*, but a clerk might easily have evolved the distinction for himself.[3] Again, the Exeter scribe did not set down that King Edward had held Barnstaple and Lydford *in dominio*. But the Exchequer clerk was transcribing the matter under the heading *Dominicatus Regis*, and may thence have derived the phrase.[4]

We find instances of tenurial status in the Devonshire record similar to those of Somerset. The *libere* of the Exeter version is on various occasions *pariter, pariter et potuit ire ad quemlibet dominium, et potuit ire cum sua terra ad quemlibet dominium.*[5] *Libere* is in at least one instance in the Exchequer but not in the Exeter text (but in the first the tenant could "go where he would", in the latter "separate" from the owner of the manor); the "land of three thegns" in the Exeter version is held "for three manors" in the Exchequer.[6]

Much of the above is derivable from the Record Commissioners' editions of Domesday Book, or from the translations and footnotes in the Victoria County Histories (though a warning must be given that each contains numerous errors and omissions).

[1] *Holcoma*, 336b, 114ai; 408, 115bi. The entries refer to two widely separated places.

[2] 116a2, 462. See also p. 54 above. Not all these, of course, would be *injuste*.

[3] 85b, 100b2.

[4] 87b, 100a2.

[5] 96, 100b2 (*Wirige*); 86, 100bi (*Ferlie*); 98, 101b2 (*Nimetone*); 125, 102bi (*Colrige*), and many other cases.

[6] *Iwis*, 116bi, 376b; *Tavi*, 318, 108b2.

But only the surviving manuscripts can demonstrate a further curiosity. In several instances in which Exeter and Exchequer texts disagree, the latter gives a figure which is that of the Exeter version *before* this was finally corrected. For example, the number of ploughlands at Modbury (217b, 104b2) is in the Exchequer version given as twenty-three. This, it seems, was what was originally recorded in the Exeter version, but in contrast to the brownish ink of xxiii, a black i has been added between xx and iii. The value of Beer is *iii librae* in Exchequer (104ai), but in Exeter (184) an obviously postscriptal fourth i appears. The Exchequer's value for Great Torrington (116bi) is £20, Exeter's £15; and the £15 has been written over an erasure (376b). Similar instances are by no means confined to the ploughlands and values: they occur, for example, in connection with the number of furlongs or acres of coppice (Down St. Mary, 182, 103b2; Ide, 117b, 101a2). The Exeter manuscript suggests that despite the numerous obvious errors and inaccuracies which went unnoticed, it was on the whole very carefully checked and amended, and it is quite conceivable that supplementary alterations should be made in it. The fact that some of these did not find their way into the Exchequer Domesday rather suggests, first, that they were made after a copy was constructed for use at Winchester; secondly, that this copy was perhaps made as soon as the entries for a fief, so far as the individual Hundred or group of Hundreds was concerned, were thought to be complete.[1]

That the surviving Exeter Domesday was sent to Winchester for transformation into the Exchequer Domesday is, on the face of it, improbable. It bears few signs of hard usage, and it is most unlikely that, once at Winchester, it would be returned to Exeter, the provincial capital. But it is altogether likely that the province would have such great need of its own digest of the results of the Inquest that what was despatched to Winchester was a transcript of it. Moreover the "original returns" would be impossibly

[1] See also p. 70, n. 2. For the "group of Hundreds basis" for the construction of the Exeter version—a regular territorial basis and sequence are most marked—see R. Welldon Finn, "The Making of the Devonshire Domesdays", *Trans. Dev. Assn.* vol. 89 (March, 1958). The whole question of the construction of the Exeter Domesday is one which I hope before long to discuss.

bulky for Exchequer use. The text shows that the Inquest left many doubtful points undetermined and many problems unsolved, and it seems likely that there were anticipated further official visits to enquire into the illegalities of occupation and inheritance which, e.g. at Ely and Canterbury, had needed investigation by royal legates. The availability locally of a copy of the statements made to the *legati regis* would be essential. A copy made and sent to Winchester may or may not have included sections of the *Liber Exoniensis* such as the Summaries or *Terrae Occupatae*, since the Exchequer clerks included neither in their condensation. Perhaps such material was included with a transcript for some provinces, for a Summary was inscribed, though no doubt in error, in the Yorkshire Domesday.[1] The *invasiones* were recorded in what seems to be a copy of the eastern counties' material; the *clamores* are reproduced in the Exchequer text for certain midland and northern shires. It is possible that *Terrae Occupatae* was constructed with a view to the availability of a brief record of outstanding Inquest difficulties if the Exeter Domesday was not to be copied, but forwarded to Winchester.

To whom, it may be asked, was the work of copying the Exeter Domesday entrusted, and what form did the copy take? To these questions we probably shall never know the answers, but we may be able to estimate the probabilities. The existence of two passages within the surviving Exeter Domesday, written in the script of Exchequer clerks, and making use of the formulae, vocabulary, and order of material of the Exchequer Domesday, may suggest that these owe their origin to Winchester writers sent to advise on the compilation of the Exeter Domesday and perhaps to copy it for transformation into Exchequer form.[2] Indeed, there is no *proof* whatever that the Exchequer text was not produced in the provinces, county by county.[3] But serious difficulties militate against the adoption of such a theory. We

[1] 381a2. On fol. 138 is a largely illegible erasure which suggests to me that a Summary of the lands of the Bishop of Coutances was begun in the body of the Exeter text, just as a Glastonbury Summary was added to fol. 173.

[2] These passages are discussed and reproduced in R. Welldon Finn, "The Evolution of Successive Versions of Domesday Book", *Eng. Hist. Rev.* lxvi. 561.

