

THE MAKING OF THE SOMERSET DOMESDAYS

R. WELLDON FINN, M.A.

References to the Exchequer Domesday are distinguished from those of the *Liber Exoniensis* by inclusion of a i or 2 to indicate the number of the column in which the matter in the former appears.

When the idea of compiling a *descriptio* of England originated, we probably shall never know. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle suggests that it was determined upon after 'deep speech' at Gloucester at midwinter, 1085; the colophon of 'Little Domesday' shows that the *descriptio* for some counties at least was made in 1086, and the 'writings'—whatever stage these represent—were brought to King William by the autumn of the same year, before he finally left England. It is however not easy to visualise how an Inquest decreed at Christmas could have been organised and conducted in a season which, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle tells us, was unusually inclement, with such rapidity that its voluminous products were ready for dissection by the spring or early summer of the following year. It must be remembered that this implies that the authorities of every shire, and its landowners, have had to be advised of the action to be taken, and these have had to instruct the officials of Hundred and vill and manor as to what would be required of them, and the last to collect the detailed information. Six months, largely winter months when travelling was at its worst, seem scant time for organisation, collection, and initial inscription of the material. It may be that both the idea and the first stages of the Inquest date to a point earlier than Christmas, 1085, and that the 'deep speech' was concerned with the anomalies and difficulties which had presented themselves.* We know that the Inquest produced opposition in the country, and Domesday Book reflects the difficulties the inquisitors must have encountered.

Whether the representatives of Hundred, vill, and manor journeyed to the shire town or local centre to make their reports, or whether officials made a progress through the Hundreds, is probably indeterminable. A shire-town could hardly contain at

*The absence of mention of young livestock and the fewness of *animalia* and *vaccae* may suggest that the manorial details were collected in or after the autumn. Professor Galbraith has pointed out that inclusion of the demesne beasts suggests that it was intended that the record should have contemporary value.

one and the same time all the witnesses and testifiers; on the other hand, a journey by the inquisitors about the shire would occupy some considerable time. The structure of the Exeter Domesday suggests most strongly that geopolitical considerations governed one aspect of the Inquest. For in almost every fief the manors in the west of the shire, or south of the Mendips, were first inscribed. Those north of the Mendips come next, and each fief ends with the eastern Hundreds. It suggests proceedings based on Taunton, Bath, and perhaps certain other towns, perhaps Wells, and Frome or Milborne or Yeovil.* But the order in which manors appear does not suggest internal geographical regularity or consideration.

It is indeed difficult to think that all the types of information recorded could have been extracted in a single operation. For in addition to the primary statistics, there was obviously enquiry into who owned the land, how he came by it, its former status, and, in cases of dispute, what evidence there was as to the legality of its transfer.

Professor Galbraith has suggested that there may have been not only a geographical return by vills and manors, but a special return for the larger fiefs also, which much of the structure and language of Domesday Book indeed suggests, and that if this was so, the clerks would have had a means of checking that nothing had been omitted.† The account of *Modiforda* (116) includes the phrase *testimonio brevis regis*, as though there is available an independent record of the royal estates. The account of the Glastonbury fief is arranged far less on an hundredal basis than are most fiefs, and the reason might be that a return of the Abbey lands was made independent of hundredal statements.

Either a dual return, or two stages of the Inquest, are often suggested by the material we find bound up in the *Liber Exoniensis* and headed *Terrae Occupatae*, and which, among other minor points, deals principally with the addition of a manor to one of which T.R.E. it was not part, apparently illegal addition of a manor to

*The component parts of the geld-roll Hundred of Yeovil are in different sections of a fief, showing that, e.g., Tintinhull was considered independently of Stone. Each, with Houndsbarrow (Houndstone) and *Liet* (*Lieget*) is named as a Hundred on fols. 63b-64b.

†V. H. Galbraith: *The Making of Domesday Book* (*Eng. Hist. Rev.*, lvii, 1942): *Studies in the Public Records*, p. 99.

