

# THE PLACE-NAMES OF THE DOMESDAY MANUSCRIPTS <sup>1</sup>

By P. H. SAWYER, M.A.

ASSISTANT IN HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

**D**OMESDAY BOOK is important not only for historians but also for students of English place-names.<sup>2</sup> It is based on a survey of England made in 1086 and was itself compiled before 1100, possibly even before the death of William I in September 1087.<sup>3</sup> Its *Index Locorum* records over 23,000 place-name forms (including repetitions and variants), and for many place-names it provides the first evidence. For example, of the 500 place-names in *G-* listed in Ekwall's *Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-names*, Domesday Book is the earliest source cited for over 200 while only 71 are traced to pre-conquest sources some of which are themselves only preserved in post-conquest copies. It may therefore be claimed that because of its scope and date Domesday Book is the most important source of English place-name forms.

<sup>1</sup> I should like to thank Dr. F. E. Harmer, Miss M. Dominica Legge, Professor A. McIntosh and Dr. R. Forsberg for their help and criticism.

<sup>2</sup> The manuscript is preserved in the Public Record Office. The printed text, in two volumes corresponding to the two volumes of the original, was issued in 1783 without title-pages. These were reissued later by the Record Commission who also published, in 1816, a volume of *Indices* and a volume of *Additamenta* including Exon Domesday, see below p. 484, n. 1. The bibliography of this edition is most conveniently discussed in the Public Record Office's pamphlet *Domesday Re-bound* (H.M.S.O., 1954), pp. 11-13. Vols. i and ii are here referred to as DB and LDB respectively.

<sup>3</sup> For a general survey of Domesday research see D. C. Douglas, "The Domesday Survey", *History*, xxi (1936-7), 249-57. For more recent work see below *passim*. The date of the compilation of Domesday Book is discussed by V. H. Galbraith, "The Making of Domesday Book", *Eng. Hist. Rev.* lvii (1942), 161-77; D. C. Douglas, *The Domesday Monachorum of Christ Church, Canterbury* (Royal Historical Society, 1944), pp. 23-5, cf. the review of this work by R. V. Lennard in *Eng. Hist. Rev.* lxi (1946), 253-60; and by V. H. Galbraith and J. Tait, *The Herefordshire Domesday* (Pipe Roll Society, New Series xxv, 1947 and 1948), pp. xxv-xxvi. Confirmation of the early dating may be deduced from the pamphlet *Domesday Re-bound*.

Before its evidence can be used to the best advantage it is necessary for both philologists and historians to understand the process of its compilation. Students of this problem have used besides Domesday Book other manuscripts deriving from the same enquiry, in particular those that are based on the earlier stages. These are themselves important for the information they contain additional to that preserved in Domesday Book, and they frequently contain better place-name forms than those in Domesday Book. These forms have been used by philologists, interested in etymologies and eleventh-century phonology and orthography, and by historians concerned with the relations between Domesday Book and these related manuscripts.

In this article an attempt will be made to indicate the value of the place-name forms as evidence for the relations between the manuscripts in which they occur and also to question some of the assumptions of philologists who have perhaps not fully appreciated the significance of the "satellite texts".

Exon Domesday, or the incomplete survey of Cornwall, Devon, Somerset, and Dorset that forms the bulk of the manuscript known as the *Liber Exoniensis*,<sup>1</sup> is closely related to the account of the same areas in DB. Some scholars have considered the two works to be independent compilations from the "original returns" of the Domesday Enquiry,<sup>2</sup> while others, particularly Baring, have argued that DB for the south-west of England was derived from Exon.<sup>3</sup> Baring based his argument, in part, on a comparison of the place-names in the two manuscripts, but Dr. Olof von Feilitzen has written, "the evidence adduced by Baring is scarcely conclusive, and the numerous discrepancies between the two versions in the spelling of place- and personal-names

<sup>1</sup> *Libri Censualis, vocati Domesday Book, Additamenta* (Record Commission, 1816), pp. 1-493. Besides Exon Domesday, referred to here as Exon, the *Liber Exoniensis* contains an account of a geld collected in the south-west. For this see V. H. Galbraith, "The Date of the Geld Rolls in Exon Domesday", *Eng. Hist. Rev.* lxxv (1950), 1-17; and J. F. A. Mason, "The Date of the Geld Rolls", *Eng. Hist. Rev.* lxxix (1954), 283-9.

<sup>2</sup> For example, O. J. Reichel, *Victoria History of the County of Devon*, i, 378-9.

<sup>3</sup> F. H. Baring, "The Exeter Domesday", *Eng. Hist. Rev.* xxvii (1912), 309-18. See also R. Welldon Finn, "The Evolution of Successive Versions of Domesday Book", *Eng. Hist. Rev.* lxxvi (1951), 561-4.

favours the assumption that they are independent copies of the same original".<sup>1</sup>

The following examination of the place-names in both manuscripts supports Baring's argument.<sup>2</sup> It must, however, be emphasized that he did not rely on the evidence of place-name forms alone. A discussion of the other evidence would be beyond the scope of the present article but it may be remarked that it is not to be dismissed as "scarcely conclusive".

A very large number of names in Exon have Latin inflexions that are, in the equivalent names in DB, either dropped or represented by a final *-e*. For example :

| <i>Exon</i>                       | <i>DB</i>                                  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Acforda . . . fol. 25             | Acford . . . fol. 75                       |
| Sepetona . . . fol. 27            | Sepetone . . . fol. 75                     |
| Froma . . . fol. 198              | Frome . . . fol. 91                        |
| Badentone . . . fol. 95           | Badentone . . . fol. 101                   |
| inter Barnestabl̄m et             | inter Totenais et Barnestaple <sup>3</sup> |
| Toteneis et Lidfordam . fol. 334b | et Lidford . . . fol. 108b                 |

If such differences are ignored, a large number of names common to both manuscripts have the same spelling. This close correspondence between them is not in itself sufficient to prove the dependence of DB on Exon, but a comparison of the variant forms of the same names in both does, in fact, go far to prove the interdependence of these two manuscripts.

Both DB and Exon are arranged by fiefs. If the procedure of the Domesday enquiry was the same in the south-west as it appears to have been elsewhere in the country, and there is no reason to suppose that it was fundamentally different, the source of these feudally arranged surveys was a series of "original

<sup>1</sup> Olof von Feilitzen, *The Pre-Conquest Personal Names of Domesday Book* (Nomina Germanica 3, Uppsala, 1937), p. 9, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Extensions of manuscript abbreviations are indicated by the use of different type. Initial letters are printed as capitals, regardless of the manuscript reading, but capital letters occurring in other positions are not preserved. Capital *V*, which does not occur in the examples quoted in an initial position, is printed as *u*. All the place-name forms quoted from DB and Exon have been checked in the manuscripts. Cornish examples are omitted from the discussion of individual place-names because they are predominantly Celtic and therefore raise special problems, but the statistics of particular forms, see below pp. 492-7, include the Cornish examples.