[3] But if it was, why was no Exchequer Domesday for the eastern counties, inscribed county by county, drawn up?

are told that the " writings " were brought to King William, and it is far more likely that these were transcripts, province by province, of Exeter and " Little " Domesday type, of the initial rearrangement of Inquest material, than that they were the existing Exchequer quires and leaves.[1] Apparently the only place they could have been brought to him, if delivery to a single place is implied, is either Winchester, where he spent the Easter of 1086, or Salisbury on the occasion of his Lammas visit in the same year.[2] The oath taken at Salisbury, when " all the people occupying land who were of any account over all England, whosesoever vassals they might be, . . . all submitted to him and became his vassals and swore allegiance to him that they would be loyal to him against all other men ", might have a significance additional to the report of the chronicler : it may be that on that occasion the tenants-in-chief formally accepted the truth and justice of what had been inscribed in these " writings ". Secondly, if the Exchequer text had been produced in the provinces, we should expect it to contain fewer *lacunae* and errors than it does, for presumably the " original returns " would still be available for consultation, in the shire towns or the provincial capitals, and we might expect the Exeter Domesday to have been further corrected and supplemented if that had been the method of procedure. The existence of the Summaries, of the geld accounts, and of *Terrae Occupatae* within the *Liber Exoniensis*, and their omission from the Exchequer text, suggest that it was intended to conduct enquiries into the disclosures of the Inquest locally and not centrally, as would certainly be the logical procedure.

We cannot, of course, be sure what form a copy of the Exeter Domesday may have taken, but the probability is that in arrangement, composition, and content it differed very little from the surviving text. It does not seem very likely, even though Exchequer clerks made entries in the Exeter Domesday, that they constructed or superintended a transcript which condensed, omitted, and combined information as was done for the making of

[1] Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, *sub anno* 1086.

[2] As Winchester was the home of the Treasury, it seems unlikely that the " writings " were brought to Westminster, where he was at Whitsuntide.

the Exchequer text. Had they done so, there would probably be fewer errors, omissions, and marginal and postscriptal matter than there is in the Exchequer production. Certain inclusions therein, most uncharacteristic of the Exchequer version, but identical with what we find in the Exeter Domesday, suggest most strongly that they automatically and unthinkingly copied by accident phrases which are commonplaces in " Exeter " work. The Exeter clerks, when indicating the time for which the former value of a manor is given, usually say *quando recepit.* This the Exchequer scribes usually convert into a simple *valebat* or *valuit* or *olim*, but there are a number of instances of *quando recepit* in the Exchequer text, suggesting that often enough they copied literally the phrase before them.[1] Practically every Exeter entry opens by saying that someone holds one manor ' which is called Y '. The Exchequer clerks normally open ' someone holds Y ', but on not a few occasions the Exeter formula *quod vocatur* appears.[2] The Exchequer clerks usually contract their *manerium* to $\overline{\text{M}}$, but here and there the Exeter's equivalent *mansio* appears, as though the writer forgot to make the customary change.[3] Frequently, too, the Exchequer text lists the classes of population in their Exeter order, which is that of social or economic importance—*villani, bordarii, servi*—instead of bringing the *servi* to the beginning and associating them with the demesne land and teams as they usully do.[4]

The formulae and vocabulary of the Exeter Domesday, and of " Little Domesday ", are frequently so unlike those of the Exchequer Domesday that occasional appearances of the former in the latter, in shires for which we have no earlier text, suggest that here too the clerks making an Exchequer Domesday worked from provincial transcripts. We find, for example, the Exeter formula *ea die qua rex E. fuit vivus et mortuus* in Surrey, and here and in Hampshire and in Worcestershire *quod vocatur* before a

[1] See, e.g. 96bi-97ai.

[2] E.g. *Ragiol* (90b2), *Dinnitone* (91bi), *Tavetone* (106bi), *Laierda* (107ai), *Sanctus Germanus* (120bi), *Gargalle* (122ai).

[3] E.g. *Chivele* (69b2). The Exchequer *manerium* is occasionally found in the Exeter Domesday, e.g. on 53 and 179.

[4] E.g. *Tarente* (83b2), *Aissecote* (90a2), *Iohannestou* (112bi).

place-name.[1] These and other " provincial phrases " are indeed widely dispersed through the Exchequer Domesday, and none is confined to a single region.[2] The mention of four *afri* at *Clive* might be because here the Exchequer clerk forgot to omit the livestock recorded in the provincial draft.[3]

A suggestion not only of the construction of the Exchequer Domesday from documents of Exeter Domesday type, grouped by " provinces ", but also of these being the only material available to the clerks, is to be found in the fact that certain entries are in the Exchequer Domesday in altogether the wrong county and folios. *Gessic* certainly, and a holding *in Gelingeham* most probably, which appear in the Wiltshire Domesday, should have been placed in that for Dorset.[4] The former is one of the Gussages near Wimborne St. Giles, and seems to be indicated by the geld account for Badbury Hundred, which says that Earl Aubrey had held $8\frac{3}{4}$ hides *de terra Geldanti*.[5] He has no mention in the Dorset Domesday, and the Gussage entry is the last in the section devoted to the lands he had held in Wiltshire before he resigned his northern earldom and his lands passed *in manu regis*. What had probably happened is this ; the Exeter clerk must have forgotten to insert before *Gessic* a cross-head of the type *Terra quae fuit Alberici comitis* (which appears before his Wiltshire lands) *in Dorseta*, or else the Exchequer clerk failed to notice its existence. If it was of the character of that distinguishing the Somerset from the Devonshire lands of Glastonbury Abbey, he may well have missed it, for the account of her Somerset estates begins on the same line as that which concludes the record of her solitary Devonshire manor, and at the end of this line, out in the margin in two lines, are merely the words *In Sumerseta*.[6] It is impossible to guess how the Gillingham error may have occurred,

[1] E.g. *Cuntune* (48b2), *Sudwerche* (32ai), *Witcerce* (41ai), *Oswaldeslau Hundred* (172bi). *Tempore regis Edwardi*, the Exchequer formula, appears quite often in the Exeter text, but infrequently compared with its characteristic phrase.