the 'honour' of a pre-Conquest landholder, and failure to render former customary dues. Entries in *Terrae Occupatae* were made with far less hundredal regularity than was the Exeter Domesday. The prime geopolitical divisions are well marked, but rarely do all the entries relating to the individual Hundred come together; for example, Cannington manors appear as Nos. 10, 11, 13, 16 and 26—No. 186 is obviously in a postscriptal section. But the order of entries, and the usually close similarity of language and detail to that of Domesday Book, suggest most strongly that one set of material furnished both.* The *Terrae Occupatae* entries relating to a particular fief appear for the most part in an order identical with the order of the manors concerned in the Exeter Domesday: of 27 passages relating to the Bishop of Coutances only one is not in its Exeter Domesday order. The fact of additions to or ablations from a manor is often concealed by the wording of the Exeter Domesday; e.g. fol. 149*b* does not say, as fol. 522 does, that 2½ hides have been added to the manor of *Estona*, merely how much each of three thegns had held T.R.E. There are occasional discrepancies, of fact and language, but these are insufficiently marked to suggest the improbability of common origin.† The information of *Terrae Occupatae* we find in the Exeter Domesday either at the very end of an entry, or (and frequently) postscriptal or marginal. It rather looks as if there may have been two stages of the Inquest; one concerned with manorial equipment, one with descent of the manor.

Duplicate entries, of two types, are common. The usual explanation of their occurrence has been that the clerks were careful, e.g. where there was dispute as to legality of possession, to record the matter in the account of the lands of each of the claimants: if so, they failed to do this often enough. Possibly one entry was derived from a hundredal return, the other from a feudal *breve*, but both may have come from the latter source. Glastonbury holds the manor of Mells, 5½ hides of which are held

*The order of entries is at times disturbed because the clerks, apparently with the general principle of conversion from a geographical and administrative to a feudal basis strongly in mind, grouped together entries relating to the same tenant-in-chief (e.g. fols. 514-5, 515*b*-6, 522*b*).

†e.g. fol. 372 says that half a virgate has been added to the manor of *Strengestona*, fol. 509, two-thirds of half a virgate more: Taunton is assessed at 54 hides on fol. 517, 54½ on fol. 173*b*.

by Azelin of the Bishop of Coutances (*Mulla*, 168, 520) : in the account of the Bishop's lands we find 'Asscelin' holding 5½ hides at *Millescota*, which was near Mells (147*b*, 519*b*), and nothing suggests that the two entries do not in fact refer to the same holding. Something more than sheer carelessness drove the clerks to inscribe within small compass two mentions in the account of each fief, and three in *Terrae Occupatae*, of Roger of Courseulles's ablation of part of Long Sutton from Athelney Abbey (fols. 191, 515 ; 191*b*, 435*b*, 524*b*, 525*b*). Certain manors which Glastonbury seems to have lately lost, and which are recorded at the end of the account of the Glastonbury fief (172*b*), are described also under the fiefs of their new owners, e.g. Hutton and Elborough, *Hutona et Elleberia* on fol. 172*b*, *Hotuna* and *Illibera* on fol. 139*b*, as though these had no common source. It is not very likely that a vill would twice return itself, or that the Hundred would do so : if each major fief made its own return, if only a list of its manors, both *de jure* and *de facto* owners might well include such disputed holdings.

It was for long assumed that the accounts relating to collection of geld referred to the levy of 1083-4 and were made up in the latter year. Professor Galbraith has shown that they suggest 'a special effort to check the collection . . . in the light of a great body of information derived from an inquest' ; and, as he says, this inquest looks very like that of 1086, while there are 'unmistakeable examples of the indebtedness of the geld roll compilers to the primary geographical material of the Domesday inquest.'* I suspect that the Somerset material may represent portions of two copies of the accounts ; fols. 526-7 are smaller than fols. 75-82*b*, and not all in the same script, and an account for Thurlbear (78*b*, 526*b*) appears in each section. The geld accounts tell us of a good deal, e.g. the names of sub-tenants, which did not find its way into Domesday Book. They make mention of places, e.g. *Oda* and *Pirtochesuuorda* (Williton, 79*b*) which, if they were included in the Exeter Domesday, were recorded only as unnamed manorial components. It begins to look as though the Domesday Inquest was a far more complex and comprehensive matter than it was once supposed to be. It is difficult to deduce how and when it was conducted, but we can see the results.

*V. H. Galbraith : *The Date of the Geld Rolls in Exon Domesday* (*Eng. Hist. Rev.*, lxxv, 1950).

The preservation of the Exeter version for the five south-western counties in single compass, and the comparative uniformity of treatment for each shire, make it certain that this group of shires was an unit in the scheme of the Inquest. But how, in what form, and where, was the material from which the clerks of the Exeter Domesday worked derived? Despite the obvious similarities, there are sufficient indications in our Inquest manuscripts to suggest most strongly that, while following certain general instructions, each shire formed an independent unit in the primary scheme, and treated its material in slightly varying ways.

