THE EXETER DOMESDAY AND ITS CONSTRUCTION

By R. WELLDON FINN, M.A.

1. The Background

The Liber Exoniensis, colloquially but somewhat unfortunately known as the "Exon" or "Exeter" Domesday (for this is but a part of the collection of documents), should have attracted more attention from the earliest commentators on Domesday Book than it did. For not only is it the sole surviving source of any portion of the Exchequer version, but it is also almost certainly an initial conversion of primary hundredal, manorial and burghal returns to the Inquest of 1086 into a feudal form.

Much of the original material is now lost; what remains occupies 532 folios, written on both sides, of which almost one hundred pages are entirely blank. The matter was inscribed in loose booklets, 103 of which have survived. In the late fourteenth century these were bound up in illogical order, but were rearranged, largely according to the plan of the Exchequer Domesday, by Sir Henry Ellis before the text was first printed in 1816. The booklets vary considerably in composition: some are indeed not true booklets, but consist of a single leaf (e.g. fols. 107, 107b; 193 (blank), 193b); there are two dozen of four leaves each, fifteen of six, twenty-three of eight, and one of twenty-six. In 1811 they had been given reference letters and numbers (a-5f).¹ The scheme was a somewhat imperfect one, for it would have been better to allot an appropriate reference to a booklet known to be lost; e.g. that which must have followed fol. 414 and contained the portion of the lands of "Rualdus Adobatus" which in the Exchequer Domesday (115a2) closes his fief. The material which has survived consists of:

Though, as will later be demonstrated, something other than hundredal, manorial and burghal returns seem also to have been used in its making, these must have been the principal source of fols. 11-12b, 25-62b, and 83-494b, and probably of Terrae Occupatae also. For though there are inconsistencies and interruptions, in each fief the Hundreds appear in a sequence the regularity of which is most marked, and all holdings in a fief within a single Hundred normally come together. For example, in all Devonshire fiefs, entries for the adjacent Hundreds of Lifton, South Tawton, Black Torrington, Hartland, Shebbear, Fremington, and North Tawton precede those from others, and for all but three entries the above order of Hundreds is in any fief invariable. From fol. 125 to fol. 129b (thirty-two consecutive entries) every entry is for Braunton-with-Shirwell Hundred. Twenty-seven manors of Roger de Courseulles in Cannington Hundred (423-6) are consecutive. Robert of Mortain’s manors in Tybesta Hundred occupy the whole of
booklet 3e (247-254b), and two entries for it, probably postscriptal, immediately precede these forty-eight entries (245b; 246, 246b are blank). Examples could be multiplied indefinitely.

But here regularity ceases. The manner in which the Exeter Domesday section of the work can have been constructed has long been a mystery. For the handwritings of a number of clerks appear and disappear at irregular and apparently illogical intervals; moreover, the work of more than one writer can in a number of instances be seen within the compass of a single entry.\(^1\)

A glance at any consecutive dozen lines of the manuscript is apt to be disconcerting. It is frequently immediately obvious that a quite considerable number of different handwritings is represented, and that some of the scripts are by no means easy to distinguish from each other. Whale's suggestion that there were two groups of clerks at work, one native and one Norman, employing for \textit{et} the Insular \(\text{\textit{et}}\) and an ampersand respectively, is obviously inadequate.\(^2\) Very rarely, and usually for short stretches of the work only, does any clerk maintain consistency of formula, contraction, or orthography. (Here the handwritings will be distinguished by allotting to each a somewhat appropriate capital letter.) Clerk A, for example, spells Gytha \textit{Guitda} and \textit{Guida} in consecutive entries (106b, 107); F, who mostly contracts \textit{animalia} to \textit{animl.}, includes an occasional \textit{aialia.}, and having, in thirteen consecutive entries, reduced \textit{mansionem} to \textit{ma.}, writes \textit{mans.} in his next two (323b-6, 331b).\(^3\) In his first fifteen Somerset entries, J writes \textit{ecclesia} seven times, and \textit{aecclesia} thrice. C has \textit{in qua est} for sixteen out of his seventeen entries beginning with fol. 225b, but once he writes \textit{in ea est}, which at 228b becomes his normal introduction.

It is impossible altogether to attribute these inconsistencies to the possibility that a clerk may have been copying exactly whatever he had before him, and that he was reproducing the orthography, formulae, and contractions of more than one

\(^1\) E.g. \textit{Ratdona} (316). One clerk recorded the name of the owner and of the manor, and its assessment, while a different clerk wrote the remaining seven lines.


\(^3\) It is unfortunately impossible, without the use of Record type, to indicate the forms of the contractions.
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predecessor. Nor can it be assumed that they are the product of dictation. If either was a governing factor, it is most improbable that one clerk, and one clerk only, would intermittently have written \( \div \) to represent est, or twenty times in rather more than sixty entries would have used the spelling hyda, and in the same space written also hida eleven times. The fairly consistent use by another of an \( x \) instead of the usual \( c \) in certain proper names, too, must be due to individual idiosyncracy.\(^1\) Orthography and formulae are unquestionably apparatus full of latent dangers. But each is at times so markedly characteristic, and the employment of a word-form or formula so unlike that of some clerks whose handwritings can more readily be isolated from the rest, that, coupled with a suggestive but dubious script, they may well help to determine its author.

The varying physical conditions under which the work was executed, and mental or bodily fatigue on the part of a clerk, or even the quality of the writing materials, might cause a handwriting to vary so appreciably that often we may think we are seeing the work of two clerks where only one is in fact represented.

It seems as if about a dozen clerks worked on the Exeter Domesday. Only two—clerks G and A—contributed to the accounts of all four counties (the solitary Wiltshire entry surviving may be ignored); J is found in all except Devonshire. F appears in Devonshire and Dorset; S in the former and in Cornwall. T is to be found in Devonshire only; H and D confine themselves to Somerset material; the work of C is not found outside Cornwall. Owing to the paucity of the Dorset material, it is difficult to apportion certain scripts, but I think that two, and perhaps three, writers, B, E, and K, are represented here alone.

Almost every entry is prefaced by a sign presumably included to indicate where the record of a major holding began. The signs are of varying design, and several of the clerks employ distinctive types of these. That of G, for example, is a long pennon, with one or more lines running its length, on an extensive

\(^1\) E.g. Bristrix (394b), Halebrix (331b), Brixtrix (421b), Alebrix, Albrix Alrix, Alurix (333-4, 368b, 396).
A's pennon is squat and plain. F employs what looks like a forward-sloping capital Y with closed top; S a sign resembling a straggling capital T. Unfortunately, these signs are often a clue to the writer of only doubtful value. Consistency of design is lacking, and often a clerk, on completing the account of a manor, inscribes his own characteristic sign, but a different clerk then writes the entry following it. Some of these signs, notably those of D and H, are extremely complex.