[2] They are to be found, e.g. at *Comenore* (58bi), *Stibenhede* (127a2), *Grimanleh* (173b2), *Meratun* (183bi).

[3] 165ai.

[4] 69ai, 73bi.

[5] 18b. See *VCH : Wilts*, ii. 135, 175, 217.

[6] Fol. 161. There are other cross-heads which could easily have been missed ; e.g. that for William of Falaise's Somerset lands (369), which runs on to the text of the preceding fief.

but that the holding should have been entered under Dorset is suggested by the fact that the geld account for the Dorset Hundred of Gillingham says that " Fulcredus " has $2\frac{1}{2}$ virgates in demesne, which seems to imply the three virgates of the *in Gelingeham* entry. No other mention of this man in the Dorset geld accounts can be implied.

Absence of the essential headings which alone could guide the Exchequer clerk with only material of an " Exeter Domesday " type at his disposal is the most probable explanation of the fact that the Northamptonshire Domesday contains so many entries which belong to other shires. It includes the Oxfordshire estates of the Bishop of Coutances.[1] Both the manors of St. Remy at Rheims which appear in it are and were in Staffordshire and have against them the name of a Staffordshire Hundred.[2] In addition, a Warwickshire manor belonging to Thorney Abbey (222bi), two manors of the Count of Mellend and one of Gilbert de Gand, four in Oxfordshire belonging to Hugh de Grentmaisnil and one which is William Peverel's, two of William FitzAnsculf's, one of which is in Staffordshire and the other in Warwickshire, are all within the Northamptonshire section.[3] These errors do not suggest an intensely careful or systematic checking of the Exchequer Domesday, and in every case these come at the end of the relevant fief, as if a landholder's manors in several adjacent shires, which we may think were within the same Inquest group of shires, were, as they are in the Exeter Domesday, inscribed on the same sheet and in the same booklet. The presumption must be that the cross-heading indicating the shire in which the holdings were was omitted or went unnoticed. There seems to be some additional suggestion that the document which the Exchequer clerks were using to make the account of Warwickshire did not clearly, or perhaps at all (except by means of the ascription of manors to Hundreds), indicate the county in which each of the Bishop of Coutances's lands lay, for the aspect

[1] From *Finemere* onwards, 221ai.

[2] 222b2 ; the account of this fief looks as if it might be a late entry.

[3] These manors of the Count of Mellend are postscriptal, written right across 224a. This further suggests that the structure of their source was not clear to the Exchequer clerk. The other references are 227bi, 224b, 226a2 (*bis*).

of 238b suggests that the account of his Warwickshire fief was squeezed in after the preceding and succeeding accounts had been inscribed.

Assuming that Professor Galbraith is right in suggesting that " Little Domesday " is a fair copy of a document of Exeter Domesday type, sent to Winchester for the making of an Exchequer version thereof,[1] its text ought to suggest that its source was a document strongly resembling the Exeter Domesday in form, for it is reasonable to assume that each provincial body of clerks worked to a more or less uniform plan. A fair copy it most certainly is, for the interlineations, *marginalia*, and postscripts are remarkably few. There are only forty-two interlineations in the 107 double-sided folios of the Essex Domesday, which is by far the most heavily corrected of the three counties concerned, and very few of these consist of more than a few words or a figure omitted in the copying. Since the postscripts consist chiefly of odd words omitted originally, or deal with illegal acquisitions, changes in manorial structure, and property in the borough of Colchester, it is probable that in the original most of these were late interpolations occupying similar positions, and copied literally or with the advisability of incorporating them in the text overlooked.[2] In the Exeter Domesday the bulk of the marginal and postscriptal matter looks and reads as if it may have been derived from a stage late in the proceedings of the Inquest, and just possibly from documents distinct from the primary statistical " original returns ", since it is chiefly concerned with additions to and ablations from manors, or failure to pay customary dues—in fact, the sort of matter which we find in *Terrae Occupatae*, and which perhaps was not available, or which needed the verdict of authority, at the moment that the main text was being inscribed.

Nothing more than the production of a fair copy seems to have been the aim of the authors of " Little Domesday ". There is no evidence, as there is on almost every folio of the Exeter Domesday, that the text was systematically checked, and in which many

[1] " The Making of Domesday Book ", p. 166 ff.; *Studies in the Public Records*, p. 97.

[2] E.g. *in Colecestra* (11), *Bummesteda* (28b), *Newelanda* (31), *Rodinges* (49).

errors were underscored and corrected.[1] The interruption of the Norfolk ecclesiastical fiefs by the lands of lay holders suggests that the clerks were at no particular pains to reshape the material available.