We are perhaps too apt to think, because a copy of the *Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensis* has survived, but nothing else of a similar nature, that the primary record for all shires took an identical or at least a similar form. Obviously the organisers of the Inquest, only some score of years after the Conquest, were obliged to use the Hundred as their secondary unit, and this is reflected throughout the relevant portions of Domesday Book. The order of appearance of manors in each fief in the Exeter Domesday shows that at least in part the clerks were using hundredal returns. Robert of Mortain's fief (265) opens with half-a-dozen manors all of which are in South Petherton. Twenty-seven Cannington manors of Roger of Courseulles (423-6) appear consecutively. Examples could be multiplied indefinitely.* The Somerset text, in contrast to that of most other shires, does not contain references to the testimony of the men of the Hundred, but the scheme bears ample witness to the fact that the unit next to the shire was the Hundred.

But it is by no means as certain that the ultimate unit was the vill. True, the Somerset text speaks of a number of places as *villae*.† But, as Maitland pointed out, the vill of Domesday Book could not have had much organisation.‡ To define a vill would be impossible, and we can hardly think of those minute settle-

*A return for the fief might well also have been arranged by Hundreds: if so, checking would be easier.

†e.g. *Nortchori* (105), *Peghenes* (477): in the geld account *Hame* (82b) is *villa* as well as *mansio*. The term seems to have been loosely used, for in Devonshire Totnes is both *burgus* and *villa* (334). But perhaps there is a hidden distinction between the urban and rural constituents of what is all known as Totnes.

‡F. W. Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond*, p. 12.

ments of western Somerset, manors though they are said to be, as villis; e.g. Downscombe (430), where a solitary inhabitant is recorded, or Pixton (429), where neither inhabitants nor teams is mentioned. It certainly looks as though, when the constituent parts of a shire or Hundred were assessed, that the vill, or a combination of villis, was the unit.* But it is at least doubtful whether 'villis' in, say, the Exmoor region were combined, perhaps to the extent of a dozen or more, to form a five-hide unit, or whether at any time anyone thought of them as villis. It is far more probable that many of these small settlements were not in being when the initial assessment was determined, but that as they arose an appropriate hidage was laid on them, irrespective of combinations of odd virgates and ferlings into an artificial five-hide block. Certainly, many a 'vill' could not have sent a 'priest, reeve, and six *villani*' to the Inquest, as the instructions which preface the *Inquisitio Eliensis* directed: they simply did not exist in these manors where often a bordar or two are the sole persons recorded. This must have been an ideal rather than practice, and a reeve may have responded for several local manors.

Never, as Professor Galbraith has reminded us, were the Normans more feudally-minded than on their arrival in England.† The only form which they could conceive for the ultimate presentation of the Inquest's results was one in terms of the honour, the fief, and the manor, and it may have been, in the older and less artificially assessed parts of Anglo-Saxon England, that the manor was the only unit possible.

The geld accounts suggest most strongly that after the Hundred, the manor was here the unit. Some do not deal with Hundreds as such: we have one which begins in *mansionē Hame sunt xvii hidae* (82*b*), and on fol. 526*b* the manors of Thorn Falcon and of Thurlbear are independently dealt with. The vill indeed was an impossible unit for the collection of geld, for many a vill was split between two or more manors with different owners, and geld had to be collected from the manor's owner or inhabitants. Babcary (277*b*, 466)

*e.g. Pitcott (146, 480) was represented by two manors, one of which by 1086 had been added to the manor of Stratton-on-the-Fosse. But Pitcott's total assessment is five hides: there are many parallel cases. We may think that Tintinhull (7½ hides, fol. 266*b*) and Hescumbe (2¾ hides, fol. 137) had been two villis artificially combined to form a ten-hide block.

† *Studies in the Public Records*, p. 99.

seems to be a 5-hide vill composed of two manors equally rated. The first has no geld-free demesne, and is sub-infeudated; the Bruton geld account (81*b*) shows Humfrey the Chamberlain holding one hide in demesne in the second.*