2. The Handwritings

The characteristic prefatory sign, and the capitalization of the G of Gildum, are but two of the outstanding features of clerk G's work. He uses the Insular or Runic 1 for et = and, frequently omits the amount of terra villanorum, and, on the whole, contracts very little, but spells words such as carruca, villani, quadragenaria, in full. He is inconsistent, for he uses, e.g., both tagni and tegni, and ferlinus and fertinus, and sometimes employs both forms within a single entry. His work as a whole displays marked carelessness and orthographic instability; many of his more obvious mistakes are underscored in the text to show that correction was required (though frequently no correction was made). He writes, for example, in lalat. (underscored) for in lat(itudine), pues for oves, and villainos, angilicus, ferttinus, redididit, tenuitunt, vallebat. He contributes in the neighbourhood of 550 entries.

A script, neater than G's, which is fairly easily identifiable on sight, is that of clerk A, who uses the ampersand for et throughout. He is perhaps the most consistent of all the clerks as regards abbreviations and orthography; in most instances he spells out animalia, villani, arare, and agros in full. His Somerset entries, however, for the most part make use of aialia., and of the fertinus spelling, whereas in his Devonshire and Cornish work ferlinus predominates at first, changing to fertinus in booklet 3c, and back to ferlinus in 3e. Minor idiosyncracies are the use of a character larger than usual for a Roman figure v or for that letter; a high consistency of employment of tegnus, teglanda;

1 This, too, is a feature of Vol. II of Domesday Book (the record of the eastern counties).
and beginning the final phrase of his entries *hec* (not *et*) *valet.*

A seems to have written over 700 entries.

Clerk F was the author of rather less than 100 Devonshire entries, all of which come from the fourth to the sixth groups of Hundreds in order of appearance in any fief, i.e. for manors in the east and south. He also seems to have written ten of the 161 surviving Dorset entries, all in western Hundreds. The script is somewhat italic and angular; the ampersand is largely used for *et,* but there is a tendency to employ, in the final lines of an entry, the Runic 1, and to use this over letters to indicate a contraction. He normally contracts *mansio(nem)* to *mans.,* and uses *animl.* and the *ferlinus* spelling. Minor characteristics are frequently writing *viiii* rather than *ix,* and *nemeris* for *nemoris.* F’s work is to be seen on, e.g. fols. 49-51, 310b-11, 324-6.

The prefatory sign of clerk T is inconsistent, and there is no appreciable degree of uniformity reflected in the 200+ entries he contributes to the Devonshire section. He often uses *mans.* for *mansio(nem),* G. for *gildum,* *aliaia,* *aal.* for *animalia.* He largely uses the *ferdinus* form, but is inconsistent about the employment of *viiii* or *ix,* *runcin(os)* or *rucin(os).* For *et* he uses the ampersand. Both F and T very frequently contract *servos* to *serv.* T’s handwriting can be seen on fols. 295-6b, 301b-8, 411b-13, etc.

Clerk S also writes over 200 entries, mostly for Devonshire (though little for the south), and about a score of Cornish entries from fol. 259 onwards. His contractions are somewhat irregular, for he uses indifferently *gild.* and *gildu,* *animl.* and *anil,* but shows a preference for *ferdinus* over *ferlinus.* He has two strongly individual characteristics; the writing of *viiii* or *viii* *to,* where other clerks have a plain *viiii* or *viii,* and the not infrequent use of *‡* for *et* in addition to a normal employment of the ampersand. It is only in his work, and within a comparatively small geographical area, largely in west Devonshire, but including a little of east Cornwall, that the unusual spelling *hyda* instead of *hida* appears. He contributed largely to the Devonshire section of

1 The work of A and G can be seen in the first (A) and two subsequent entries (G) in the reproduction of a page of the Exeter Domesday in the printed *Additamenta* volume (iv) of Domesday Book.
Terrae Occupatae. Good examples of his work are to be found on fols. 290-4b, 313-14b.

Clerk C is to be found only in Cornish material, to which he contributes about sixty entries. He writes a neat, upright, regular hand, ruling his guide-lines rather closer together than does A, from whom he took over when the first ten manors in the Hundred of Winnianton in Robert of Mortain’s fief had been inscribed. His prefatory sign is not unlike A’s, but the open pennon is more elongated and slopes upwards; he uses a long-tailed Insular 1 for et. He is not alone in using villani (habent) alteram terram instead of specifying the hidage of the terra villanorum, or in changing from consistency of employment of ferdinus to that of ferlinus in the midst of his work. All but sixteen of his entries do not begin a new line. His work is on fols. 225b-33b and 244-5b.\(^1\)

Clerk J writes a somewhat italic hand, often prefaced by a sloping sign of three lines converging downwards to a single tail with a bar across the top of the three lines. He uses both ampersand and Insular 1, but has a number of distinguishing features, among which are making a diphthong of what elsewhere is merely a or e, and, when s follows a vowel, ligaturing the two letters, with the s small and superscript. He writes Craeneburna (61b), aequas (for equas, 57), Leomaerus (56b); the last folio is a good specimen of his style of writing. He writes tannus for thegn, and, like A, often ends hec rather than et valet. He contributes at least thirty-four Dorset entries, in which he several times writes sollidi for solidi, and gueldum for geldum. The latter appears not infrequently in the Terrae Occupatae section for Somerset also, as does gelldum; here J wrote practically all the entries after the fortieth one. In all he wrote at least 150, and perhaps nearly 200 entries. Characteristic work of J’s can be seen on fols. 59-62b, 145-7b, 185-7.

\(^1\) C displays several points of interest. His Mortain fief entries for Winnianton Hundred are the only ones in the section which do not have a marginal f against them, and these are the entries which were omitted, when the Exchequer text was made, to avoid duplication of material. Does the f indicate that an entry so prefaced was copied, or was meant to be copied? Also, he spells the name of the former Abbot of Tavistock—Sihtric—correctly, whereas other clerks have Suetric or Sistric. Was he by any chance a local man?
Clerk H writes not far short of 200 Somerset entries. He has a number of characteristics: the frequent reduction of *molendinum* to *mol.*, the writing of *leuga* as *leugua*, the contraction of *bordarios* to *b.*, and, in mentioning *terra villanorum* or tenants’ teams, introducing the phrase by the words *villani habent, qui habent, villani sui*, and adding *suo* to the standard phrase *in dominio*. He displays a preference for the forms *tannus, tandem, fertinus*. *St-* at the beginning of a place- or proper name is ligatured. His work is visible on fols. 141b-5, 352-5b.