No index to the Exeter Domesday booklets survives, and it is doubtful if one ever existed. There is on fol. 532 a short list of fiefs, but it is markedly incomprehensive, and the twenty-seven sections it names are in no sort of logical order.[2] It is probable, however, that the inscription of the word *Cornubia* at the head of certain booklets was done in order that those appropriate to this county could be readily collected. The Essex and East Anglian Domesday has the name of the county at the head of left-hand pages, and that of the appropriate fief on the right. It is prefaced by an index of the landholders concerned, and it may be that the original draft from which it was made was in the form of loose booklets, each containing a number of fiefs, or a portion of a large one, as was the Exeter Domesday. Such booklets may have borne on their initial leaves a contents list of the fiefs they contained; the deleted indexes of fiefs on fols. 9 and 17 rather suggest that they may have been unthinkingly copied by the transcriber, since if there was to be a general index and the work as a whole stitched together, they would be unnecessary, and were perhaps accordingly struck through.[3] Fols. 292, 372 (Suffolk) also contain similar lists of fiefs.

An additional hint that Little Domesday is a copy of an earlier document is to be found in the fact that twice sheets have been inserted in the quaternions, "suggesting a copying

[1] I have noticed two passages in the Essex section which suggest a possible check: large marginal crosses against *Hacuuella* (51b) and *Phenna* (63) suggest that the transcribing clerk or a supervisor may have seen that these entries were virtual duplicates of what had just previously been inscribed for *Hechuuella* (50a) and *Fenne* (62a). Two whole Norfolk entries, on fols. 267a, b, have been underscored: someone must have noticed they had been included in the wrong fief.

[2] It does indeed begin with the royal demesne, and the lands of the late queen follow. But the widow of Eustace of Boulogne comes next, and though the lands of Bishop Odo were in the same booklet as the end of those of the Bishop of Coutances, Odo is unmentioned. It does not look as if it was made by consultation of the *original* booklets, for the four Abbeys represented in booklet h come in an order different from that in this booklet, with Bath Abbey, from 2g, intervening.

[3] It is suggestive of a booklet form for the draft that the first list covers the contents of eight leaves.

omission made good by an insertion ".[1] Another is that blank spaces, which might have been left unfilled because what should occupy them was, at the time of inscription of the surrounding matter, unavailable, are few, as are the instances of compression of the material added by way of postscript or interlineation, the need for which is commonly obviously due to the information these give not being to hand.[2] Only in a dozen places is Essex matter (usually no more than a word or a figure) carried over from what should have been the last line of a folio or an entry to save wastage of almost an entire line or turning matter over to a fresh page. This too suggests that the clerks were producing an unchanged copy of a record in which they could plainly see what was still to come.

It seems probable that the material of the Exchequer Domesday was not invariably inscribed in the order in which it appears in the record, but all divergencies from the normal must be considered in relation to the material from which they were derived. The absence of cross-heads, or their insertion marginally or in spaces inadequate for them, suggest that in the drafts those landowners concerned were not accorded independent sections. The material of the entries regarding them may have been what we find in the Exeter Domesday from fol. 456 onwards. A series of examples occurs in the Wiltshire section, beginning with the land of Bernard Pancevolt.[3]

Many, if not all, of the indexes of tenants-in-chief appear to be late work. So often they fail to harmonize with the order of arrangement of the text that we are entitled to deduce, first, that the rubricated cross-heads, the inclusion of which would have made the work of compiling an accurate index easy, had not been inscribed, or were incomplete, when many indexes were made; secondly, many, if not all, of the transcripts from which the Exchequer clerks worked, probably included no contents lists.

[1] " Domesday Re-bound " (H.M.S.O., 1952, p. 42). The same pamphlet suggests (p. 43) that " the use of special Rulings on the three pages containing the List of Contents of each County is a noteworthy mark of orderly procedure in drafting—or perhaps . . . in the making of a fair copy ".

[2] *Op. cit.* p. 44.

[3] 72b2, and succeeding entries to the end of 73a2.

If the lands in several shires were *not* kept distinct, selection of the fiefs appropriate to the individual county would be the more difficult, and might result in initial omissions, which might be reflected in the indexing.

The Kent index comes on fol. 2a2, not, as we should expect, on 1a, as though the accounts of Dover and Canterbury and " the possessions of St. Martin " and his Canons were already inscribed when it was written. The Berkshire index on 56ai is very much cramped, and a space is left before it ; so is that for Warwickshire on 238ai, and it overflows into the second column. In Dorset insufficient vertical room was left for even a two-column index—obviously the rest of 75a was already inscribed—and from the 52nd entry the numbers and names spread right across the folio. Alfred *Hispaniensis* was omitted from it ; this threw out the numbering, and to restore the congruence, Iseldis, no. 55 in the Index, was given no heading or number in the text, though room had been left for these. William of Mohun's land is numbered 25 in the Somerset index, but 21 in the text (that of Roger of Courseulles is also numbered 21 in the text, and 22-24 follow it). xxv might easily be misread as xxi. The correspondence remains imperfect until the 45th section. To adjust matters after an earlier mistake, no section of the text was numbered XL in the Devonshire Domesday. These are but a small selection of failures by the clerks to harmonize the Indexes with the text.[1] In addition, there is frequent lack of verbal congruence, or identity of subject, between index and textual headings.

Terra Regis may often have been inserted in the Exchequer Domesday after matter succeeding it was already inscribed. The accounts of it often suggest that they are the product of a special feudal return as well as (or in place of) hundredal returns ; a Somerset entry adds to the name of the pre-Conquest holder of *Modiforda* (116) the words *testimonio breve regis.* Perhaps the material for the King's lands was not always available to the Exchequer clerks when they began to inscribe the account of a shire ; perhaps it received a special checking, in the provinces or at Winchester. The space on 2b2, with the Archbishop of

[1] In Leicestershire Earl Hugh is No. 13 in the Index, 43 in the text—see *V.C.H. : Leics.*, i. 298.