So, for that matter, does the language of Domesday Book suggest that the manor was the Inquest's unit. The normal formula of the Exeter Domesday is that someone holds *i mansio quae vocatur Y*. It seems that *i mansio* has significance, for the inquisitors have obviously been at pains to find out whether a holding is or has been more than one manor. In Dorset an entry begins *Abbas habet unam mansionem quae vocatur Pidela* (39), and in Somerset Roger of Courseulles is said to have *ii mansiones in Suttona* (435*b*), and William of Mohun *ii mansiones quae vocatur Chiluetun* (360*b*): we are frequently told that what used to be two or more manors is now held for one (e.g. *Stratona* and *Piccota*, fol. 519). This further suggests, with the manor the gelding unit, that there is a connection between an inquest into the state of the manors and one into whether all are gelding as they should. We remember that, according to the preface to the *Inquisitio Eliensis*, the first question to be asked of the jurors is 'what is the name of the manor?', as though the enquiry was being conducted by manors and not by some other unit. Jurors or clerks have been exercised to discover that what has been added to a manor was formerly so many manors, that a hide in the manor of Hardington is really in the manor of Hemington (147, 315), that land is *de mansionem quae vocatur Bodecaleia* (173). I think too that if land individually dealt with was *not* a manor, they usually indicated this even when they did not specifically state it was part of the manor of Y; e.g., they wrote of 'the land (*terra*) which is called *Chent*' (143).† Alternatively they said the land was 'in' some place: e.g., *Pantesheda*, which is not said to be a manor, and is a very small place (433).

*The first manor has 1½ hides of manorial demesne, but Robert of Mortain has no geld-free land in his demesne manors in this Hundred.

†For Kenn we are given only assessment, inhabitants, and value, without any mention of plough-lands or teams or appurtenances, just as we are for components of manors such as *Chintone*, which formerly *iacuit in Bertona* (434*b*), or Oakley (374*b*, 517) which was part of Martock, or *Denesmode-suella* (89*b*) which had been abstracted from Somerton.

The structure of Domesday Book also suggests it. If the unit was the vill, and there was in it more than one manor, both in the same fief, why did the jurors and the clerks not report on the vill as a whole? For what they did was to make a separate report on and entry for each of the manors known by the names of, e.g., Broford (429), Vexford (427*b*), Holford (433*b*), Stretcholt (350), Huntspill (354, 355), Tarnock (351*b*), Weston-in-Gordano (141*b*, 142*b*), Bishopsworth (141*b*), Tadwick (464*b*, 465), Twerton (146, 146*b*), Marston Magna (278*b*, 279), Curry Mallet (429), Chilthorne Domer (279*b*, 280). We should expect, again, if the unit was the vill, two manors with the same name and under the same ownership to come consecutively in the account of the fief. But they do not; e.g. in the cases of Huntspill (one of the two manors here is a Hundred in itself, which again suggests a manorial, not villar, basis) and Weston-in-Gordano. If the representatives of the vill spoke for it, we should expect, in the individual vill, the extent of pasture and wood in each manor to be given in the same way. If the manor was the unit, practice might vary, and this is what we find. In one of the Quarne manors (358*b*, 473*b*), pasture is in one case given by acres, in the other by linear dimensions; so it is at Luccombe (380, 463); the same applies to the woods at Tickenham (438*b*, 448*b*).*

The divergent spellings of a place-name or proper name have been attributed to the effects of dictation of the material, though dictation might seem to be an incomparably inconvenient method of construction, and the fact that the handwriting of the Exeter Domesday changes so frequently on a folio, and even within the account of the individual manor, does not altogether suggest that this was the method used. But if each manor was separately reported, verbally or in writing, individual idiosyncrasy and pronunciation, together with the recording of unfamiliar names, might well produce these variations. We find, for example, *Selvra*, *Selva*, *Silva*; *Westou*, *Waistou*; *Ratdeflot*, *Radeflota*; *Cedra*, *Ceder*; *Celeuorda*, *Celleuvert*; *Caiuel*, *Kaiuert*; *Hesterige*, *Hengesterich*, *Dregcota*, *Draecota*, *Hascecomba*, *Hetsecoma*; *Elleberia*, *Illebera*.† The three last pairs are particularly suggestive, for they

*See also, e.g., Nether Stowey (344, 373), Chilcompton (154, 354*b*), Pitcott (146, 480), Chelwood (282*b*, 447*b*), Weston (185*b*, 448*b*).

†In the fiefs of the owners we find *Herfelt* and *Opecedra*, but in the list of lands connected with the Bishop of Winchester's manor of Taunton, *Hafella* and *Vbcedene*, which may suggest these were taken from different sources.

are in each case variant forms of the same manor, which, owing to an illegality, were recorded in each of the fiefs concerned, as though both Glastonbury Abbey and the usurpers had returned them.*

Whatever may be the truth, we can see fairly plainly what happened next. The primary, largely geographical, returns were transformed into the Exeter Domesday. The material was arranged according to tenants-in-chief, and inscribed in loose booklets of varying size, with one or more for the individual fief, but sometimes with the account of more than one fief within the individual booklet. In the process (as the *Inquisitio Eliensis* and *Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensis* show also), some information considered irrelevant or unnecessary was omitted.† How much information was unfortunately left out we can never know; the original may have contained the names and full accounts of former manors now absorbed in another manor, and of all constituents of a complex manor. The Exeter clerks, indeed, may have thrown into a single entry what in the original were several entries, just as the Exchequer clerks combined in a single statement a number of descriptions of the individual manorial components: the record in *Terrae Occupatae* of the assessment and values of former holdings now added to some manor certainly suggests that each holding had been independently dealt with during the Inquest.