Clerk D was responsible for between fifty and sixty Somerset entries. He has a tendency to be uncertain about aspirates: e.g. he writes *abt.* or *abuit* for *habuit*, and *Hedricus, Harundel, Hengelerus*, while frequently the *h* which should have come at the beginning of a word is interlined.1 Almost invariably he writes *leuga* as *leuca*, and *tantundem* as *tantondem*, though frequently *u* has been written above the *o*. A score of times he, like J, ligatures and superscribes *s* after a vowel in penultimate place; he consistently uses *ferdinus* or *firdinus, tannus*, and *molenin.* or *molendin.*, and uses *viii* more often than he does *ix*. D, too, is guilty of many major errors: he writes *seous* and *soruos* for *servos*, *nissi* for *nisi*, *reecapit* for *recepit*, *cadruca* for *carrucas*. Fols. 140-1, 373-3b, 444b, 453-3b display his work.

It is possible that on fols. 430-1b and 463-3b the work of yet another clerk, confined to Somerset entries, appears, but it is not very likely that one would deal with only some twenty manors.

The material of Dorset is too slight for pronouncements to be really definite, but it is probable that work which is not that of G, A, J or F appears. Half-a-dozen times the *gueld-* spelling occurs, but the work does not seem to be J’s; the clerk who writes these passages may have made about twenty entries, several of which have *log.* for *long.*, *tagnus* or *tannus*, *hec valet*. Some other entries are marked by extreme contraction of words: *mas.* or *ms.* or *ma.* for *mansio(nem)*, *car.* for *carr.* or *carruca*. But we really have insufficient specimens to allow for profitable deduction.

Despite the imperfections he manifests, it may be that G

---

1 See, for example, fols. 140-1, 351, 363b, 374b, 438b, 478b.
occupied a position of special responsibility. He wrote about 40 per cent. of the material for *Terra Regis* for Somerset, and 30 per cent. of that for Devonshire. He wrote all of it for Cornwall; indeed, until the conclusion of the Church fiefs is reached (208b), he wrote all but six of the entries for the first fourteen Cornish sections, embodying nearly 100 entries. He was responsible for a high proportion of the lists of Hundreds on fols. 63-4b, the geld accounts for Dorset, Devonshire and Cornwall, and probably all but five of those for Somerset. He may also have contributed to *Terrae Occupatae* for Devonshire. A’s work too suggests comparative eminence, both from the volume of his output, the fact that he wrote all but six of those entries for the Somerset *Terra Regis* which G did not, early contributions to the Cornish Domesday, and probably some entries in the lists of Hundreds and the Somerset geld accounts. It is of interest that the hand which wrote the account of the Bath Abbey demesne manors in the Bath Cartulary, which so strongly resembles the Exeter Domesday account of these, looks very like that of A, while the formulae, contractions, and orthography are also similar to his.¹

Finally, there are three entries which are in the script, not of any of the above clerks, but of an Exchequer scribe, which suggests that the *curia* may have sent officials to Exeter to organize and superintend the work.² None of the hands described above in any way resembles the set hand of the *curia*.

3. The Making of the Record

It is virtually certain that the Exeter Domesday is an initial conversion of returns grouped by manors, boroughs and Hundreds into a form in which the unit is the fief. The arrangement leaves us in no doubt that Wiltshire and Dorset material was to some extent kept separate from that of the other three shires, for on no occasion is material from the first group found in
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a booklet which contains what is relevant to the second.¹ The postscripts, interlineations, and marginalia are so numerous, and the arrangement sufficiently imperfect, as to negative the possibility that we have here a copy of an earlier draft.

But the composition of the booklets suggests very strongly that the organizers had considerable knowledge of how much space a section would occupy; yet a collation of the Exeter Domesday with the Terrae Occupatae section shows that not all the material available was included in the former.² Obviously the work was to some extent planned; there is no suggestion of continuous redrafting irrespective of ultimate convenience in handling the products. When dealing with the Dorset lands of Roger Arundel, the clerks began a new booklet (k). His fief occupied three pages, 50-1b, and eight lines of fol. 52. They left the rest of 52, and all 52b, blank, which experience had probably suggested was a wise precaution, since in the accounts of many other fiefs postscripts had had to be added marginally or where inadequate space for them existed. This left them one leaf of the booklet for the addition of another small fief, and on fol. 53 the two manors of Serlo de Burcy were inscribed, leaving 53b blank. We do not know what other small fiefs were still not dealt with, but it so happens that only one fief which follows these in the Exchequer text was small enough to be included on what was left of fol. 53 and on 53b.³ The bulk of the Devonshire fief of Baldwin of Exeter was inscribed in three booklets (3k, 3l, 3m; fols. 288-311b), each of eight leaves. This left twenty-four Devonshire and three Somerset entries

¹ Except for the Summaries, from fol. 527b to 531. William de Mohun’s lands both in Wiltshire and in Dorset appear on fol. 47.

² E.g. information about a virgate of land called Ledforda, which happens also to occur in the geld account for Williton Hundred (509b, 79b), that Torchill was a Dane (Celuia, 518b; Caluica, 450), the existence of the manor of Chefecoma (499, 117). Frequently Terrae Occupatae gives information about individual manors absorbed by 1086 into a different manor which in the Exeter Domesday has been converted into a single comprehensive statement. Terrae Occupatae, incidentally, looks as if it might be a fair copy, and not original work.

³ Probably they would not put that of Humfrey the Chamberlain (83ai) here, because it would make him precede his more important brother Aiulf, the sheriff of Dorset, and Aiulf’s fief would have taken up at least three leaves.
for inscription, which would and did go comfortably into a four-leaf booklet (3\,n; 312-15b).

Calculation, however, was often imperfect. A ten-leaf booklet is by no means unknown, and one of this size would have absorbed William of Mohun’s manors in Devonshire and Somerset. When 3w, of eight leaves (356-63b) was complete, six entries were as yet unmade; these were added in a 2-leaf booklet (3x; 364-5b), and though fols. 365, 365b needed to contain three lines only, no fief other than William’s was begun in the vacant space. Robert of Albemarle had sixteen manors, all in Devonshire. They would not have gone into the space afforded by a two-leaf booklet, and one of four leaves would have been over-generous, since probably there was no other small Devonshire fief uninscribed, while the logical juxtaposition would be that of Roger of Courseulles in Somerset, which is a very large one. The result is a three-leaf booklet (41; 419-21b) completely filled. Two-, four-, and eight-leaf booklets, the most convenient to handle, were designed whenever possible.

It is not only collation with Terrae Occupatae which suggests that the Exeter Domesday does not contain all that it might have done. The geld accounts record men and estates of which we can find no trace in Domesday Book, but from this we must not argue too closely, for the dates and material of their sources and those of Domesday Book might not be identical. Still, the apparent absence of manors from the Exeter version argues a certain carelessness. After finding the space for the name of a manor left blank (436), we are not surprised also to find entries giving no place-name, but merely tenet i mansionem, or a holding described merely as Terra Colgrini (423b), or an entry (not included in the printed text) which says only Eduuardus tenet iii hidas terrae (398). Despite the checks on the work obviously

1 Yet there are suggestions that a clerk may not have been conscious that he had finished a section. At the end of Baldwin’s fief comes the customary prefatory sign, as though the writer expected there was still more to come. But he may have inserted it unthinkingly.