<sup>3</sup> The printed text has *Rarnestaple*.

returns " in which the information was arranged by hundreds and by vills. In these, to judge by the *Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensis*,<sup>1</sup> the only fairly complete copy of a set of " original returns " that has been preserved, each vill was named only once. If more than one tenant-in-chief held land in any one vill its name would be repeated in DB under each fief. The rearrangement of the " original returns " into Exon and DB, has, therefore, sometimes resulted in the same name being recorded several times, not always in the same form. It is, of course, not always possible to be certain that similar names in DB (or Exon) refer to the same place and not to different places with the same name, but if those cases are studied where it is fairly certain that the different references are to the same place, the variants in DB under different fiefs are found to parallel the variants in Exon under the same fiefs. If DB was derived from the " original returns " independently of Exon it is extremely unlikely that there would be, in all these cases, such a close correspondence between them in variant forms of the same name. Only a few examples are given below.

| <i>Exon</i>                     | <i>DB</i>              | <i>Modern form etc.</i> <sup>2</sup> |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Meroda . fol. 301b              | Merode . fol. 107      | Marwood. PND 50                      |
| Merehoda . fol. 408b            | Merehode . fol. 115b   |                                      |
| Mereuda . fol. 420              | Mereude . fol. 113     |                                      |
| Wellecóma . fol. 408b           | Wellecome . fol. 115b  | Woolacombe. PND 54                   |
| Wolnecoma <sup>3</sup> fol. 401 | Wolnecome fol. 110     |                                      |
| Herlescoma fol. 407             | Herlescome fol. 115    | Yarnscombe. PND 82                   |
| Hernescoma fol. 293             | Hernescome fol. 106    |                                      |
| Poteforda . fol. 399            | Poteforde . fol. 110   | West Putford. PND 160                |
| Podiforda . fol. 93b            | Podiford . fol. 101    |                                      |
| Boltesberia . fol. 220          | Boltesberie . fol. 105 | Bolberry. PND 307                    |
| Boteberia . fol. 219b           | Boteberie . fol. 105b  |                                      |
| Motberia . fol. 221             | Mortberie . fol. 105   | Modbury. PND 279                     |
| Motbilia . fol. 217b            | Motbilie . fol. 105b   |                                      |

<sup>1</sup> N. E. S. A. Hamilton, *Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensis* (Royal Society of Literature, 1876), pp. 1-96. Referred to here as ICC.

<sup>2</sup> The abbreviations used here for counties and for works on place-names are those used by E. Ekwall, *The Concise Dictionary of English Place-Names* (3rd edn., 1947) with the addition of PNCa—P. H. Reaney, *The place-names of Cambridge-shire* (English Place-Name Society, xix, 1943) and KPN—J. K. Wallenberg, *Kentish Place-Names* (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, 1931). Where forms are given without reference to one of these works the source is Ekwall, *op. cit.*

<sup>3</sup> Altered from *Welnecoma*.

The same correspondence between the two manuscripts is seen in the references to different places with the same name. In these it is possible, although improbable, that the variants are due to the "original returns". For example, many place-names in Somerset and Devon include the OE word *hiwisc*, which has, in these names, developed into the modern form *Huish* :

| <i>Exon</i>     |       |           | <i>DB</i>   |       |           |
|-----------------|-------|-----------|-------------|-------|-----------|
| Hiuuis (× 2)    | . . . | fol. 355  | Hiwis (× 2) | . . . | fol. 95b  |
| Heuuis          | . . . | fol. 427b | Hewis       | . . . | fol. 93b  |
| Hiuuis          | . . . | fol. 442b | Hiwis       | . . . | fol. 94b  |
| Hewis           | . . . | fol. 464  | Hewis       | . . . | fol. 96b  |
| Hewis           | . . . | fol. 220b | Hewis       | . . . | fol. 104b |
| Heuis           | . . . | fol. 322  | Hewis       | . . . | fol. 109  |
| Yuuis           | . . . | fol. 376b | Iwis        | . . . | fol. 116b |
| Hyuuis          | . . . | fol. 388b | Hiwis       | . . . | fol. 112b |
| Heuuisa         | . . . | fol. 400  | Hewis       | . . . | fol. 110b |
| Langehewis      | . . . | fol. 135b | Langehewis  | . . . | fol. 103b |
| Goheuis         | . . . | fol. 292  | Gohewis     | . . . | fol. 106  |
| Meleuis         | . . . | fol. 305  | Melewis     | . . . | fol. 107b |
| Bochyuuis       | . . . | fol. 407  | Bochewis    | . . . | fol. 115  |
| (ad) Yuuesleiam | . . . | fol. 388  | Iweslei     | . . . | fol. 112b |

Other groups of place-names are based on such river names as *Clyst* and *Otter*. Although variations in these are slight in both *Exon* and *DB*, such as there are occur in parallel. A common place-name element in the south west is OE *cumb*. A few examples will serve to show the agreement between *Exon* and *DB* in the forms of this name.

| <i>Exon</i> |       |               | <i>DB</i> |       |               |
|-------------|-------|---------------|-----------|-------|---------------|
| Coma        | . . . | fol. 133 etc. | Come      | . . . | fol. 103 etc. |
| Cōma        | . . . | fol. 220b     | Cume      | . . . | fol. 105b     |
| Cōba        | . . . | fol. 220b     | Combe     | . . . | fol. 105b     |
| Cōba        | . . . | fol. 320      | Cumbe     | . . . | fol. 109      |
| Conba       | . . . | fol. 324b     | Cūbe      | . . . | fol. 109      |
| Lācoma      | . . . | fol. 337      | Lacome    | . . . | fol. 114      |
| Loscūma     | . . . | fol. 368b     | Loscume   | . . . | fol. 111      |

The close correspondence between *Exon* and *DB* in these, and similar, variants indicates a close relationship between the two manuscripts. *Exon*, however, contains much information that is not in *DB* and *DB*, for the area covered by *Exon*, apparently contains nothing that is not in *Exon*. This means that *Exon* could not have been derived from *DB* unless much additional

information was also used. It would be more reasonable to argue that DB derived from Exon. It is not claimed that this is, in itself, sufficient to prove the point, but it is claimed that this evidence supports the conclusion, based on other considerations, that DB was derived directly or through an intermediate stage from Exon.

The discrepancies remarked by von Feilitzen remain. Some are due to the printed version. Baring pointed out that where the printed text has *Loduntona* (p. 352) the manuscript has *Lochintona* (fol. 375) in agreement with DB *Lochintone* (fol. 97b) and that *Hane* (p. 316) should read *Hanc* (fol. 337b) in agreement with DB *Hanc* (fol. 114).<sup>1</sup> An examination of the manuscript shows that there are other such errors in the printed version of Exon :

|                     | <i>Exon</i>                  |                             | <i>DB</i> |             | <i>Modern forms etc.</i> |
|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|-------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Printed text</i> | <i>manuscript</i>            |                             |           |             |                          |
| Gelingeha           | <i>Gelingeham</i> fol. 27b   | <i>Gelingeham</i> fol. 75   |           | Gillingham. | PND <sup>o</sup> 5       |
| Giuelcestre         | <i>Giuelcestre</i> fol. 171b | <i>Giuelcestre</i> fol. 91  |           | Ilchester   |                          |
| Bernurtona          | <i>Bernintona</i> fol. 179   | <i>Bernintone</i> fol. 103b |           | Burrington. | PND 362                  |
| Efforda             | <i>Esforda</i> fol. 301      | <i>Esforde</i> fol. 107     |           | Ashford.    | PND 24                   |

As well as these clear errors there are doubtful readings, some of which will be discussed below.

The remaining discrepancies are of three kinds.