It looks as if the record for the three south-western shires at least had all gone to Exeter for rearrangement, for Somerset estates appear in the same booklet and on the same folio as Devonshire lands. I can find no suggestion that a rearranged transcript for each shire intervenes between the original returns and the Exeter

*There is an argument against this orthographic deduction in that in *Terrae Occupatae*, which seems also to have been made from Inquest material, names are often not spelt as in the Exeter Domesday; e.g. *Relis* (91), *Redlisc* (520). But then the material of *Terrae Occupatae* may not have been acquired at the same time as that which was used for the Exeter Domesday, or it may have been originally recorded by a different clerk, who might hear and spell names differently from his colleague. It may be significant that Hutton is *Hotuna* in the Bishop of Coutances's fief and *Hoctona* in the corresponding entry in *Terrae Occupatae* (139b, 516) and *Hutona* in both the Glastonbury entries (172b, 524).

†This is shown by the fact that there are entries and information in *Terrae Occupatae* which do not appear in the Exeter Domesday; e.g. about a virgate of land called *Ledforda* (509b), which happens also to occur in the Williton Geld Roll (79b), and that Torchill was a Dane (*Celua*, 518b).

Domesday. Nor, I think, was the work of constructing the Exeter Domesday begun while the Inquest was still in progress. It is tempting to think so, and in this way explain the numerous changes of handwriting, errors, and inconsistencies, and the character of the marginal and postscriptal afterthoughts which it has been suggested might not belong to the primary stage of the Inquest. But it seems on the whole improbable that such work could have been done during the Inquest, at least during a hypothetical tour of the Hundreds. But that the work was done hastily, yet checked at least in part, is obvious.* For some unknown reason a clerk who seems to have contributed nothing else to the Exeter Domesday added to the end of the account of the Glastonbury fief a summary of the Abbey lands which is virtually identical with that to be found among the summaries of fiefs which were bound up with the rest of the *Liber Exoniensis* (fols. 527b-531).

It looks as if a minimum of half-a-dozen clerks were employed on the work, from the variegated handwritings. But in what manner they worked is probably indeterminable, since more than one clerk's work can at times be seen in the individual entry for a manor. We do not know the order in which the fiefs were inscribed, but we can see that the order in which manors appear depends on the use of hundredal returns in a fairly regular order, and that when the clerks came to deal with the less important landowners, who were not each given a separate section, they tried to group the estates of the individual together. The wonder is, when all the difficulties of such a task are considered, that they did not make more errors than they apparently did. The varying physical conditions under which the work was executed, and mental and physical 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 is often extremely difficult to apportion the handwriting of an entry

*The phrase *consummatum est* (once *usque huc* is added) is not infrequently inserted, and once the word *probatio*. There are a number of erasures and defacements; interlineations are frequent; some matter has been underscored by way of query, and occasionally the correct version added; there are obvious errors and misspellings, e.g. *cadruca* for *carrucae* on fol. 373, and *et quando Comes recepit* in the account of *Kaiuert* on fol. 384, when the manor is held by Norman of Turstin fitz Rolf. Most of the relevant points were commented upon by Eyton and Whale.

to a particular clerk. It is not unknown for a scribe to use both the ampersand and the Insular 7 contraction for *et* in a single line, and the individual writer maintains no absolute consistency of formula, orthography, or contraction.

But each seems to have characteristics which help us to determine the clerk at work, a few of which must be mentioned. The script most easily isolated is that of the clerk styled here G. He capitalises the *g* of *gildum* (he does not use *geldum*), consistently uses 7 for *et*, and is abominably careless and a poor speller. He may well have been some sort of supervisor, for his work is found in all four counties, and he is responsible for the bulk of the *Terra Regis* entries and much of the *geld* accounts. A hand fairly readily identifiable is that of J, who, when *s* follows a vowel, ligatures the two, with the *s* small and superscript. He is inclined to make a diphthong of what elsewhere is *a* or *e*. A uses the ampersand for *et*, the *tegnus* spelling (some clerks have *tagnus*, *tannus*, or *tainus*), and is inclined to contract *animalia* to *aialia*. Two others are here styled D and H, and it is possible that the Bishop of Winchester's fief was written by a clerk who contributed nothing else.