2 Collation of the text with the geld account for Bath Hundred shows that a manor of Shaftesbury Abbey, probably Kelston, was missed from the Exeter Domesday. Royal manors in Swanborough and Highworth Hundreds seem to have been omitted. (See V.C.H. Wiltshire, ii. 185, 211.)
applied, the text is very far from being a perfect one, and we may with reason think that one cause of this was that it had to be compiled as rapidly as possible.

The clerks have concealed a number of their errors from us. *Terrae Regis Dominicae* for Cornwall end on fol. 102b, and as far as we know from the geld accounts, etc., no royal manor is omitted from this. But, beginning at line 15, there are traces of an erased entry, which begins, as is customary, *Rex habet i mansionem quae vocatur* (place-name illegible) *quam tenuit Heraldus*. Possibly an account of the anonymous hide which Earl Harold had wrongfully taken from St. Petrock, about which King William had ordered a trial (*iudicum*) to be held, and the Church in justice to be reseized of it (204b) was begun here, but its inclusion thought in the end to be unnecessary. On fol. 138 (the last leaf of a six-leaf booklet), is an erasure which, from what is still legible, suggests that the clerks began to write a Summary of the Bishop of Coutances’s Somerset estates comparable to those of fols. 527b onwards (it is noteworthy that a virtual copy of the Summary of the Somerset lands of Glastonbury Abbey was included at the end of the account of the fief, fol. 173).

It is unfortunate that the compilers did not see fit to include the name of the Hundred in which each manor lies. However, by use of the geld accounts, the sequence of entries, and later documents, this can usually be determined with reasonable certainty. Reference has already been made to the fact that in almost every fief entries for a Hundred are found together without interruption, and that the Hundreds follow each other in regular sequence (p. 361). This is most strongly apparent in Devonshire, where the Hundreds fall into six largely geographical groups. It is suggestive that frequently the Hundreds of a

---

1 On fol. 270, marginally at line 16, is a suggestion (not given in the printed text) that a clerk had got so far in reckoning the difference in values for Robert of Mortain’s manors (which was given on fol. 531 in the Summary of his lands): the entry looks like *hic computantur apprediari peiorari.*

2 A consistent order of Hundreds in each fief, and geographical groups of Hundreds, are features of the Norfolk Domesday. Much which deals with hundredal sequences in Domesday Book is to be found in P. H. Sawyer, “The ‘Original Returns’ and ‘Domesday Book’”, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, lxx. 177-97, and in R. Welldon Finn, “The Making of the Devonshire Domesdays”, *Trans. Dev.*
group are consecutive both in the geld accounts and the lists of Hundreds. The fifth group, for example—Axminster, Colyton, Axmouth—come together in geld accounts and lists of Hundreds, and in the former in the same order as in the Exeter Domesday. This is not true of Cornwall, where a regular sequence of Hundreds is not so apparent, though in all relevant fiefs Winnianton Hundred comes first, and four times out of six Tybesta appears second. In Somerset the order in which the Hundreds occur in any fief is apt to be irregular, but in almost all of the fiefs the Hundreds in the west of the shire and south of the Mendips come first, then those north of the Mendips, finally, running from north to south, those in the east. A marked system of groups, and regularity of order, is noticeable in Dorset.

But in a limited number of instances the structure is disturbed as a result of errors or by the manner in which the Inquest seems to have been conducted. On fol. 388b, two manors in Fremington Hundred were inscribed. Then, on fols. 389-90, a different clerk wrote the account of nine in North Tawton. Presumably it was then discovered that Johanesto, the last of Goscelm's manors in Fremington, had been overlooked; it was at once inscribed, and the clerk followed it with the three remaining manors in North Tawton. It is indeed possible that some of the misplacements are not the result of clerical error, but caused by doubt as to whether some passage was to be included, or in what form, the entry being held back until this was settled.

If the occurrence of the varying scripts is set against the sequence of manors in a fief, it is at once apparent that in the majority of instances the handwriting changes when a shift occurs from one Hundred to another. In numerous cases, however, one clerk will inscribe the manors in two or three consecutive Hundreds, but still the change of script occurs when the last of these Hundreds is completed.

Obviously only full tabulation can display the workings of the system, but the record of one small fief will demonstrate it. The Somerset lands of Alfred d'Epaignes are on fols. 371b-5.

The first three manors are in North Petherton Hundred, and are all inscribed by clerk G. The next six are all in Cannington, and A’s work. Then five in Williton were written by clerk D, one in Carhampton by A, and one in Milverton by H. The final eight manors are in five different Hundreds, and written by five different clerks. But, as we shall see, errors were apt to occur. Apparently a manor in Abdick Hundred was inscribed before it was discovered that a second manor in Milverton had been overlooked.1 The fief ends with three manors in Andersfield (A), Achelai (Hundred uncertain—D’s work), one in Taunton (A), and one in Frome (G).

The Bishop of Coutances’s Devonshire manors which lie in the initial group of Hundreds mentioned above occupy four double-sided folios (121-5b). Clerk A writes the Lifton entries, G the early ones from Black Torrington; then S writes the remainder for this Hundred, those for Hartland, and the early ones from Shebbear. Clerk T finishes off Shebbear; in turn A and G inscribe Fremington entries, and also those from North Tawton. The system seems to persist even in those entries in the Cornish fief of Robert of Mortain which are postscriptal to the bulk of its entries. On fol. 259, after G has inscribed eighteen manors in Rillaton and seven in Connerton, S appears when a block of seven manors in Stratton, followed by a number from other Hundreds, begin. On 262b A writes two Winnianton entries; J follows with six in Stratton and six in Rillaton.

Coupled with the fact that sometimes an entry is the work of more than one clerk, the frequent absence of apparent system governing the changes of clerk is at first sight disconcerting. It is plain, too, that there are accounts of fiefs which are not

1 But there may be reason for this misplacement: the manor, Preston in Milverton, was held by Hugh of Alfred. Now a Hugh de Vautort holds a part of Preston from Robert of Mortain, and this has been taken out of the distant royal manor and Hundred of King’s Brompton (103); moreover, one of the two entries about Preston in Terrae Occupatae (515) says that Robert fitzIvo holds some of Preston of Robert, but the Exeter Domesday does not mention this. It may be that tenurial ramifications were such that clerk H did not know if Preston should be included here, and that while enquiry was being made, clerk A carried on and inscribed the account of Ilia. Or the commissioners may not at the critical point have decided about the legality of ownership of these Preston holdings.
arranged on the normal hundredal basis. An outstanding example is that of Glastonbury Abbey in Somerset. On the normal geographical basis, Dereberga in Cannington should have come first, but this is placed sixth, with a manor in Winterstoke opening the account. The manors in Frome Hundred (Mulla, Wateleia, Camelertona, Crenemulla) are separated into two pairs by four manors in four different Hundreds. Glastonbury, and its associated islands, close the main account, and there follow notes on manors in which various laymen had acquired, apparently illegally, Glastonbury property. The Abbey had recently suffered vicissitudes of varying kinds, and it may be that the clerks, four of whom, with A and J predominating, contribute to the account, took their material from a schedule supplied by the Glastonbury authorities. The possibility of individual returns by fees is not small. ¹ Other fiefs with unusual structures are those of the Bishop of Winchester and Athelney Abbey in Somerset, and of St. Petrock (which had suffered severely from losses of land to laymen) in Cornwall. The manors in St. Petrock's own Hundred are interrupted by those in the three other Hundreds in which the Saint held land.