(1) Those names where the scribe of DB has mistranscribed the forms in Exon. Other forms confirm the accuracy of Exon in these and the error in DB is easily explained.

|                 | <i>Exon</i> |            | <i>DB</i>  |                        | <i>Modern forms etc.</i>    |
|-----------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <i>Dorset</i>   |             |            |            |                        |                             |
| Heltona         | . fol. 39   | Eltone     | . fol. 78b | Hilton.                | PND <sup>o</sup> 189        |
|                 |             |            |            | <i>Haltone, Helton</i> |                             |
| Iwerna          | . fol. 49   | Werne      | . fol. 81b | Iwerne.                | PND <sup>o</sup> 10, 26, 57 |
|                 |             |            |            | <i>Iwern(e)</i>        |                             |
| <i>Somerset</i> |             |            |            |                        |                             |
| Betministra     | fol. 90b    | Beiminstre | . fol. 86b | Bedminster             |                             |
|                 |             |            |            | <i>Bedmenistr(a)</i>   |                             |
| Briuuetona      | fol. 90b    | Brumetona  | . fol. 86b | Bruton                 |                             |
|                 |             |            |            | <i>Briweton</i>        |                             |
| Babakari        | . fol. 277b | Babachan   | . fol. 92b | Babcary                |                             |
|                 |             |            |            | <i>Babekary</i>        |                             |
| Nonin           | . fol. 364  | Noiun      | . fol. 96b | Nunney.                |                             |
|                 |             |            |            | <i>Nony, Nuni</i>      |                             |

(This is a simple confusion of minims and the form in Exon might easily be mistaken for *Noiun*.)

<sup>1</sup> Baring, *Eng. Hist. Rev.* xxvii (1912), 316-7.

| <i>Exon</i>          | <i>DB</i>           | <i>Modern forms etc.</i>                |
|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Ciretona . fol. 364b | Eiretone . fol. 96b | Cheriton<br><i>Chirintone</i>           |
| Telma . fol. 447     | Teluae . fol. 98    | Elm<br><i>Theaumes, Elme</i>            |
| <i>Devon</i>         |                     |   |
| Pinnoe . fol. 95b    | Pinnoch . fol. 101  | Pinhoe. PND 443<br><i>Peonho, Pinho</i> |

(The *-e* of Exon in this name might easily be read as *-c*. The reverse is the case for Cheriton above.)

|                                 |                                |   |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| Pillanda . fol. 127b            | Welland . fol. 102b            | Pilland. PND 55<br><i>Pilland</i>                             |
| Pedicches-<br>wella . fol. 127b | Wediches-<br>welle . fol. 102b | Pickwell. PND 44<br><i>Pido(c)keswell</i>                     |
| Dinintona . fol. 219            | Dunintone . fol. 105b          | Dinnaton. PND 269<br><i>Dynenton</i>                          |
| Dueltona . fol. 295             | Oueltone . fol. 106b           | Dolton. PND 366<br><i>Duvelton(e)</i>                         |
| Clisewic . fol. 339b            | Chisewic . fol. 114            | Clyst St. George. PND<br>585<br><i>Clyst wicon, Clistwiķe</i> |

(2) This group includes those names where the scribe of DB has attempted to correct real or apparent errors in Exon or has correctly extended abbreviations in Exon. It would not be unreasonable to suggest that a scribe familiar with OE place-names could have extended, or corrected, the following :

|                         |                      |                              |
|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|
| Langat' . fol. 59       | Langetone . fol. 83b | Langton Herring. PND<br>247  |
| Esteha . fol. 105b      | Estham . fol. 87     | Eastham. So.                 |
| Brstou . fol. 141b      | Bristou . fol. 88    | Bristol. So.                 |
| Hordcerleia . fol. 147b | Horcerlei . fol. 88b | Orchardleigh. So.            |
| Draintuna . fol. 429b   | Draitune . fol. 94   | Drayton. So.                 |
| Fihida . fol. 431b      | Fifhide . fol. 94    | Fivehead. So.                |
| Didasá . fol. 120b      | Didasham . fol. 102  | Dittisham. PND 322           |
| Bochelan . fol. 123     | Bocheland . fol. 102 | Buckland Filleigh. PND<br>90 |
| Wafforda . fol. 392b    | Wasforde . fol. 112  | Washford Pyne. PND 397       |

That the DB scribe did sometimes correct his source is shown very clearly in those cases where the "correction" was itself an error. For example, Exon *Notforda* (fol. 31b) is in agreement with other early forms of Nutford in Dorset, the name clearly being derived from OE *hnutu* plus *ford*. This name is written as *Nortforde* in DB (fol. 75b), presumably on the (incorrect)

assumption that its first element was OE *norþ*. Elsewhere DB correctly makes the same alteration, i.e. *Nortmoltone* (DB fol. 101) for *Normoltonę* (Exon fol. 95); North Moltone, cf. PND 344.

In Exon prepositions are sometimes joined to names and generally DB separates them, e.g. *Adbrigam* (Exon fol. 57) becomes *ad Brigam* (DB fol. 83b), but in one case DB made a mistake in doing this. *Incrintona* (x 3, Exon fol. 402) becomes *Crintone* (DB fol. 110b) for Ilkerton, Devon; cf. PND 64 where other early forms are given, e.g. *Hilcrinton*, *Ilcrynton*.

The correction of *Rluperiga* (Exon fol. 397) to *Luperige* (DB fol. 112b) for Lupridge (cf. PND 303) may have been due to the preceding entry in Exon, *Luperiga*. Similarly the alteration of *Eriñtona* (Exon fol. 85b) to *Ermentone* (DB fol. 100b) for Ermington (cf. PND 272) may have been due to the occurrence in the margin of the same folio of Exon of the form (*ad*) *Hermentonam*.<sup>1</sup> Whether or not this is a reasonable explanation it is worth remarking that a similar extension occurs in the case of Galmpton (cf. PND 304), where Exon has *Walenītona* (fol. 322) and DB has *Walementone* (fol. 109). In both cases the minims here read as *-in-* or *-ni-* may in fact read *-m-*.

There are three further cases where DB corrects a corrupt form in Exon.

| <i>Exon</i>            | <i>DB</i>             | <i>Modern forms etc.</i> |
|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Speftesberia fol. 47b  | Spehtesberie fol. 82  | Spettisbury. PND 76      |
| Bulfestrensis fol. 182 | Bucfestre . fol. 103b | Buckfast. PND 293        |
| Bulfestra . fol. 183   | Bucfestre . fol. 104  | Buckfast. PND 293        |
| Morchetona fol. 169    | Monechetone fol. 90b  | West Monkton. So.        |

In the first of these the extraordinary form *Speft-* is almost certainly an error for *Spest-* where the *-st-* stands for OE *-ht-*. This is not unusual in Exon and where it occurs DB frequently alters it to *-ht-*. The scribe of DB may well have recognized this *-ft-* form as an error. The other examples cannot be so conveniently explained. It is possible, however, that Exon was not the immediate source of DB but that there was an intermediate stage, a fair copy or slightly abbreviated version of Exon.<sup>2</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> The probability of this is increased by the fact that when Exon has the form *Erñtone* (fol. 218) without any such fuller reading nearby, DB has *Erñtone* also (fol. 105b).

<sup>2</sup> This was suggested by V. H. Galbraith, *Eng. Hist. Rev.* lvii (1942), 165-6.



preparation of such a copy might have provided an opportunity for some doubtful readings in Exon to be checked against its source, the "original returns" of the enquiry. This may be the explanation of some of the corrections discussed above. There are, therefore, a few names that have better forms in DB than in Exon. Whether or not the explanations suggested above are acceptable, these cases are certainly not numerous or startling enough to be regarded as insuperable obstacles to the acceptance of Exon as the source, direct or indirect, of DB. It is worth remarking that the differences between Exon and DB discussed under this heading are, with three or four exceptions, of a different kind from those listed in the preceding group.