Canterbury's fief beginning on 3, suggests that the whole of 2b, which proved to be more than ample space to contain the account of the King's estates, was originally left blank for it, and that some succeeding portions of the Kent material were inscribed before it was completed. The gap on 172bi suggests that the same thing happened in compiling the Worcestershire section; so does the Nottinghamshire account, where the whole of 282a2 is blank.

But the appearance of later folios in each section of Domesday Book is even more suggestive. For Wiltshire, only a single Exeter Domesday entry survives, and so here we shall not be influenced by the aspect of an earlier draft. The passages which end 64bi, which mostly have to do with boroughs and quasi-boroughs, and which are in a hand different from that which wrote the account of the borough of Malmesbury above them, were obviously written after the rest of the leaf, which includes the index and the opening of *Terra Regis*, and presumably certain succeeding leaves also, was inscribed, for at the end the matter spreads right across both columns.[1] The notes about churches, closing the account of *Terra Regis* (65bi), are in a hand unlike that of the entry above them; the "*Fac.*" below, opposite the beginning of the Bishop of Winchester's fief, might be an instruction to a clerk there to open the account of his lands, thus leaving space for the addition later of these notes. We may think with reason that the closely-written account of the estates of the Bishop of Lisieux, which ends the second column of 66a, was not inserted until 66b, or the beginning of it, had been inscribed.[2] The final entries in the first column of 68b, which is appreciably longer than the second, look like afterthoughts, and obviously both the manor of Hugh de Baldric and two of Aldred's were at first missed, since they had to be written in right across the foot of both columns of 73a and 73b, which presumably were already

[1] We may well wonder why the Wiltshire Domesday begins on a dorso. Were the clerks expecting to receive more material, perhaps about boroughs? It might be that only the *Terra Regis* portion of 64b was already written, and that the clerks felt the burghal material might fill 64a and 64bi.

[2] What we have already seen suggests that it may have been overlooked, because concealed within a booklet, or lacking a clear cross-heading.

complete.[1] But the most curious entry is that on 72b2 for a hide *in Coleselle* (a Berkshire vill, though the holding may have been geographically and fiscally in Wiltshire), which is certainly postscriptal, for it has nothing to do with the preceding two lines, which carry over the account of *Segrie* from 72b2 to 73ai.[2] From the length of 72bi, it looks as if the last, or last two, entries for Roger of Berkeley had also been postscriptal, though probably made earlier than that for *Coleselle*, and that when the clerk found an entry, one of the holders named in which was Roger of Lacy, he put it in as close as he could to those of the other Rogers and persons whose initial was R, maintaining an alphabetical principle strongly apparent, though imperfectly followed, in much of the whole Exchequer Domesday. The owners of *Coleselle* do not appear in the index on 64bi, and as this includes, in their proper order, all the tenants-in-chief except those inserted late on 68bi, who have nothing to do with the previous heading, that for the Canons of Lisieux, the index and the Coleshill entry are presumably late work.

The Exchequer account of Dorset includes two holdings which are not in the surviving booklets (e,f) of the Exeter Domesday which cover *Terra Regis*. This suggests that they were in a separate booklet in the copy sent to Winchester, or raised problems to which a solution could not be given when *Terra Regis* was being transcribed. For *Melcome*, the account of which looks like a postscript, squeezed in at the end of *Terra Regis* on 75b2 in characters smaller than the normal, had been taken away from Shaftesbury Abbey by Harold Godwineson, and so may not have been in any *breve* for the royal lands originally. *Hinetone*, which had been Gytha's, was for some reason at first missed: obviously when the clerk wanted to inscribe it there was no room to do so at the end of *Terra Regis*, and the lands of the Bishop of Salisbury had already been recorded at the end of 75b2 and on 77ai, 2.[3] Accordingly, a fresh sheet,

[1] Postscripts so inserted suggest that the clerks were trying to keep as far as possible to a pre-determined order of fiefs.

[2] The *in Coleselle* entry is unrubricated, and may thus have been among the very latest entries.

[3] Part of Melcombe had been Gytha's: it looks as if a section of the Exeter Domesday concerned with her property and Harold's ablation was initially overlooked.

76, had to be inserted, interrupting the continuity of the Bishop's estates, with a mark here and on 75b2 to show where it should have gone. The clerk also failed to notice the solitary manor of Baldwin, Sheriff of Devonshire, and most of the lands of William of Mohun. Again a new folio, 81, had to be inserted into the text, which shows that matter beyond this point had already been inscribed. On the front is Baldwin's manor ; on the back, and in a script unlike that for the rest of his lands, the omitted manors of William of Mohun. But why he should have omitted them originally is a mystery, for the first entry missed (*Poleham*) is on the same Exeter folio (47b) as the last one correctly inscribed on 82ai. It rather suggests that the copy of the Exeter Domesday which the Exchequer clerks were presumably using was not the the same, folio for folio, as the surviving Exeter Domesday. Baldwin's manor is so far from its proper place, which would be 82bi, that it may be an addition later than those for William of Mohun. The Dorset Domesday, according to the numbering of fiefs, includes a good deal which is postscriptal.[1]

For Somerset and Devonshire the errors are fewer. Matter originally omitted had to be crammed in on 86bi and 87a2 ; postscripts are also discernible on 92a, b, 93a, 95ai, 98bi, 102a2, 103ai, 117bi, for example. It is curious, since in the copying of the Exeter Domesday postscripts and *marginalia* might have been put into their proper place, that often what is postscriptal or marginal in the Exeter version is postscriptal also in the Exchequer text.[2]