One other possibility of apparent disturbance of hundredal order existed. We cannot be sure that the units of the Inquest were invariably the Hundreds as indicated in the geld accounts. It is true that Hundreds of Wellow and Kilmersdon, places within Frome Hundred, are named in the lists of Somerset Hundreds on fols. 63b-4b, but the geld account knows Frome Hundred, comprising Frome and Wellow and Kilmersdon, only. But while the geld accounts show that some of the Bishop of Wells's manors were therein considered as part of the Hundreds in which they were physically situated (e.g. Banwell in Winterstoke, fols. 77, 157), the bulk were treated as composing "part of the land which belongs to the honour of the bishop" (78b), an artificial and widely dispersed unit of which we hear nothing in the lists of Hundreds. In these Wells and Wiveliscoombe and Kingsbury Hundreds appear, but in the geld accounts these episcopal manors are all included in Bishop Giso's Hundred.

The geld accounts have only a Hundred of Yeovil (Givela, 79). But the structure of Domesday Book shows that for Inquest purposes those of Tintinhull, Houndsbarrow, Stone, and Liet or Lieget, which comprised it, were treated independently. Each of these appears in the Hundred lists (as does that of Coker which formed part of Yeovil geld-Hundred, but for which Liet is substituted); the appearance of these Hundreds in most fiefs (e.g. that of Robert of Mortain) is not consecutive, but the Yeovil constituents are interrupted by entries from Hundreds other than these four.\(^1\)

It was the irregularity of hundredal sequence throughout Domesday Book rather than the traces of systematic order which first attracted the attention of early commentators. Ballard thought that the material had been dictated to the inscribing clerks, and that for each shire there were at least two pairs of clerks involved; it was his contention that as work on one Hundred was completed for the individual fief by one pair, its record was exchanged for that which the other pair had been using.\(^2\) Now dictation, the presumption of which was pressed into service to account for the frequently-varying spellings of Hundred- and place-names, might seem to be an incomparably inconvenient method of executing the work, and inevitably productive of far more errors, corrections, erasures, and disorders than we find displayed therein. The irregular sequence of the various clerks' work, moreover, hardly suggests that dictation was the method employed. On this principle, too, the occurrences of Hundreds should alternate, and though the order of appearance in, e.g. Devonshire and Norfolk, is at times inconsistent, the instances of irregularity form a very small minority. Differences of pronunciation by dictating clerks could well account for the extraordinary variations of place- and

---

1 Domesday Book quite often mentions Hundreds which are not among those which normally furnish the rubricated divisions, e.g. Cresseuelle (207a2) and Kenebaltune (206b2); in the Isle of Wight were Caubome hundred quod iacet in Bovecome Hundred (52bi) and Hemreswel (54ai) which seems to have contained three small manors only.

2 A. Ballard, *The Domesday Inquest* (p. 17). W. de G. Birch (*Domesday Book*, p. 52), and O. J. Reichel *V.C.H. Devonshire*, p. 379) seem also to have thought that the matter was dictated.
proper names which are everywhere apparent. But equally they could have originated during the making of an earlier record of the Inquest, or in a list of properties within a Hundred, such as an earlier account of geld liability or payment, which the clerks might have used to guide them.\(^1\) It is most improbable that, if dictation had been employed to produce the Exeter Domesday, we should so frequently find displayed individual clerical idiosyncracies, e.g. S's use of *hyda* within a limited geographical area, D's *leuca* and H's *leugua*, J's *gueldum*. But it is altogether probable that, when the 'original returns' were being prepared, clerks unfamiliar with English or local name-forms might write them down phonetically and that individual pronunciations would produce strange variants.\(^2\)

A possible means of procedure would have been for a clerk to take the Inquest's record of the first Hundred to be inscribed and work steadily through it, fief by fief. Indeed, this would seem to furnish a potentially economic system, for once he had completed the entries for the first fief, another clerk could have begun on the Hundred to be dealt with second, and others could have followed him. But this does not appear to have been the system employed. The entries for Shebbear Hundred, for example, in the order in which the fiefs now appear, are the work in turn of G, S, T, A, T, G, A, S, and so on. It is quite common for the consecutive entries for a Hundred in a fief to be the work of more than one clerk; e.g. G writes the first entry for Bishopsworth in Bedminster (141b); the second immediately

\(^1\) *Boteberia, Boltesberia,* appear consecutively on fols. 219b, 220; *Crahecme* and *Crauecoma* on fols. 310, 310b, yet the same clerk writes each pair of entries. We have *Lonnela* and *Lonnima* in the space of five entries from 393-4, both clerk F's work, and G writes *Wesfort* and *Wesforda* in consecutive entries on 409b. A clerk is capable of inscribing two versions of a name in a single entry; e.g. *Brantona, Bractona,* on fol. 83b and again on fol. 498b. There is no uniformity in Exeter Domesday entries and the corresponding passages in *Terrae Occupatae*; we find *Afetona* and *Afretona* (342b, 503b), *Sidelham* and *Sidreham* (318, 495b), *Engestecota* and *Hainghestecota* (122b, 497).

\(^2\) Not infrequently a holding is said to be *ad* rather than *in* somewhere. This has produced, e.g. *Atiltona* for Ilton (191), *Efjord* for Ford (273b), *Telbricg* for Ellbridge (245b), *Dorseda* for Orsett (II, 26b). Dr. P. H. Reaney has suggested to me that a single sound would probably not convey the same combination or order of letters to different clerks.
follows it, but is H’s work. It might be expected, too, that under this system the clerks would have begun a fresh booklet for each tenant-in-chief; or else that those who hold lands only in, e.g. south-west Devonshire, would come in the same booklet. But Ruald ‘Adobatus’ and Robert of Albemarle do not; between them comes William of Poillei. It does occasion- ally happen that all the entries for a Hundred, usually a small one (e.g. Cutcombe-with-Minehead) are the work of a single clerk. It happens also that the whole of a fief, again not a large one, e.g. that of Bath Abbey, was inscribed by one clerk only. But this might be entirely fortuitous. Throughout, we are handicapped by not knowing in what order the fiefs were in­scribed, but it is reasonable to suppose that those of laymen were considered largely in order of size and importance, and probable that inscription was in accordance with the principles of sequence displayed by the Exchequer Domesday. In this Terra Regis comes first; there follow, as a rule, the lands of the Bishops, and then the lands of the abbeys and the earls, while at the very end come the lands of the king’s sergeants and thegns.