(3) The third, and last, group of discrepancies between the place-name forms in Exon and DB includes those names where the two manuscripts exhibit different scribal traditions. For example, where Exon uses *w* or *uu* as if to serve both for the consonant *w* and a following vowel, DB uses *w*, *uu* or *u* and a vowel.

| <i>Exon</i>                      | <i>DB</i>            | <i>Modern forms etc.</i>           |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| Luluurda . fol. 28               | Luluorde . fol. 75   | Lulworth. PND <sub>o</sub> 140     |
| Oscheruulla <sup>1</sup> fol. 42 | Oscherwille fol. 78b | Askerswell. PND <sub>o</sub> 237-8 |
| Wllega . fol. 144b               | Wilege . fol. 88b    | Wooley. So.                        |

A few examples will serve to illustrate the variety of such scribal differences between the two manuscripts.

| <i>Exon</i>                     | <i>DB</i>                      | <i>Modern forms etc.</i>                   |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Obpe Win-<br>borna fol. 27      | Opewinburne fol. 75            | Wimborne St. Giles.<br>PND <sub>o</sub> 87 |
| Medessan . fol. 29b             | Medesham . fol. 75b            | Edmondsham. PND <sub>o</sub> 101           |
| Canolla . fol. 62               | Cnolle . fol. 82b              | Knowle. PND <sub>o</sub> 132               |
| Nortchori . fol. 105            | Nortcuri . fol. 86b            | North Curry. So.                           |
| Sheptuna . fol. 276             | Sceptone . fol. 92b            | Shepton Montague. So.                      |
| Bisobestona fol. 280            | Biscopestone fol. 93           | ? So.                                      |
| Bristriche-<br>stona fol. 331   | Brictricestone fol. 110        | Brixton Barton. PND 258                    |
| Bristeles-<br>borda . fol. 481b | Bristeles-<br>worde . fol. 118 | Brexworthy. PND 133                        |
| Coltesborda fol. 481b           | Coltesworde fol. 118           | ? D.                                       |

In these last two examples the printed text has *-horda* and this may be a correct reading although *-borda*, with *-b-* for *-w-*, is

<sup>1</sup> This reading, with *-uu-*, is that of the printed text. The manuscript has four minims that could be read as *-wi-*.

both possible and more likely. These may be compared with the forms for Bloxworth (cf. PND<sup>o</sup> 65) where Exon has *Blochesborda* (fol. 36b) and DB has *Blocheshorde* (fol. 77b).

It was probably as clear to the scribe of DB as it is to philologists today that at least some of the scribes of Exon were not completely familiar with the native English tongue. In fact, von Feilitzen has written, "At the same time Exon in some respects shows stronger traces of Anglo-Norman scribal influence than DB, e.g. the extreme frequency of prosthetic *e* before *s* plus *a consonant*, the frequent use of the letter *y* for OE *i* and the practically consistent unvoicing of final *-d* to *-t* in *-fort*, *-lant*, etc."<sup>1</sup>

It will not be possible, here, to discuss this judgement of von Feilitzen's in full but a few examples may serve to draw attention to some of Exon's peculiarities. The first example of Anglo-Norman or French scribal influence in Exon referred to by von Feilitzen is the occurrence of prosthetic *e* before initial *S* plus *a consonant*. This occurs also in DB itself and is almost certainly due to French influence.<sup>2</sup> Thus, Sleaford in Lincolnshire is *Sliowaford* in an OE text but in DB is written *Eslaforde*, Smithdown in Lancashire from OE *smēpe* plus *dūn* became *Esmedune* in DB, and Snodland in Kent is *Snoddingland* in an OE text but in DB is *Esnoiland*.

It is, as von Feilitzen remarked, extremely frequent in Exon but is generally corrected in the equivalent entries in DB. There are in the place-names of Exon 69 examples of it<sup>3</sup> and under 47 cases where it might have occurred but did not.<sup>4</sup> Of the 69

<sup>1</sup> von Feilitzen, p. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 72, M. K. Pope, *From Latin to Modern French* (2nd edn., 1952), §§ 361, 603, 1106.

<sup>3</sup> This total excludes *Hesmalacoma* (Exon fol. 313b) which in DB (fol. 108b) appears as *Smelecome*, Smallicombe, cf. PND 628. It also excludes place-names in *Ess-*, e.g. *Essecestra* (Exon fol. 94b), cf. PND 20-1. It is interesting to note that DB preserves the initial *E-* in these names and also in such cases as *Esselingaforda* (Exon fol. 468b), cf. DB fol. 117b, *Esselingeforde*; Shillingford, cf. PND 503 and *Essapla* (Exon fol. 488), cf. DB fol. 118b, *Essaple*; Shapleigh, cf. PND 470 where this form from DB is not quoted. If the index to the *Liber Exoniensis*, in the same volume as the printed text, is used for the compilation of statistics of forms in Exon, care has to be taken to exclude forms from the Geld accounts, see p. 484, n. 1.

<sup>4</sup> This total comprises 33 in *St-*, 5 in *Sp-*, 5 in *Sc-*, 2 in *Sh-*, 1 in *Sc-*, and 1 in *Sch-*. Abbreviations of *Sanctus*, etc., are not included.

DB corrects 65.<sup>1</sup> There are in Exon 14 cases of etymological *E-* in *Es-* plus a consonant, e.g. *Esforde*, *Estone*, *Estham*, *Escewiche*. DB generally preserves the initial *E-* in these, it being clearly etymological. But in one case DB drops such an initial *E-*, i.e. Eastrip, near Brewham, Somerset from OE *ēast* plus *ƿorp* which is *Estropa* in Exon (fol. 382b) but *Storpe* in DB (fol. 97b).

Exon and DB have 139 names in common having OE *ford* as a final element. Of these 90 are inflected in Exon, e.g. *-forda*, and do not have final *-d*. Of the remainder 40 have *-fort* and only 9 (all in Somerset and Dorset) preserve the *-d*. There is none with final *-t* in DB, 110 being in *-d*, and 29 in *-de*, the latter corresponding to inflected names in Exon. Similarly of the 47 names common to Exon and DB with OE *land* as a final element, 38 in Exon are inflected, 8 are in *-lant* and one in *-lan*. There is none with final *-t* in DB. This unvoicing of *-d* to *-t* is probably due to Anglo-Norman influence. Von Feilitzen considers most cases of DB *t* for OE *d* as due to this but remarks that "there was also a tendency in OE for final *d* to become *t* in unstressed positions, especially after *n*, *r* and *l*. . . . Hence DB *-t* < *-d* may sometimes reflect native sound-development."<sup>2</sup> Even if *-t* was a possible phonological development in some dialects this spelling indicates a certain orthographic non-conservativeness, itself probably due to Anglo-Norman influence. Whatever the explanation of this characteristic of Exon, it is remarkable that DB restores the traditional *-d*.

Among the other consistent differences between Exon and DB the cases where DB has *-ge-* for Exon's *-ghe-* may be noted.

| <i>Exon</i>        |           |  | <i>DB</i>         |           |  |
|--------------------|-----------|--|-------------------|-----------|--|
| Ringhesteta . . .  | fol. 60   |  | Ringestede . . .  | fol. 83b  |  |
| Ringhestede . . .  | fol. 60   |  | Ringestede . . .  | fol. 83b  |  |
| Peghenes . . .     | fol. 477  |  | Pegens . . .      | fol. 98b  |  |
| Ringhendona . . .  | fol. 300  |  | Ringedone . . .   | fol. 107  |  |
| Eighebera . . .    | fol. 307b |  | Eigebere . . .    | fol. 107b |  |
| Langhestan . . .   | fol. 311b |  | Langestan . . .   | fol. 108  |  |
| Chenighedona . . . | fol. 343b |  | Chenigedone . . . | fol. 114b |  |

<sup>1</sup> The 4 that DB does not correct are:

| <i>Exon</i>   |           | <i>DB</i>     |           | <i>Modern forms</i> |
|---------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|---------------------|
| Esturt . . .  | fol. 272b | Esturt . . .  | fol. 92   | Stert, So.          |
| Estana . . .  | fol. 431b | Estone . . .  | fol. 94   | Stone, So.          |
| Eslida . . .  | fol. 445  | Eslide . . .  | fol. 94b  | Lyde, So.           |
| Estreta . . . | fol. 340b | Estrete . . . | fol. 114b | Strete Raleigh. PND |

<sup>2</sup> von Feilitzen, pp. 96-7.