[1] See, e.g. the *Chingestone* and *in Ferneham* postscripts, *Povertone* (80bi), Hugh de Port's manor (83a2). *Povertone* is an interesting late entry : the clerk marked it for insertion, not at the end of the account of the fief, but next to a manor in the same Hundred as that in which it is ; that is, presumably, in its Exeter Domesday order. The lands of the widow of Eustace of Boulogne were probably overlooked ; in Somerset these are among the lands of the *comites*, and though the position of appearance of the *comitissae* varies in Domesday Book, she should not have been relegated to the very end, save for three *servientes regis* also overlooked, as she is here. Her fief was at the end of booklet f in the Exeter Domesday, after the late Queen's lands (whom she follows also in the general Exeter index), and so may not have been discovered until almost all the Exchequer text had been inscribed.

[2] E.g. the addition of *Baldrintone* to *Raweberge*, 102a2, 124b. But I suspect that the copy of the Exeter Domesday may have been made as soon as the original was inscribed, possibly entry by entry, or at least Hundred by Hundred. This, if so, would explain many oddities ; postscripts may have been added to the original after the main entry had been copied.

It is obvious that 87bi was not all inscribed at one time, or by a single clerk; the first two manors of the Bishop of Salisbury on 87b2 are differently spaced, and probably in a different hand, from that of the third. The account of Thurstan fitzRou's manor on 115b2 looks as if it was not written by the clerk who continued the column, and the space left before it is unusually generous. Aiulf's two manors on 116a2 are either postscriptal, or crammed in so as not to run over to the back of the sheet. The clerks missed the Tavistock lands in Cornwall until they had inscribed all the rest of the ecclesiastical land, and the large gap on 121bi looks as if they were afraid they might later discover other omissions, for which they left space.[1] It appears, too, as if the script sometimes changes when the lands of a fresh sub-tenant of Robert of Mortain are reached, e.g. on 123ai, 123b2, and 124ai, 2, while a space was left after his demesne manors on 122a2.

The most interesting afterthought is that for *Ulvredintone* (Werrington). It should have come on 101ai, but it was inserted, late, on 101a2, with marks to indicate its proper position. Since Werrington is the manor of which the *barones regis* disseized the Abbot of Tavistock, and which seems to be the final addition to *Terra Regis* on fol. 98 of the Exeter Domesday, it is quite possible that it was not accidentally omitted, but that the clerk had to enquire where to include it. We have to remember that the Exchequer clerks were not merely copying; they were omitting, contracting, and re-ordering material also. This would account for some errors, and what appear to be omissions may have been caused because the clerk did not know how to proceed without instructions, and continued with other material until these were given. The eccentricities intensify the impression gained, first that the copy of the Exeter Domesday was not in a form in which the material had been separated into counties, except by

[1] The Tavistock lands, in the Exeter Domesday, are in booklet 2n, together with the Abbey's Devonshire fief, and as they do not come at the beginning of a booklet, it is possible that, in the absence of an index, they were at first missed through being concealed within it. They are numbered iii on 121a2, showing they should have come, taking their proper precedence, after the Bishop of Exeter's fief (ii) on 120bi,2. The first fief of those which precedes them is numbered iiii, but the first i is a black postscript to an original red iii, showing that when it was inscribed, Tavistock was forgotten.

sub-headings, and secondly that it was, like its predecessor, in the form of loose booklets, but with the composition of these perhaps slightly altered.

Now a reason for the inscription of the account of each shire in the Exchequer Domesday in an order different from that in which the fiefs appear would be this, if the material was in booklet form. With the account of a fief covering several shires in a single booklet, its transcription could be effected only for a single shire at any moment. With the lands of more than one man contained in a single booklet, the separate accounts of their lands could not be simultaneously inscribed. Since the hand-writings of the Exchequer Domesday indicate the employment of more than one clerk for the account of a single shire, and probably the delegation of shires in the same group to different clerks, difficulties, unless the work was to be extravagantly prolonged, would arise. Thus, though the order of appearance of fiefs was surely pre-determined, to inscribe them throughout in that order would be either impossible or uneconomic of time. So, it would seem, the clerks were sometimes forced to calculate the space to be left for the ultimate inscription of a fief or fiefs. This was no easy matter; for though the amount of space occupied in their source could be seen, it had to be compressed and reduced in accordance with pre-determined principles. Thus at times insufficient space was left for the inscription of a fief or fiefs; often (especially in northern or midland shires), the clerk seems to have played for safety and begun a new folio or column, in consequence leaving far more room than was ultimately required for the record of a fief on which at that moment he was unable to work. Moreover, unless the task was most carefully and methodically performed, and a full index made before it was begun, it would be most difficult to determine from the provincial record all the sections necessary; it would be easy to overlook the need for including, to close the account of the *Terra Regis* or to intervene between the major ecclesiastical lands and those of the lay tenants, those holdings connected with churches on royal estates, of minor clerics and those ecclesiastics who had only one or two properties within a shire, or tenancies in frankalmoign, and we can by consulting the facsimiles of Domesday Book see the

difficulties these caused. The separation of the lands of those minor tenants grouped in a single section in a provincial record would also prove fruitful of error. The authors of *Domesday Re-bound* suggest that experience derived from compiling the accounts of the southern counties caused the Exchequer clerks to leave room at the end of the account of a fief for the insertion of subsequent discoveries or matter, the need for inscription of which was not immediately determined. It was the normal custom, in writing " Little Domesday ", to leave considerable space between fiefs, which sometimes proved wise, and permitted the easy addition of a postscript without using the margin, e.g. on 427b.