The occurrence of the handwritings and the structure of the Dorset Exeter Domesday suggest that the clerks were using raw material divided into groups of adjacent Hundreds, so that occasionally a single clerk, or a pair of clerks, made, in each relevant fief, all the entries from such a group. Changes in script, and irregularities of hundredal order, within the material of such an unit, might so be caused by omission of an entry by one clerk, repaired by a colleague checking his work. In Somerset there do seem to be Hundreds all the entries for which, in varying parts of the Exeter Domesday, were inscribed by one clerk; e.g. Carhampton, Cutcombe and Minehead, and perhaps Chew. But if the instances of each script are mapped, no obvious pattern or system is displayed. J, for example, wrote a considerable proportion of the entries north of the Mendips and west of Bath, and comparatively few in the west of the shire, but the work of one or more of G, A, D and H is also to be found throughout the northern Hundreds. (The two entries for Bishopsworth, fol. 141*b*, are consecutive, but G wrote the first, and H the other.) Sometimes we find the whole of a fief—a small fief—inscribed by a single clerk. A wrote the account of each of William of Falaise's three manors, which are in three different Hundreds. J was responsible for all

the 15 manors of Bath Abbey (185-7). This might be entirely accidental, or, since the manors are confined to a small area within three adjacent Hundreds, and the possibility of the availability of a return from the authorities of the fief is considerable, he may in one uninterrupted operation have combined a feudal with a manorial return. But this is no more than a possibility, for G and H inscribed the remaining manors in Bath Hundred. J may merely have used an earlier geld account, or a list of all manors within a Hundred, to help him select those 'original returns' which were to be inscribed as booklet 2q. J, too, was responsible for almost all—perhaps all—the entries in *Terrae Occupatae* after the fortieth.

If we study two of the largest fiefs, those of the Bishop of Coutances and Robert of Mortain, we shall find that sometimes the handwriting changes at the end of what seems to be an associated group of Hundreds, but that it changes also within a string of manors all of which are in the same Hundred. For example, where, at fol. 145*b*, the group changes from north to east of the Mendips, J succeeds H, but, while we are still concerned with manors in Frome Hundred, A replaces J (*Tablesforda*, 148). From fol. 275*b*, 18 entries are all in either Frome or Bruton Hundreds, but the Frome entries do not all come together, and H, G and J are all represented. But A writes the next 17, the first 7 of which are in Milborne, and the rest in Stone. In nine fiefs, the manors in North Petherton head the list, and when A was inscribing the early entries for the *Servientes Regis* (477-8), he selected first all the manors in that Hundred, and did not bring together the entries for the individual landowner. But when J was at work on the estates of Athelney Abbey (191), he did not begin with *Hama* in North Petherton, but with *Atiltona* in Abdick, which with *Sutuna*, probably in Somerton, perhaps opened a list of manors furnished for the fief as a whole. They are the Abbey's principal manors, and the ablations from the fief close the account.

A fief displaying a most interesting but erratic structure is that of Walter of Douai. It begins, normally enough, with manors in North Petherton, Winterstoke, and Bempstone (350-351*b*), and continues with those in Bruton (352-3). But then come five further manors in North Petherton (353, 353*b*), and two more in Bempstone separated by the Hundred-manor of Huntspill (354); next, three in Chewton and one of doubtful site (354*b*), and then still three more in Bempstone (355) and one in Milborne in the

south-east. Until we reach the second occurrence of a Hundred, the handwritings are mixed, but from 352b-355, H alone seems to be responsible. Did a supervising clerk point out the omissions to him, or were these additions postscripts on separate sheets or rolls of the returns, noticed after the change from western to eastern groups had been made? There is something of geographical consistency about each group, and *Doneham* is said to be "of that land which the king gave to him between two waters"—perhaps the rivers Parrett and Axe, and for the purpose of guarding the district against pirates or invaders.*

Intensive and laborious investigation of the handwritings, orthography, and formulae might conceivably throw light on the conduct of the Inquest as well as on the making of the Exeter Domesday. The two last features are unquestionably apparatus full of latent dangers. But it may be that a peculiar formula, or spelling of a word, is limited in occurrence in such fashion as to make it certain that it is the product, not of the individual clerk, but of the geopoly, just as a particular contraction or character may mark the scribe. The unusual form *gueldum*, *gelldum*, for example, is found in a section of J's work in *Terrae Occupatae* (511b-513). With one exception, all the manors concerned are to be found in a comparatively small area; its existence rather suggests that it was not local but clerical or vocal idiosyncrasy which produced its occurrence.†