Von Feilitzen speaks of this characteristic of Exon as "in accordance with Continental usage" and according to Miss Pope it is a northern French feature.<sup>1</sup>

In DB generally the voiceless stop (k) is represented before *e* and *i* by *ch*. Von Feilitzen explains this as "in accordance with Anglo-Norman usage",<sup>2</sup> It is extremely frequent in Exon, although less so than in DB owing to the prevalence in the former of endings in *-a*. For example :

| <i>Exon</i> |   |   |           | <i>DB</i> |   |   |          |
|-------------|---|---|-----------|-----------|---|---|----------|
| Wica        | . | . | fol. 144  | Wiche     | . | . | fol. 88b |
| Estoca      | . | . | fol. 146b | Stoche    | . | . | fol. 88b |
| Cruca       | . | . | fol. 89   | Cruche    | . | . | fol. 86  |

but

|             |   |   |           |             |   |   |          |
|-------------|---|---|-----------|-------------|---|---|----------|
| Chingestona | . | . | fol. 150b | Chingestone | . | . | fol. 89  |
| Bichecōma   | . | . | fol. 358b | Bichecome   | . | . | fol. 95b |
| Estochet    | . | . | fol. 267b | Stochet     | . | . | fol. 92  |

Infrequently Exon has *ch* for (k) in other positions, for example :

|        |   |   |          |       |   |   |         |
|--------|---|---|----------|-------|---|---|---------|
| Churi  | . | . | fol. 89  | Churi | . | . | fol. 86 |
| Cochra | . | . | fol. 107 | Cocre | . | . | fol. 87 |
| Acha   | . | . | fol. 433 | Ache  | . | . | fol. 94 |

Exon sometimes uses the letter *k* where DB has *ch*, for example :

|                 |   |   |           |                  |   |   |          |
|-----------------|---|---|-----------|------------------|---|---|----------|
| Kingesberia     | . | . | fol. 156  | Chingesberie     | . | . | fol. 89  |
| Babakari        | . | . | fol. 277b | Babachan         | . | . | fol. 92b |
| Kinuardestuna   | . | . | fol. 283  | Chinwardestone   | . | . | fol. 91b |
| Sparkeforda     | . | . | fol. 352b | Spercheforde     | . | . | fol. 95  |
| Kaiuert         | . | . | fol. 384  | Chaiuert         | . | . | fol. 97b |
| Pokintuna (× 2) | . | . | fol. 429b | Pochintune (× 2) | . | . | fol. 93b |

The use of the letter *k* was rare but not unknown in both OE and old French.<sup>3</sup>

The discrepancies between the place-name forms of Exon and DB are, therefore, not necessarily an obstacle to the acceptance of the dependance of DB on Exon. In fact they offer a very interesting field for philological analysis, for by comparing them it is possible to study, in a large number of examples, at least something of the process by which the DB forms were achieved. The possibilities offered by such an analysis have not been

<sup>1</sup> von Feilitzen, p. 112, Pope, § 701.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 107, cf. Pope, §§ 690, 1209.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 109.

exploited here and consequently only very tentative conclusions can be offered. Briefly these are that Exon was apparently the work of scribes some of whom were unfamiliar with English, presumably Frenchmen or Normans. The orthographic peculiarities of Exon cannot all be said to be due to French influence, but the association of such fairly certain French characteristics as prosthetic *e-* before *s* plus *a consonant* with others, less definitely French, such as the unvoicing of final-*d* to *-t* supports the supposition that the latter were in fact due to French influence.

The tendency in DB to remove these and replace a more normal OE orthography implies, as do the corrections made in DB, that its scribes were familiar with OE orthography and probably included Englishmen. Von Feilitzen has himself suggested the possibility that "native scribes may occasionally have been employed in the compilation of the returns", but adds that there is also "the possibility that in the twenty years that had elapsed since the Conquest and the time of the Survey some of the Norman clerks may have acquired a working knowledge of Anglo-Saxon orthography and of the traditional spelling of some of the more common personal names".<sup>1</sup> This comparison of Exon and DB suggests that English scribes, or Normans who had familiarized themselves with English, were employed in the final stages of the Domesday enquiry as well as in the compilation of the "original returns". It may further be argued that such corrections as are made in DB would have come more naturally to Englishmen than to foreigners who had learnt the language. A further point is that where DB does not consistently alter the orthography of Exon, for example, both Exon and DB use *ch* for (k) before *e* and *i*, we are dealing with a general characteristic. As it cannot be suggested that this example was a native development it seems probable that it was a very generally accepted Anglo-Norman convention.

Exon is in many ways similar to volume two of Domesday Book, which is sometimes known as Little Domesday Book and is here referred to as LDB. Both are written in single columns

<sup>1</sup> von Feilitzen p. 7, n. 1.

in several hands that differ from the set hand of DB. Both contain categories of information not included in DB, both use similar formulae not used in DB and neither is such a tidy manuscript as DB. It has in fact been suggested that they are both local rearrangements of the "original returns" of the Domesday enquiry and that while Exon was further condensed into DB, LDB was for some reason not so treated.<sup>1</sup>

If the place-names of LDB are studied the first characteristic that is noticed is that, as in Exon, many are inflected. For example :

|          |                               |
|----------|-------------------------------|
| fol. 9b  | in Slamondesheia tenet . . .  |
| fol. 10b | Wareleiam tenuit Guert . . .  |
| fol. 31  | Fifhidam tenet Ricardus . . . |

In this LDB may be contrasted with DB where far fewer names are inflected, the normal forms there being, for example :

fol. 2b Tarentefort, Hagelei, Elesford, Middeltune, Middeltun, Faureshant.

Von Feilitzen remarks that LDB "preserves a greater number of traditional OE spellings than" DB.<sup>2</sup> In his discussion of particular personal names he places the forms found in the Domesday texts in order of development, and in many cases the first forms quoted come from LDB, for example :

OE *Ēadnoð* ; *Ætnod*, *Ætnodus*, *Ednoth* from LDB followed by other forms such as *Ednod* from DB.

OE *Lēofsige* ; *Leofsi*, *Leofsius* from LDB followed by *Lefsi*, etc. from DB.

Cf. also *Ēadmund*, *Ēadrīc*, *Lēofric*, *Lēofwine*, *Ulfkell*, *Ūhtræd*, *Wulfhēah*, etc.

In one respect the place-names of LDB are strikingly similar to those of Exon. In both manuscripts there is a tendency to unvoice final *-d* to *-t*. LDB contains 413 names with OE *ford* as a final element. Of these 200 have the form *-forda* but of the remainder only 41 preserve *-d* while 172 have *-t*. This may be contrasted with DB where of the 747 such names, 194 do not end in *-d* but generally have the form *-forde*, of the remainder 536 preserve *-d* while there are only 17 cases of *-fort*, these being in eight counties.

It is, however, not possible to say, because of this preponderance of unvoiced final *-d* in LDB, that it exhibits more French

<sup>1</sup> By V. H. Galbraith, *Eng. Hist. Rev.* lvii (1942), 161-77.

<sup>2</sup> von Feilitzen, p. 6.

influence than DB. The critical test of that influence is the occurrence of prosthetic *e-* before *s* plus a *consonant*. LDB has fewer cases of this than might be expected, for example :

Exon has 33 place-names in *St-*; and 61 in *Est-*,  
 DB has 550 place-names in *St-*; and 170 in *Est-*,  
 LDB has 182 place-names in *St-*; and 35 in *Est-*.