The Yorkshire-Lincolnshire section of Domesday Book is among the most illuminating of potential clues to the making thereof. Inspection will demonstrate how many folios and columns are blank, as though the sections, of whatever category, were inscribed in an order quite unlike that of their present appearance, and many originally altogether independently of their neighbours.[1]

fols.	
295a-6b*	blank (297a, b is also blank)
298ab	City of York, and Index of Tenants
299-332a2	Yorkshire Domesday (for all three Ridings)
332bi-333ai	Fee of Robert Bruce (not contemporary)
333b-5b	blank
336ai-337a2	City of Lincoln, Borough of Stamford, *in Torchesey*, possessors of sac and soc, Index of Tenants
337bi-371bi	Lincolnshire Domesday (for all three Ridings)
372a, b*	blank
373ai-374a2	*Clamores* of Yorkshire
374b	blank
375ai-377b2	Lincolnshire *clamores*
378a, b	blank
379ai-381ai	Yorkshire " index " by wapentakes
381a2	Index and Summary of Count Alan's land
381bi-382a2	Yorkshire " index " by Hundreds

[1] Those marked * are leaves at the end of gatherings. In addition, 313b, 318b, and 382b are blank folios. Most of the final entries of sections do not complete columns ; sometimes a whole column (e.g. 314b2) is blank.

The absence of certain material for which space was left might be due to the fact that it was unavailable when required, to postponements of the task for some indeterminable reason, or to misconceptions. The inscription of the accounts of towns such as London and Winchester may have been postponed, or the originals thereof may not have reached the Exchequer; the inspiration of the survey may have departed before this work was put in hand. The clerk or supervisor may have known that in Somerset was the borough of Bath, and left space for it at the start, ignorant that an account of it had been or would be inscribed within the body of the work.

But the blanks and spaces to which reference has been made above may be caused by the character of the Exeter Domesday, and, as has been argued, of the construction of all the Exchequer Domesday from documents of similar type. Suppose—which is probable enough—two clerks were at work simultaneously on Somerset and Devonshire. According to the plan laid down for him, the former should next inscribe the lands of Ralph of Pomeroy. But he is unable to do this, for the booklet (3s) in which they are is in use by the clerk inscribing Devonshire. Either he must wait until the booklet is available, or he must continue with another fief, and must either depart from a logical or agreed order or calculate how much space to leave for it, which implies an interruption while he examines the relevant booklet or consults an alternative source for the information, perhaps (if it was available) a list of the manors concerned. When the gap comes to be filled, he may not be at work, and so the account of this fief will appear in a script different from that which prefaces it. He may also miscalculate, resulting in a blank space or the need for over-compression of the material. It would be easy to forget that a missing fief ought to be inscribed at a particular point, and fill the space left for it, with the result that when it was inserted, it had to be done in the wrong place or across both columns at the foot of a leaf, which quite frequently happened. Possibly at times the agreed or the logical order was abandoned, owing to the impossibility of immediately inscribing the fief which should come next. In determining the order, a vaguely alphabetical principle was often employed. So, after Roger of

Courseulles and Roger Arundel, we might in Somerset expect to find others whose Christian names begin with R. But we do not; we pass to some whose names begin with W. It may be that when dealing with Walter Giffard, who comes in the middle of booklet 4q, the clerk noticed the name of Ralph of Mortemer in the same booklet, and accordingly went back to the R's.

The somewhat illogical order towards the end might be the result of the requisite booklet being in use elsewhere. After dealing with only two of the *Franci Tegni*, the clerks moved to the *Servientes Regis*, whose lands were in a different booklet, bringing together the lands of an individual tenant scattered in the Exeter Domesday, but not giving each a heading.[1] It looks as if subsequently it was discovered that the *Franci Tegni* were not finished with, but not until the *Angli Taini* had been dealt with. All this does not suggest careful planning, or the construction of an inflexible and logical order for all the fiefs.

Devonshire was more adequately done—but then Exeter lies within it. After the obvious initial laymen, Baldwin of Exeter and Juhel of Totnes, the clerks recorded the W's, even extracting the lands of William of Eu from the *Franci Tegni* section in booklet 4t. They naturally inscribed the lands of Goscelm immediately after those of his brother Walter de Claville, since in the Exeter Domesday these had formed a single section, and then set down the fiefs of ten tenants whose initial was R. On 115ai-117ai we can see an alphabetical principle at work, and in separating into individual sections the lands of the four *arbalistarii* and transcribing the remaining entries for the *Franci Milites* and those for the *Angli Tegni* they worked almost faultlessly, bringing the lands of the individual together and preserving the Exeter Domesday's order of manors. But (supposing it was in the copy they were using) they altogether missed Floher's manor of *Sotrebroc*.