The name-forms, both of places and of persons, what Eyton calls 'the continual airing of their Latinity,' the formulistic use of phrases such as *ea die qua rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus* which is the equivalent of the Anglo-Saxon version of 'on the day when King Edward was quick and dead,' suggest that the clerks were not all professionals, and indeed the inhabitants of local monasteries or cathedral *scriptoria* may have been used at least in part for the task.‡

*Mr. P. Haggett has suggested to me that *inter ii aquas* might imply the district between the sea and the marshland.

†The form occurs also in Dorset, largely in J's work, and in two well-defined but distinct areas.

‡What we find in the Exeter Domesday may of course be due not to the clerks who made it but to those of the Inquest, whose versions may have been literally reproduced.

But it looks very much as if Exchequer clerks were at least at one point concerned with the making of the Exeter Domesday, for there are three Somerset entries which are in the script used by Exchequer clerks and make use of Exchequer formulae.* Possibly one or more Exchequer officials visited Exeter to show the clerks how to make a copy of our Exeter Domesday for use at Winchester and the making of the Exchequer Domesday. It seems certain that a copy was made of the Exeter Domesday, and most unlikely that the surviving Exeter Domesday could travel to Winchester and later return to Exeter. Moreover there are indications that what the Exchequer clerk used was not the Exeter Domesday as we have it, but one slightly corrected and improved.† The Exeter Domesday itself was probably not purely a local compilation. Its arrangement of certain fiefs, and of *Terra Regis*, is so like what we find in the Exchequer Domesday for other counties that we may think its inspiration was in part the supervision of Exchequer officials. For occasionally, though most unusually, we find in the Exeter Domesday a manner of grouping the royal estates, the occasional collection together of a sub-tenant's manors, and separation of demesne estates from those of the *milites*, which reflect the way in which the Exchequer clerks revised their material, and which the Exeter clerks rarely adopted at the start. There is a good deal in the Geld Rolls which suggest that Exchequer clerks were at least

*These are printed, with facsimiles, and discussed, in my article *The Evolution of Successive Versions of Domesday Book* (*Eng. Hist. Rev.*, lxvi, 1951).

†The editors of the Palaeographical Society's facsimiles (2nd series, vol. II, Part I: II. 70-1) point out that *usque hoc scripsit Ricardus*, etc., are in hands which differ from those of the text, so that "it is evident that they cannot refer to the compilation of the present Ms., but are probably the memoranda of persons engaged on a fair copy." In the Cornish Domesday, a team at *Lannachebran* (205b, 121a2) is recorded in the Exchequer but not in the Exeter text: the existence of a mint (*moneta*) at Taunton (87bi) does not appear in the surviving Exeter Domesday: in Dorset two phrases in the Exchequer text are not in the Exeter version. But we cannot be sure that an Exchequer clerk was not sufficiently knowledgeable to make a change from 'Juhel' to 'Judhel de Totenais' (334b, 125a2) of his own accord. Corrections may have been made in the copy from which the Exchequer worked.

in part concerned with their making ; it may have been Exchequer officials who examined the shire's and Hundreds' accounts.*

Though Eyton thought that the Exchequer clerks never saw an Exeter text, and Reichel maintained that the Exeter and Exchequer Domesdays were entirely independent compilations, Baring was convinced that the Exchequer text was compiled from the Exeter version, and treated the matter in some detail.† Subsequent judgments support Baring's views. Baring gave instances of the Exchequer clerks copying obvious errors in the Exeter text, and of blanks in the latter appearing in the former with the information also missing, e.g. the plough-lands at *Lulestoc* (478*b*, 98*bi*). Several times the Exeter Domesday writes *iiii* or *v* virgates instead of the more usual hide or hide and a quarter ; four times at least the Exchequer Domesday exactly reproduces the number of virgates and also does not speak of a hide, or of a hide and a virgate.‡ There is a great deal of evidence additional to that quoted by Baring that the Exchequer Domesday was made from a slightly corrected copy of the Exeter Domesday, and nothing else. We see it in the details, in the order of manors in the individual fief, in the close similarity of language, and in the fact that it adds practically nothing to the surviving Exeter Domesday.††

The Exchequer clerks were obviously working according to a set plan which determined the order of appearance of the major tenants-in-chief and which instructed them to omit the livestock, adopt their own special formulae (e.g. there is land for 7 teams

*The Geld Roll uses as a rule the Exchequer's *manerium*, not the Exeter's *mansio*, though many of the name-forms have an 'Exeter' flavour. The lists of Hundreds include a suggestion of both 'Exeter' and 'Exchequer' name-forms, with emphasis on the latter.