LDB has, therefore, a greater proportion of *St-* names than *Est-* names and cannot be compared with Exon in this respect.

The orthography of LDB is certainly different from that of DB. For example, it has 41 place-names with initial *Ph-* for *F-*, while Exon and DB have none. It has 121 place-names with initial *K-* while in DB there are only 13 and in Exon only 6. As shown above DB tended to alter Exon's (-)k- to (-)ch-, so there is in this a slight parallel between LDB and Exon although it is only slight. Von Feilitzen explains the use of the symbols *-st-* for OE *-ht-* as due to Anglo-Norman influence and has calculated that there are in personal names 220 examples of this in Exon, 63 in LDB and 111 in DB.<sup>1</sup>

These orthographical peculiarities of LDB are not necessarily indicative of direct French scribal influence, although they are clear evidence of a different scribal tradition from that of DB. No satisfactory explanation of this differing tradition can be offered here. It is possible that the scribes of LDB had acquired certain habits such as the unvoicing of final *-d* to *-t* from Continental scribes, but it is also possible that the scribal tradition of LDB was native. It is, however, clear that the orthography of LDB deserves close consideration.

This orthographical analysis of the three main Domesday texts shows that the compilation of Domesday Book was not, linguistically, a simple matter. Zachrisson's view that "from a linguistic point of view we have to look upon Domesday Book as an essentially Norman and French work", accepted by von Feilitzen, needs revision.<sup>2</sup>

Philologists, in discussing the orthography of Domesday Book, have explained the French influence it exhibits by the

<sup>1</sup> von Feilitzen, pp. 121-2. Cf. Pope, §§ 378, 1178, 1216.

<sup>2</sup> R. E. Zachrisson, *A Contribution to the Study of Anglo-Norman Influence on English Place Names* (Lund, 1909), p. 60, cf. von Feilitzen, p. 8.

assumption that the scribes responsible were generally French. Zachrisson wrote: "This (French) influence culminates in Domesday Book, where English place names are recorded by French clerks on the oral evidence of English and French jurors. . . ." <sup>1</sup> His pupil, von Feilitzen, has expressed the same opinion: "Though . . . there is the possibility that English scribes may occasionally have been employed by the Domesday commissioners and in the royal chancery, the philological as well as the historical evidence leaves no doubt that the vast majority of the clerks responsible . . . must have been Normans." <sup>2</sup>

It has been suggested above that Englishmen played a large part in the final stage of the compilation of DB. There is also evidence that the early stages of the enquiry preserved much better place-name forms than those found in DB. This would not prove that Englishmen were responsible for these stages as well although it increases the probability that this was the case. It does, however, show that the process by which the place-name forms of DB were achieved was very complicated.

One of the most important texts deriving from the early stages of the Domesday enquiry is the *Inquisitio Eliensis*, an account of the estates held or claimed by the Abbey of Ely in Cambridgeshire, Huntingdonshire, Hertfordshire, Essex, Suffolk, and Norfolk. <sup>3</sup> It is preserved in three manuscripts, A, B, and C. B and C are independent copies of one exemplar, A is a copy of B. Von Feilitzen noticed that IE(B) and IE(C) "frequently preserve the late OE forms practically intact, whereas the spellings of A . . . are more worn down". <sup>4</sup> But as he accepted Round's explanation of the sources of IE, that is that for Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex it derived from LDB, which has worse forms than IE, he was forced to conclude that the better forms in IE are due to corrections made by the scribe(s) of IE. <sup>5</sup> In fact Round himself thought that IE incorporated corrections and

<sup>1</sup> R. E. Zachrisson, "The French Element", *Introduction to the Survey of English Place-Names* (English Place-Name Society, vol. i, pt. i, 1929), pp. 98-9.

<sup>2</sup> von Feilitzen, p. 8.

<sup>3</sup> N. E. S. A. Hamilton, *op. cit.* pp. 97-191. Referred to here as IE.

<sup>4</sup> von Feilitzen, p. 10.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 8, n. 1.



additions to the information found in its source.<sup>1</sup> Von Feilitzen writes: "The fact that the orthography of English names in IE (B, C), which is held to be copied from the actual Domesday returns, shows a definitely OE character hardly warrants the conclusion that the documents on which it is based were drawn up by English scribes. If the Ely clerks, who were most probably Englishmen, excerpted or copied an Anglo-Norman return they would naturally try to restore the familiar OE forms of place- and personal-names."<sup>2</sup> He refers to Round in support of his claim that IE "is held to be copied from the actual Domesday returns". In fact Round is here only speaking of the Cambridgeshire section of IE; for Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex he argued that its source was LDB.

LDB was, however, not the source of IE for Norfolk and Suffolk. For these counties IE contains information not found in LDB.<sup>3</sup> Round thought that such information was supplied by the scribe of IE, but a detailed comparison of the two texts shows that for these two counties the source of IE was arranged in a different way from LDB and it has been suggested<sup>4</sup> that the best explanation is that for these counties IE and LDB had the same ultimate source, a rearrangement of the "original returns". It is therefore unnecessary to argue that the name forms of IE are an improvement on those of its source, which may well have had better forms than LDB. It is possible that these were better preserved in IE than in LDB.

It is, unfortunately, impossible to prove that such corrections or improvements did not take place, but there are some indications that when the various texts were copied the names were corrupted rather than corrected.

There is no reason to doubt Round's suggestion that for Cambridgeshire, DB, IE and the *Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensis* (here referred to as ICC) had the same source, the "original returns" of the Domesday Enquiry.<sup>5</sup> The ICC is a twelfth-century manuscript and is in many ways a bad text, its

<sup>1</sup> J. H. Round, *Feudal England* (1895), pp. 130-3.

<sup>2</sup> von Feilitzen, p. 8, n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> C. Johnson, *Victoria History of the County of Norfolk*, ii, 4, 134-8.

<sup>4</sup> By the present writer, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, lxx (1955), 187-9.

<sup>5</sup> Round, *op. cit.* pp. 8, 135-9.

names frequently being corrupt. But it sometimes preserves a slightly better name form than DB. For example :

- (i) ICC p. 23 *Wrattinga* ; DB fols. 190b, 195b, 196b, 198, 199 *Waratinge* for *Wrattung*. Cf. PNCa 121-2 where other early forms point to the first element OE *wrætt*.
- (ii) ICC p. 32 *Wicham* ; DB fols. 191, 193b, 196b × 2, 198 *Wicheham* for *West Wickham*. Cf. PNCa 112.
- (iii) ICC p. 43 *Trippelaue* ; DB fols. 191, 197 *Trepeslau*, fol. 199 *Trepesai* for *Thriplow*. Cf. PNCa 90.

Sometimes IE (B) or (C) and ICC agree in a better form than DB. For example :

- (i) ICC p. 3 *Sneilewuelle* ; IE (B, C) p. 101 *Sneillewelle* ; DB fol. 199 *Snellewelle* for *Snailwell*. Cf. PNCa 195-6 where other early forms point to OE *snægel* as the first element.
- (ii) ICC p. 19 *Westlai* ; IE (B, C) p. 104 *Westlai* ; DB fols. 190b, 195b, 197b, 202 *Weslai* for *Westley Waterless*. Cf. PNCa 120.
- (iii) ICC p. 66 *Meldeburna* ; IE (B, C) p. 109 *Meldeburna* ; DB fols. 191b, 193b, 198b *Melleburne*, fol. 194b *Melleborne* for *Melbourn*. Cf. PNCa 58 where other early forms show that the *-d-* is etymological.
- (iv) ICC p. 94 *Ramtuna* ; IE (B) p. 112 *Ramtuna*, (C) *Rāptune* ; DB fol. 201 *Rantone* for *Rampton*. Cf. PNCa 183.