An alternative system would be the completion of a fief in a single operation. This would have been economical of time, for as soon as a clerk had written the entries for one Hundred, he could pass to another fief, still working on the same Hundred, while a different clerk could work on the first fief for the next Hundred to be considered. But this does not seem to have been the system adopted. For example, the Somerset fief of Robert of Mortain begins with an entry in South Petherton by G, but H writes the next three entries, also in this Hundred, as are the next two, which G inscribed. Immediately following is an entry for Williton Hundred and another for Bullstone, both G’s work, and then come six manors

1 There is only one Hundred of Bedminster in the geld accounts. But one Hundred list records two: Betmenistre and Bedmynstre (64b). Moreover, the manors are Bischeurda and Biscopuurda; they were perhaps independent settle­ments. Thus G and H may have been dealing with separate Hundreds.

2 It is interesting that while in the Exeter text demesne manors, or those of a single sub-tenant, are rarely grouped together as they often are in the Exchequer version, the royal manors have been rearranged in groups according to previous owner.
in Tintinhull written by A. A further argument against the employment of this method is that very frequently the entries on the individual folio do not look as if they were all inscribed at the same time, especially when manors appearing consecutively are in different Hundreds though written by a single clerk.¹

What might account for all the above irregularities and eccentricities would be the compilation of the Exeter Domesday as the Inquest proceeded. They might even manifest themselves if the entries were made, not as soon as the material was furnished by delegates and jurors, but, say, at the close of each day’s proceedings. I very much doubt, however, if the manuscript would look as clean as it does if this had been the method employed, especially if enquiries had been conducted at Hundred-moots and it had travelled with the clerks from place to place. There are a number of further arguments against this hypothesis also. It is improbable that the completeness, largely regular sequence of information, and comparative neatness of most entries would be as adequate as we find these to be. Many a large manor consisted of a caput and a number of associated villages, often well distant from the caput. It is possible that some at least of these returned figures giving the statistics for the manor as a whole. But, since frequently we find separate entries for the demesne and the sub-tenancies, and also interlineations furnishing what look like the figures for outlying holdings, it seems more likely that the information about a complex manor originated in a number of returns, and that where these were thrown into a single entry, this was not done during the actual holding of the Inquest.²

¹ E.g. on fol. 266 Crauuecoma in Williton was surely not inscribed by G as soon as he had written Lopena in South Petherton immediately above it. Nor does it look as if A wrote Estochelanda in Cannington as soon as he had completed Tetesberga in North Petherton (356), or Gernefella in Bruton straight after Vdeberga in Frome (447). Or see Stocca (452), Brien (354).

² We have separate figures for most of each of the named villages which make up the dispersed Glastonbury manors of fols. 161b-9b, or the royal manor of Keynsham (113b-4). For interlined statistics, see, e.g. Banuella (157, 157b). We cannot help feeling suspicious about the discrepancies between Exeter and Exchequer figures for Sidbury (118b, 102ai), for the latter gives 5 hides against 3 in the former, 30 ploughlands against 20, 25 against 18 tenants’ teams. T.R.E. there had been two holders, Alwine and Godwine, and it looks as if the surviving Exeter text gives us the figures for one holding only, and that those of the
The details of *Terrae Occupatae*, too, show that there was at the disposal of the clerks information about each of the numerous pre-Conquest manors and holdings which by the time of the Inquest had been absorbed in some other manor. To *Aissa* (269, 513b) had been added the holdings of two thegns, rated at one and a half hides, and worth £3 6s. 8d.; collation of the entries shows that *Aissa* itself without the additions was rated at two and a half hides and was worth £1 13s. 4d. The Exeter Domesday gives merely the total value of £5.\(^1\) It is questionable, too, whether, if inscription synchronized with Inquest, the organizers could have calculated as adequately as they did what space would be required for a fief with manors in more than one shire.

Yet it does seem that the Exeter Domesday must have been inscribed, at least in part, while the Inquest was in progress. It is surely significant that almost all the *marginalia* and postscripts, and a number of the interlineations, are concerned with illegal additions to and ablations from manors, inability of holders to separate themselves from the lordship or manor to which they were attached, failure to pay customary dues, and similar irregularities. Among all these we find, for example, the wrongful inclusion of *Nimeta* in the manor of Molland (95), the detachment of *Pendauid* from the royal manor of *Glustona* (101b), the claim of the Bishop of Coutances to have *Boeurda* because it had been Brictric's—but "the thegns do not know by what means Brictric had it" (126b), the inability of the thegns who were the predecessors of the *milites* of Tavistock Abbey to "separate from the Church" (177), the statement that the holdings of Robert of Mortain which "could not separate from" the royal manor of Winnianton (99) were "of the demesne manor called Winnianton" (225b-6). They include the detachment of moor and meadow and coppice from Sea- vington and their transference from the Mortain fief to the royal manor of South Petherton (265b), and the retention over periods

\(^1\) Here, as it happens, the Exeter Domesday gives us the hidage of the additions; usually only *Terrae Occupatae* does so, and sometimes it gives the number of ploughlands for these also.
varying from twelve to eighteen years of the customary dues payable by certain local manors to Axminster (84b). More significant still, each of certain entries made in duplicate is marginal or postscriptal. The former holder of a hide in the manor of Ditcheat "could not separate from the Church"; the entry is marginal both on fol. 170 and in Terrae Occupatae on fol. 519; marginally we are told that Keinton Mandeville lay in Barton St. David in King Edward's day (434b), and the hide at which it is rated is recorded postscriptally on fol. 480. It is equally suggestive that the addition of the manor of Barlington to that of Roborough is marginal on fol. 124b, and postscriptal on fol. 102a2 of the Exchequer Domesday text. It may be that the Exchequer clerks did not notice the entry until they had completed the column, but this suggests that it was marginal also in the copy of the Exeter Domesday they were using, and therefore perhaps that it had not been added to the original when the making of the copy was begun. Examination of the manuscript suggests, from the difference of colour in the inks employed, that most of the marginalia, and many interlineations, are postscriptal. Good examples of these are apparent on fols. 315b, 350, 491, and in the case of an obvious postscript to fol. 443b (Aisxa). Much of the geld accounts, too, do not suggest that they were inscribed in a single operation, for the colour of the ink frequently changes (e.g. on 70b at line 16), and the detail for Black Torrington was altered during its reproduction.1 All this suggests, first, that when the clerks began the construction of the Exeter Domesday, there were outstanding a number of disputed points or illegalities about which the inquisitors had formed no judgement, or about which they wished to hear further testimony; they are all the kind of difficulty about which we hear, in the record of other shires, that the witness of the Hundred or the shire had been demanded. Secondly, it suggests that the making of the copy which the Exchequer clerks used was begun while the work of inscribing the Exeter Domesday was still in progress. This suspicion is intensified when it is found that a number of the discrepancies between the Exeter and the Exchequer versions are apparently caused by the

1 See H. P. R. Finberg, Devonshire Studies, p. 34.
late addition to the Exeter text of figures which presumably were not transferred to a copy already made for Exchequer use. It is significant, too, that in the Essex Domesday, which is surely a fair copy of a document comparable to the Exeter Domesday, the majority of the postscripts are of a character similar to those indicated above.