†Eyton : *Domesday Studies : Somerset*, p. 5 : Reichel in VCH, Devonshire, pp. 377-9 : Baring in *Eng. Hist. Rev.* xxvii, p. 309. Whale in *Trans. Devon. Assn.* xxviii (p. 391) and xxxvii (p. 266), and in *Principles of the Somerset Domesday (Proceedings of the Bath Natural History and Antiquarian Field Club, x)*, p. 13, agreed with Baring. So does Professor Galbraith, *op. cit.*, and Sawyer in *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, lxx.

‡e.g. *Eluurda* (361, 96*ai*).

††There is no material alteration of the order of manors in the vast Coutances and Mortain fiefs, and most changes are caused by the transposition of important manors to begin the account of a fief, and rearranging Church lands on an agreed principle. It is significant that the lands of John, *hostiarius*, on three different folios of the Exeter version (477-9), are brought all together in their Exeter order on Exchequer 98*bi*, and that the ablation from *Suttona* twice mentioned on a single leaf in the Exeter Domesday (191, 191*b*) is also twice recorded on Exchequer 91*a2* in small compass.

rather than 7 teams can plough this land), condense and contract the material, omit what was not vital (e.g. demesne land or former values, though this was not done systematically), and (presumably to save space) throw several associated entries, e.g. those relating to sub-tenancies in a large manor, into a single entry or two or three statements. In the process, they made occasional errors, omitted some entries, overlooked certain statements, and at times over-condensed and approximated. For example, at *Ciretona* (364b), the *villani* had three oxen towards a team of eight, which the Exchequer clerk turned into half a team (96bi).*

It is possible that we may be able to deduce something of the way in which they worked. Two clerks may well have been engaged simultaneously on the Exchequer text for Devonshire and for Somerset. The strong suggestion of an alphabetical order for lay tenants-in-chief may have required the one doing Somerset to inscribe the lands of the various Ralphs and of Robert fitzGerold after Roger de Courseulles and Roger Arundel. If the booklet which contained any of these was in use by the clerk working on Devonshire, the other must wait until it is available, begin a different fief whose owner's name begins with a different letter, or calculate the amount of space it will occupy in its contracted form, and leave a gap for it, which may be filled by a different clerk, for the Exchequer Domesday is not the work of a single scribe. This would account both for illogicalities in the order of fiefs, gaps in the ms., or insufficient space for the inscription of a fief, so that it had to be crammed in, and changes in the script within the account of a single fief—owing to the arrangement of the Exeter Domesday in booklets this might affect the account of only part of a fief.†

*For the arguments that to the Inquest officials eight oxen made the team, see H. P. R. Finberg in *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, lxvi, 1951, answering R. Lennard in *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, lx, 1945.

†There are no obvious gaps in the Somerset Exchequer Domesday, but they are most marked in many shires, and are most readily explained on the above principle. Good examples of differing Exchequer calligraphy can be seen in both columns of fol. 87b: it does not look as if the whole account of the Bishop of Winchester's fief was written by a single clerk or all at the same time, and the first two manors of the Bishop of Salisbury occupy relatively far less space than his third and final manor. The one marked gap is that at the very beginning, where space was left for an account, presumably of Bath (86ai); the clerks perhaps did not realise that the royal borough, which should have prefaced the whole work, was recorded, though lightly, in the Exeter Domesday both under *Terra Regis* and the Abbey fief, and expected they would receive a much fuller account of it.

We do not know for certain when the Exchequer Domesday was drawn up, but it was probably begun immediately the provincial redraftings were available. Some of the material would quickly become out of date, and no useful purpose would be served by delaying transcription. The work of the Inquest may have been over by Easter, 1086; the Exeter Domesday could easily have been inscribed and copied and sent to Salisbury or Winchester by Lammas; and the Exchequer clerks could have begun, if not finished, during the autumn, or even before. But in point of fact the work was never finished, or so the absence of any account of so many leading boroughs and certain manors, of an Exchequer text for the eastern counties, the tailing-off of the Dorset text and the marginal notes furnishing reminders that information missing must be enquired into, would suggest. The work stopped, perhaps, with the King's final departure from England or with his death, or because further enquiry, never made, was considered desirable.