The superiority of IE and ICC over DB in these examples is slight, but if it is argued that the forms in IE are the result of improvements made by the scribe of IE, this argument must also apply to ICC. The numerous bad forms in ICC give little support to any such suggestion that ICC corrected these few names independently of IE. A more reasonable explanation is that the source of both IE and ICC had better forms than DB and that these forms are better preserved in IE than in DB or ICC.

The argument that the early stages of the Domesday enquiry preserved much better name forms than those in DB is supported by an examination of other manuscripts deriving from the early stages of the same enquiry in other counties. In fact, all these "Domesday Satellites" contain many name forms that are better than those of DB, even though most of the texts are late copies containing independent corruptions.

*The Domesday Monachorum of Christ Church, Canterbury* (here referred to as D Mon)<sup>1</sup> contains several sections that are related

<sup>1</sup> Edited by D. C. Douglas for the Royal Historical Society (1944).

to the Domesday enquiry and these are all in a hand that may be dated paleographically about 1100.<sup>1</sup> The relations between some of the "Domesday" sections of this manuscript and Domesday Book have not been determined, and although any attempt to do this will have to take name forms into account, a discussion of these cannot be dissociated from a detailed analysis of the manuscripts and their arrangement which would be out of place here. Only two of these sections will, therefore, be considered.

- (i) D Mon fols. 2<sup>v</sup>-5; pp. 81-95 in Douglas' edition. An account of the Kentish estates of the Archbishop and the monks of Christ Church, Canterbury.
- (ii) D Mon fols. 5<sup>v</sup>-7; pp. 99-104 in Douglas' edition. A list of almost all the Domesday estates in Kent, other than those dealt with in (i) above and those of the Bishop of Rochester, beginning *Rex tenet Derteford*.

It has been argued that the date of the first section is 1087 but that this copy "cannot have been written down at earliest before the end of 1089".<sup>2</sup> Professor Douglas has shown that this section and the equivalent parts of DB have a common source and he suggested that this source was the "original returns".<sup>3</sup> Many of the place-name forms in this section are very much better than their equivalents in DB. For example:

| <i>D Mon</i>       | <i>DB</i>          | <i>Modern forms etc.</i>                                |
|--------------------|--------------------|---|
| Bixle . p. 86      | Bix . . fol. 3     | Bexley. KPN 134<br><i>Byxlea, Bixlea</i>                |
| Sunderhersce p. 87 | Sondresse . fol. 3 | Sundridge. PNK 69.<br><i>Sunderhirse, Sunderersce</i>   |
| Mellingettes p. 87 | Metlinges . fol. 3 | Malling. KPN 253-4<br><i>Meallinges, (of) mealligan</i> |
| Boctune . p. 91    | Boltone . fol. 4   | Boughton Malherbe. PNK 203                              |
| Langeport . p. 92  | Lampport . fol. 4b | Old Langport. PNK 483-4                                 |
| Lenham . p. 93     | Lerham . fol. 4b   | Lenham. KPN 94-5<br><i>Lean(a)ham</i>                   |
| Freningeham p. 95  | Forningeham fol. 4 | Farningham. KPN 326-7<br><i>Fringingaham</i>            |

Besides such organic differences the place-names in this

<sup>1</sup> D. C. Douglas, *D Mon*, p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 23, n. 3.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 16-21.

section of D Mon are often orthographically much closer to the traditional OE forms than those in DB. For example :

| <i>D Mon</i>      | <i>DB</i>           | <i>Modern forms etc.</i>                                     |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Stursæte . p. 81  | Estursete . fol. 3b | West Gate. KPN 164<br><i>Stursete</i>                        |
| Stutinges . p. 83 | Estotinghes fol. 4  | Stowting. KPN 324-5<br><i>Stuting</i>                        |
| Otteford . p. 87  | Otefort . fol. 3    | Otford. KPN 90-1<br><i>Otteford</i>                          |
| Liveland . p. 93  | Leuelant . fol. 4   | Leaveland. PNK 286   |
| Godmæresham p. 90 | Gomersham fol. 5    | Godmersham. KPN 145<br>from OE <i>Godmær</i> plus <i>hām</i> |
| Earhede . p. 86   | Erhede . fol. 3     | Erith. KPN 17<br>from OE <i>ǣar</i> plus <i>hȳp</i>          |
| Fleotes . p. 83   | Fletes . fol. 3b    | Fleet. KPN 83<br>from OE <i>flēot</i>                        |

The accuracy, it might be termed archaism, of this section of D Mon is probably due to its source containing better forms than DB. Some of the forms cited might be due to scribes familiar with OE orthography and where the differences between D Mon and DB cannot be explained in this way it could be argued that the Canterbury scribe drew on his knowledge of the estates of his church. Such explanations seem unlikely.

The text of this section of D Mon contains variant forms of important place-names, e.g.

- (i) *Limiuwarlethe* (p. 84), *Limuarled* (p. 91), *Limuarlæd* (p. 92), *Limuarlæd* (p. 92), *Limwarlæd* (pp. 92, 93).
- (ii) *Wiuwarleth* (p. 85), *Wiuuarlæd* (p. 92).
- (iii) *Estrege* (p. 88), *Æstrege* (p. 89), *Æstræie* (p. 90).

The word "lathe" appears in the following forms : *lest* (p. 85), *led* (p. 86), *læth* (p. 89), *læd* (p. 90), *letd* (p. 91). The rubrics of D Mon frequently differ from the names in the text, e.g.

*De Tæneham ; Teneham, Tenham* (p. 85).

*De Derente ; Dærente* (p. 88).

*De Munketune ; Munechetun* (p. 89).

*De Heðe et Saltwde ; Hede, Hedē, Saltwode* (p. 93).

*De Burricestune ; Burgericestune* (p. 95).

These variations imply that when this manuscript was written there was no particularly correct form for many of these names and that scribes were able to take considerable liberties (from the view point of traditional OE orthography) and still preserve forms that are strikingly better than those in DB.

An examination of the other section of D Mon increases the probability that the early stages of the Domesday enquiry had good place-name forms. In this the Kentish estates of tenants-in-chief other than the Archbishop, Christ Church, and the Bishop of Rochester, are arranged, with few exceptions, by sitting tenants and the only information given is the tenant's name, the name of the estate and its assessment in sulungs and yokes. Professor Douglas considered this section to be derived from DB but this is unlikely.<sup>1</sup> It includes some information not in DB and seems to record an earlier state of affairs than DB.<sup>2</sup> It clearly derives from an earlier stage of the enquiry.

Several place-name forms in this section are better than those in DB, for example :

| <i>D Mon</i>       |        | <i>DB</i>         |         | <i>Modern forms etc.</i>   |
|--------------------|--------|-------------------|---------|--|
| Wodnesberga        | p. 101 | Gollesberge       | fol. 11 | Woodnesborough. PNK 586. <i>Wodnes-</i>  |
| Trulege . . .      | p. 102 | Treuelai . . .    | fol. 10 | Throwley. PNK 298<br><i>T(h)rulege</i>   |
| Suealescliue . . . | p. 103 | Soanecliue . . .  | fol. 10 | Swalecliffe. KPN 281<br>DB form unique   |
| Marcword . . .     | p. 103 | Marourde . . .    | fol. 14 | Mereworth. KPN 188<br><i>Mæreweorðe</i> The c of D Mon is probably a scribal error for e |
| Lenham . . .       | p. 100 | Lertham . . .     | fol. 12 | Lenham. KPN 94<br><i>Lean(a)ham</i>  |
| Herebrichtestune   | p. 101 | Herbretitou . . . | fol. 8  | Harbilton. PNK 211-12.<br>From OE <i>Herebeorht</i> and <i>ingtūn</i>                    |
| Grauesand . . .    | p. 102 | Grauesham . . .   | fol. 7b | Gravesend. PNK 100<br>DB form unique   |
| Boxelei . . .      | p. 100 | Boseleu . . .     | fol. 8b | Boxley. PNK 133<br><i>Boxle(e), Boxle(g)a</i>  |
| Blen . . .         | p. 103 | Blehem . . .      | fol. 14 | Blean. KPN 63<br><i>Blean</i>  |