The possibility of simultaneous execution of original and copy, then, could explain the apparently unsystematic appearance of individual handwritings, especially when we can see that the first draft was fairly adequately checked. Apart from the frequent interlineation of figures, words, and phrases, there are numerous deletions, erasures, and underscorings. It might be, then, that a clerk wrote the entries from one or more Hundreds for a fief, and then passed his work over to another for checking (and, it seems, sometimes received it again for correction, though on occasion a hand not that of the main text makes the addition or alteration). Meanwhile a third clerk carried on where the first left off, and it might be that another trio was similarly at work on a different section of the manuscript. Also, doubt as to what should next be inscribed, or whether something was to be included at all (or because the point was still under consideration) might cause a clerk to break off and apply to a supervisor for instructions, his interrupted work being taken up by a different clerk.

1 Many of these are in an ink the colour of which is altogether unlike that of the surrounding text; see R. Welldon Finn, "The Immediate Sources of the Exchequer Domesday", Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, 40, p. 58.

Consideration of the Exchequer Domesday as a whole suggests very strongly that much of it was written while the Inquest was still being held. If so, the apparent presence of Exchequer clerks when the Exeter Domesday was being compiled (p. 368) is readily explicable.

2 They include mention of *invasiones* (e.g. *Pheringas*, 14b, lines 15-7; *Neue-landa* (31, line 21), and the claims of Ely Abbey to lost lands (*Rodinges*, 49, line 20; *Phenbruge*, 97b, line 12).

3 E.g. an error has been deleted on fol. 342 (*Otria*); *nihil* struck through and *uulet iii sol.* interlined (*Tarenta*, 32); there is a large erasure on fol. 267, and most of the account of *Achelai* (374b) is written over an erasure; the repetition of *de comite* is underlined for deletion on fol. 101, and so is *lalat. for lat.* on 102b. The words *consummation est* occur ten times, in every case but one at the end of a booklet. They might denote the completion of copying or checking. In the margin of fol. 317, too, is the word *probatio*. 
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The Cornish Domesday alone is sufficiently compact for us to estimate a way in which it could have been compiled. The assumption has to be made that Devonshire was completed before Cornwall was begun, which from the structure of the manuscript and inherent probability seems a reasonable one to make. We can be sure that booklet 3d was written immediately after 3c, for the account of Witemot (241b, 242) carries over from one to the other. 3f was surely written last, for it contains the afterthoughts, and the last two entries on 245b are probably postscriptal, a blank space (246, 246b, which closes booklet 3d, are also blank) being used for two manors in Tybesta Hundred, the rest of the entries for which had filled 3e (247-54b).

G wrote all but half-a-dozen of the Cornish entries in w, y, 2n, 2x, and 2y. He took over from C where a return to manors in Rillaton Hundred occurs (as though it was discovered that C had missed these and had put in the manor in Stratton), while he did not inscribe the only two manors the Bishop of Exeter had in Winnianton Hundred. Were, then, other clerks working on the rest of the booklets concerned? A wrote the first ten entries in 3b, which he could have done whenever G was not using the material for Winnianton Hundred. C completes the booklet; J or S could have done the checking. The change from A to C comes, significantly, at a break in method mentioned above on page 366. A could have begun 3c as soon as C had finished inscribing Fawton entries and had turned to Stratton ones. He writes, indeed, all the rest of the Fawton material and then too turns to Stratton, and is not interrupted until he is well into 3d—after sixty-six consecutive entries there might well be a change, or the end of a day's work might have occurred. C continues with the Stratton and half-a-dozen Rillaton manors, which, except for the Tybesta postscripts, complete the booklet. The switches from one Hundred to another may seem entirely unnecessary. But an attempt at a feudal grouping can also be discerned, and may account for these.

C's Fawton entries begin with demesne manors, and pass to six held by Richard (the manors in Stratton he inscribes are largely Hamelin's). Later, beginning on fol. 259, seven manors held by Richard come together, then a pair of his in Rillaton and
his two in Connerton; next comes Roger’s two in Stratton and his pair in Rillaton. A, then, or while C was at work, wrote the whole of 3e (all Tybesta entries). At the same time G, having finished the entries in the first five booklets concerned, could have been inscribing the Connerton manors which open 3f, and continued with a long string in Rillaton (once C finished his contribution to 3d). The remainder of 3f (from the last entry on 258b to 264b) looks like the insertion of manors previously overlooked or whose inclusion was deliberately delayed. The Hundred changes about a dozen times in this space, and all the clerks except C contribute. The only two manors not in the previous fiefs were both in Stratton; G wrote that on 334b, A that on 397b. In all, G wrote about 661 lines, A 825, C 318, S 101, and J 61. If at least two clerks were inscribing simultaneously, the compilation of the Cornish section need have been only a matter of days.

If something like the above was the method employed, in shires where the number of Hundreds was large and the points of detail to be considered numerous, it is plain that which clerk would succeed his predecessor at the opening of entries for a fresh Hundred would be entirely fortuitous. Probably there is far more method and organization behind the construction of the Exeter Domesday than the mere text would suggest.

4. The Duplication of Entries

When the text of the Exeter Domesday is restored, largely with the assistance of the geld accounts, to its original hundredal structure, the number of duplicate entries becomes forcibly apparent. The common explanation of their existence has been that where dispute as to rightful possession occurred, the clerks were careful to note the holdings under each fief concerned. Recorded in the Bishop of Coutances’s Somerset fief is the manor of Millescota (147b), held of him for five and a half hides by “Asscelinus”, and before him by two thegns “who could not

---

1 An attempt to combine an hundredal with a feudal basis is occasionally apparent also in Terrae Occupatae.

2 R. W. Eyton, Notes on Domesday.
separate from the church of Glastonbury". In the account of Glastonbury's manor of Mulla (Mells, 168), within which the modern equivalent of Millescota lay, "Ascelin" is said to hold five and a half hides of the Bishop, de rege, and the two thegns and their inability to leave Glastonbury lordship are also mentioned. These produced two corresponding entries in Terrae Occupatae (519b, 520), which suggests that Glastonbury had argued that the king could not legitimately transfer this subtenancy. Unless the Glastonbury return mentioned Millescota by name, it looks as if the passages emanated from two different returns, not one for the Hundred of Frome. Which of the claimants would be liable for the geld due from Millescota?1 Roger of Courseulles's ablation of part of Long Sutton from Athelney Abbey is mentioned twice in each of the accounts of the fiefs concerned, and three times in Terrae Occupatae.2 This does not suggest that the clerks drew their material from a single source only, or that they meticulously noted in purely hundredal returns which items had already been dealt with. Moreover, Mulla is clerk A's work, the other Glastonbury entries mentioned above J's, while Millescota is J's and Hascecoma, Hotuna, and Illebera, A's. H wrote one and A the other of the Satuna, Suttona, entries in the Athelney account; A that in Roger's.