There is in addition an aspect of the Exchequer Domesday as a whole which suggests that its text was not altogether inscribed in the same order as that in which it now appears. It looks as if

[1] The work was imperfectly done; e.g. they failed to include with Humfrey the Chamberlain's other lands those recorded in the Exeter Domesday's section for *Franci Tegni*.

portions were inscribed as proved convenient to their authors, and ultimately brought together as could best be done into a pre-arranged but at times illogical order. Fol. 5b2 is in part left blank; the Kentish fief of the Bishop of Baieux begins on 6ai, as though it was inscribed independently of the portion now preceding it. The Sussex text looks as if the accounts of at least some fiefs, for a number begin new pages, were not inscribed in the order of the index. We find the same feature in the portions relating to Herefordshire and Huntingdonshire, and in those four northern shires characterized by the six-carucate unit—Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire, Lincolnshire, and Yorkshire.[1] In the west midland shires we can find copious indications of a possibility that the accounts of the various fiefs were not inscribed in the order in which they now appear. In the Staffordshire Domesday, for example, the account of the Bishop of Chester's lands occupies all the first column of 247a, and two-thirds of the second column. There was plenty of room to inscribe there the single Westminster Abbey manor and those of Bishop Remigius, or part of the Burton Abbey estates, but these were all inscribed on 247bi. Again, the normal appearance on 250bi of the fee of Richard the Forester and the beginning of the account of Nigel's land, compared with the compressed account of *Niwetone*, suggests that the transcription of the two fees mentioned, and perhaps that of Ralph fitzHubert which immediately precedes Nigel's, was made before that for Rainald de Bailleul which precedes them, and that the inscription of this was performed before the land of Richard the Forester, which begins the folio, was entered. Yet, unless the end of the account of Nigel's land is postscriptal, the record for the King's Thegns which almost fills column two of this folio must already have been inscribed, for Nigel's fief overflows into the foot of it.

We find similar evidence in the accounts of so many shires. There is a large space left on 238bi between the fiefs of the

[1] Note the large space blank on 20a2, with the Mortain fief beginning 20bi (Sussex), and that of 250a2 (Staffordshire). The accounts of fiefs in Herefordshire often deliberately open a new column (e.g. Ralph de Tosni's, 183a2, Roger de Lacy's, 184ai). Nottinghamshire provides many examples (283a, 284ai; 282a2, bi; 287ai, 2; 288a2, bi.). So do Yorkshire and Lincolnshire; see in particular 314b2, 315ai; 318b, 319ai; 341b2, 342ai; 345a2, 345bi.

Bishops of Chester and Worcester. 238b2 (Warwickshire) suggests that the land of the Bishop of Coutances was squeezed in after the preceding and succeeding accounts were inscribed; in view of the fact that his Oxfordshire lands were included in the Northamptonshire Domesday, I suspect that the lateness of this entry was caused by delayed discovery on the part of the Exchequer clerks that he possessed land in Warwickshire. I doubt very much, from the spacing and caligraphy, if all of 239a was written at one and the same time. Why, if inscription was done in the order of the index, should there be that gigantic and unusual blank space between the single manor of Roger of Ivri and that of Roger d'Oyly on 242a2, or the spacing between fiefs be so uneven on 243b2? The account of the Church of Worcester's land (172b) was obviously not written all at once or by the same hand; on 174a2 the lands of four minor churches are crammed in either because they were originally overlooked or because the remainder of the folio was already inscribed. We see the same feature on 182b2 (Herefordshire), and opposite, a large gap at the end of Nigel's land which could have been filled by entries such as those on 185a2, two of which were surely not written after Roger de Laci's fief which precedes them was inscribed. We can see great inequality of spacing between fiefs on 186b and 187a, and the appearance of 183b is extraordinary: we begin with the seven final lines of Ralph of Tosni's fief, then comes an unusually large space before that of Ralph of Mortemer is begun, and this continues into the second column, almost all the lower half of which is blank. The Shropshire index (252ai) bears small relation to the Domesday text; the ecclesiastical lands on 252b, 253ai do not appear in it, and apart from a misplaced entry,[1] it is obviously unlikely that the various sections were inscribed in the order of appearance. The single holding of St. Juliana must be postscriptal; it may easily have been overlooked in the text from which our Domesday was made. Nor does 260b look as if it was consecutively inscribed.

The accounts of some shires, however (e.g. Hertfordshire, Middlesex), look as if they were inscribed in order without space ever being left for the later addition of whole fiefs. But the

[1] *Brunfelde*, see *V.C.H.: Shropshire*, p. 313, n.17.

forty-second and subsequent sections of the former, which follow the lands of the thegns, must be a postscript.

These conclusions, though given here in somewhat greater detail, are in general similar to those at which the authors of " Domesday Re-bound " arrived. They suggested that unrubricated paragraphs at the foot of columns were " not only . . . additions but . . . constituted a second series not added until after the whole work was done ". This further suggests, as do occasional additions to the text in uncommon hands, and sometimes the marginal reminders that information must be sought out, that the Exchequer Domesday was checked and edited, if not altogether successfully, perhaps because of the urgency of the work which the text and arrangement everywhere demonstrate, and because it is so obviously uncompleted work. They argue that blank spaces, ultimately sometimes unfilled, sometimes partially filled, and sometimes dealt with only by severe compression of the script, were left " because further information was expected to accrue ", and that this practice, most marked after the first eight counties dealt with, was " adopted as the result of experience.[1] "

The results as a whole give every indication that they are the result of the use of documents comparable to the Exeter Domesday, unindexed, incomplete, often difficult to understand in the absence of supplementary information, and semi-professional in character, often transcribed literally and without overmuch thought. The construction of the Exchequer Domesday is a subject which still demands intensive study, and its contents, viewed in the light of their sources, should be considered with more caution than has been customary.

[1] Pp. 27-8. The compilers did not have to make insertions on extra pieces of parchment after fol. 82.

NOTE

Preliminary work on the Essex Domesday, the results of which I hope to publish before long, suggest very strongly that it is a copy of a document of 'Exeter Domesday' type, and inscribed while the original was being compiled.