In a few cases DB has a better form than this section of D Mon, for example :

| <i>D Mon</i>     |        | <i>DB</i>       |         | <i>Modern forms etc.</i>  |
|------------------|--------|-----------------|---------|---|
| Resce . . .      | p. 101 | Riesce . . .    | fol. 7  | Ryarsh. PNK 149-50<br><i>Reiersce, Riese</i> from OE <i>ryge</i> plus <i>ersc</i> |
| Lellesdune . . . | p. 102 | Ledesdune . . . | fol. 7b | Luddesdown. KPN 244<br><i>Hludesduna, Lodesdone</i>                               |

<sup>1</sup> D. C. Douglas, *D Mon*, p. 27, n. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. P. H. Sawyer, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, lxx (1955), 194 and n. 3.

and sometimes both are wrong :

|                     |                      |  |
|---------------------|----------------------|--|
| Latindune . p. 103  | Latintone . fol. 9b  | Nackington. KPN 348-9  |
|                     |                      | Apart from these and one other, <i>Ratin(g)dune</i> , all have <i>N-</i> |
| Warwintune . p. 100 | Warwintone . fol. 12 | Garrington. PNK 523-4  |
|                     |                      | Apart from these all have <i>G-</i>                                      |

The fact that this section of D Mon has, besides a number of better forms than DB, some errors suggests that its source had better forms than DB. There is, in this section, less plausibility in the argument of correction because these estates lay all over Kent and were not the property of Christ Church or the Archbishop.

Kent is very rich in Domesday texts ; there are, besides those in D Mon, two that come from St. Augustine's, Canterbury. One of these has been printed by Ballard with the title *An Eleventh Century Inquisition of St. Augustine's, Canterbury*.<sup>1</sup> It is preserved in the White Book of St. Augustine's, a thirteenth century cartulary, and its editor argues that "it is a copy . . . of a copy made between 1100 and 1154 (or possibly 1124) of an independent compilation made in or before 1087 from the original returns"<sup>2</sup> of the Domesday enquiry. In spite of its lateness and its transmission through several copies it has many forms that are much better than those of DB. For example :

| <i>Inq. Aug.</i>    | <i>DB</i>            | <i>Modern forms etc.</i>                                    |
|---------------------|----------------------|---|
| Lenham . p. 2       | Lertham . fol. 12    | Lenham. KPN 94-5<br><i>Leanaham, Lenham</i>                 |
| Wilrintun . p. 4    | Wirentone . fol. 12  | Wilderton. KPN 333<br><i>Wilretona, Wilretun</i>            |
| Garwynton̄ . p. 16  | Warwintone . fol. 12 | Garrington. KPN 315<br><i>Garwintun'</i>                    |
| Swalcliue . p. 18   | Soanecliue . fol. 10 | Swalecliffe. KPN 281<br><i>Swalewanclifes, Swales-clive</i> |
| Elfgethetun . p. 19 | Æluetone . fol. 12b  | Elvington. PNK 582-3  |

In his discussion of this last name Wallenberg wrote : "The origin of Elvington is clear from the Inq Aug form. It must be OE *Ælfgyþ*, fem. pers. n. plus *tūn*."

<sup>1</sup> *British Academy Records of Social and Economic History*, vol. iv (1920), pt. ii. Referred to here as Inq. Aug. The forms quoted here have been checked in the manuscript.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. xii.

Sometimes the failure to compare the forms in DB with those in Inq Aug has led to mistakes. For example, DB refers to *Eduard de Estan* (fol. 1b). Von Feilitzen identifies this as Stone on the principle that the initial *E-* is prosthetic.<sup>1</sup> Inq Aug (p. 33), however, has *Edward de Terstane* showing that the place was Teston (cf. PNK 166-7) and this is confirmed by DB fol. 8b where Edward is given as the pre-conquest tenant of Teston. The accuracy of Inq Aug is also shown in its personal names. Thus where DB (fol. 1b) has *Aluvinus* (*hor* interlined), Inq Aug has *Alfwyn horn* (p. 33) and is closer to the OE form of this name *Ælfwine*. Similarly Inq Aug has *Edgeth de Eselholte* (p.33) for OE *Ēadgȳð* where DB has *Edid de Aisiholte* (fol. 1b; cf. KPN 293 where other early forms of this place-name include *Hæselholte*).

Another St. Augustine's text, not published, also shows forms better than DB. This is the *Noticia terrarum Sancti Augustini* contained in the same cartulary as Inq Aug.<sup>2</sup> Ballard knew it but thought it derived from Inq Aug. This is not so. Its place among the Domesday texts is difficult to determine but it is quite clear that its source was an earlier stage of the Domesday enquiry than DB. Some of its forms are startlingly good. For example, *Aschmieresfeld* (fol. 15<sup>v</sup>) for Ashenfield where DB has *Esmerefel* (fol. 12), and Inq Aug has *Ethemesisfelde* (p. 5). Wallenberg, PNK 550, was not aware of this form but suggested that it might contain the OE personal name \**Æscmær*.

All these Kentish texts, therefore, support the argument that the early stages of the Domesday enquiry had better place-name forms than DB itself. This does not necessarily mean that the "original returns" were compiled by English scribes. Von Feilitzen's suggestion, quoted above, that Norman scribes could have acquired a working knowledge of Anglo-Saxon orthography is relevant here. We shall probably never know where these scribes came from, but we have no cause to be certain that they were foreigners. The apparent accuracy of the place-name forms in the "original returns" would also be consistent with

<sup>1</sup> von Feilitzen, p. 237, n. 3.

<sup>2</sup> PRO Exchequer (K.R.) Misc. Books, vol. 27, from fol. 14<sup>v</sup>.

the suggestion of Professor Galbraith that these returns were themselves based on documents.<sup>1</sup>

This examination of the place-names of the Domesday manuscripts, although not exhaustive, does show that from a linguistic point of view the compilation of Domesday Book was not a simple matter. Each stage resulted in an increase of error. Thus, Exon has many names that are mistranscribed in DB, LDB "preserves a greater number of traditional spellings than" DB and, if the above argument is accepted, the "original returns" were more reliable than these later stages.

Domesday Book has attracted the attention of philologists not only as a source of English place-name forms but also as the first text of Anglo-Norman. The French influence found in the final product of the enquiry, Domesday Book, is not necessarily to be attributed to the "original returns" nor are these characteristics consistently evidenced in the later stages of the making of Domesday Book.

There is much to be learnt about late eleventh-century orthography and phonology from the Domesday manuscripts but these ought to be treated as a group and not as a collection of separate sources. The name forms of the "satellite texts" are important not simply as variants of those in Domesday Book but as evidence for the way in which the names recorded by the Domesday commissioners or their scribes were copied and recopied, probably by different scribes until the final, and most familiar, forms of Domesday Book were produced. It may also be suggested that the later abbreviations and copies of Domesday Book might prove a profitable field for an investigation of subsequent orthographical and phonological developments in English. In these it is possible to study, not the written forms of names as pronounced locally, but the later treatment of determined name forms.

<sup>1</sup> *Eng. Hist. Rev.* lvii (1942), 171-7. Cf. C. Johnson, *Victoria History of the County of Norfolk*, ii, 2-4.