The Devonshire manor of Touretona was inadvertently twice recorded in the Exeter Domesday (98, 110b). G wrote the first, and S the second: each has Gida for Gytha, and the accounts correspond perfectly except for slight variations in phraseology and order, and G's xix where S has xviii.3 But we find in this

1 At the end of the account of Glastonbury land (172-3) are notes of holdings which "could not separate" from the Abbey, but which are in the hands of the same Bishop and various lay tenants; almost all are said to be held de rege. They are recorded also in the fiefs of the newcomers. Each appears in Terrae Occupatae (524-4b), which suggests that the inquisitors were not satisfied that they had rightfully passed out of Glastonbury ownership. The variation in name-forms, too, may suggest that these had been the subject of more than one independent return: in the Glastonbury entries we find Hetsecoma, Hutona, Elleberia in both the account of the fief and in Terrae Occupatae; in those for the Bishop of Coutances, Hascecoma, Hotuna (Hoctona), Illebera (137, 139b, 510b, 516). 2 Fols. 191, 191b, 435b; 515, 524b, 525b.

3 At some point lines were drawn round the second entry to show that it was unnecessary.
shire also the possibility of dual sources. In the account of his fief, Baldwin of Exeter is said to have eleven burgesses who dwell in Exeter and lie in his manor of Chent (297). They apparently appear again in the final entry for his fief (315), though here we read of "12 houses which belong to his manor of Chent". It looks as if A produced both versions: one may have come from an hundredal, the other from the burghal return. It seems, too, as if Newton St. Cyres was twice described (117, 483). The first entry, where clamat has been altered to habet, tells us how Bishop Osbern displayed his charters to support his claim to this manor, which "Domnus" is said to hold. In accordance with the witness of the francigenarii it has been adjudged to be the Bishop's; presumably this was the work of the Domesday Inquest, for it does not appear under Terrae Occupatae. But in the second entry "Domnus" is said to hold Neuentaona, and, while the Bishop's claim is not mentioned, "Domnus" is said to have held it from King Edward and says he now holds it of King William. Did a single return produce both passages? And is the interlineation of habet late work, and the manor credited to both the Bishop and "Domnus" because at the time of initial inscription the question had not been settled? If so, it looks if the Exeter text was begun before the commissioners had finished their work.

The most illuminating series of duplicate entries is for the twenty-two manors taken by Robert of Mortain from the royal manor of Winnianton (99-100b, 224b-7). G was responsible for the first series of entries, A and C in turn for the second. The order in which the manors occur differs, and so do place- and proper names. We find Cariahoil (99b), Cariorgel (224b); Brixius (99b) and Birihitsius (226), and a number of other variants. Moreover, the discrepancies in the two sets of accounts are considerable ones. Roscarnon is in one said to be held by Grifin (100), by Grifin of Join in the other (224). Five manorial values differ, often appreciably; e.g. we have 5s. and 10s. for the same place, and xxx den. against ii sol. The fiscal details

---

1 Nor does Werrington (98, 178b), of which the barones regis had disseized the Abbot of Tavistock as a result of the testimony of Englishmen.

2 Trenant, Garuerot, Trenbras, Sanctus Maiuian, Roscarnon.
vary still more greatly. Except in the case of the initial entry, we are told in the entries under *Terra Regis* that each manor gelded for so many geld-hides, -virgates, and -acres, but on turning to those in the Mortain fief find that these quantities are really those of total assessment, and that the number of hides for which each holding actually gels—a different and smaller quantity—is given also. Surely all this implies independent returns; the one for the whole complex royal manor of Winnianton, an artificial agglomeration of small settlements scattered over at least fourteen parishes, and one for each of the constituents abstracted by the king’s half-brother, which seem by 1086 to have acquired the status of independent manors, though it is said that “they could not separate” from Winnianton, and in the Mortain fief entries many are said to have been “of the demesne manor of Winnianton”.

Wherever duplicate entries occur in the Cornish material, collation almost always displays discrepancies, which argue that a single source did not produce them. From the royal manor of *Lannohoo* (101) Robert of Mortain has taken away two manors, *Podestot* and *Sainguinas*, which have twelve ploughlands and were worth £3 when received. There are entries for each of these in Robert’s fief, but there they are *Pondestoca* and *San~guinas*, taken from *Lantloho*, have sixteen ploughlands, and had been worth £2. The statistics, and certain other details, differ appreciably in the two accounts of *Treiwal*, *Treuithal* (208b, 258b), and of *Nietestou* (207b, 230b). But there can be no doubt that the entries each refer to a single holding, or part of it.

The task of the Exeter Domesday clerks, as of the inquirers, was obviously an immensely complex one, which on the whole they executed admirably. Both analysis and synthesis of their work strongly suggest that their material was complex also. The possibility of their use of returns for certain major fees, in addition to the primary returns grouped by boroughs and

1 In *Terrae Occupatae* (508) also their inability to separate is mentioned, and Robert is said to have taken them away (ablatae) from Winnianton.

2 Fols. 238, 238b. These appear twice in *Terrae Occupatae* (507, 507b), and the name-forms vary in each entry and more or less correspond in turn with each of the variants of the Exeter Domesday.
Hundreds, is obviously considerable; and so is that of their use of pre-Conquest lists of property and geld liability, possibly of recent geld collections as well. These, indeed, are reflected in the Exchequer Domesday also, but much of what we may learn of the background to the Domesday Inquest is displayed only by the earliest conversion of the Inquest's primary material, the Exeter Domesday.

¹ The insistence on the status and tenure of manors in the time of King Edward is most marked, for usually who held it in 1066 determined who ought to be holding it in 1086. As Professor V. H. Galbraith has pointed out ("The Date of the Geld Rolls in Exon Domesday", Eng. Hist. Rev., lxv. 9-11), the Exeter Domesday contains a number of phrases which suggest that the inquirers were interested in the efficient collection of geld, and that some of the phrases found in the geld accounts—surely not fortuitously preserved with the Exeter Domesday—appear in the Exeter Domesday also.