

## Chapter 7

### Some alien interventions in the C text

The principal component of Exeter Cathedral Library 3500, adding up to 452 out of a total of 531 leaves, is a portion (perhaps about one eighth) of that version of the ‘Survey of the whole of England’ which I refer to as C. If C survived complete, subsequent versions of the survey text would be of no more than incidental interest. It is only because most of C has been lost that these subsequent versions – D and DB (PRO E 31/1–2) – have value. Yet C, for various reasons (partly because it ran away to Exeter), has not received the attention that it deserves. I discussed some aspects of the evidence in chapters 4–5; but there I deliberately restricted myself to the primary text – the text as it was written in the first instance, before anyone had second thoughts – ignoring the numerous corrections and additions which were made to it, some perhaps almost immediately, some perhaps not till after some lapse of time. Alterations of one kind or another, large or small, occur throughout the text. All of them are potentially significant, but some are more obviously significant than others.

In this chapter I look at a few of the additions that came to be made in C. Though differing in nature, they have two common properties: they were made by scribes who had played no part in writing the primary text, and they tell us something about the uses that this manuscript was put to, after it had left the hands of its creators. To be specific, the additions in question are these: (1) a last-minute revision of part of the C text, made by a scribe who was acting on orders from the king, mediated by the bishop of Durham; (2) a number of memoranda written into C by the scribes who were writing the D text; and (3) two trial passages written on blank pages of C by the DB scribe. I discuss them in this order, because that is the order in which I take them to have been written. Each section of this chapter, however, is self-contained: the conclusions arrived at in one section do not depend on those arrived at in the others. The chronological implications are spelt out separately in the concluding section.

Readers familiar with the existing literature will not have been surprised by the numbered statements in the previous paragraph. They may or may not agree with them; they will not think them novel. I do not dispute that. The evidence that I shall cite has all been cited before. The interpretations that I shall propose are largely unoriginal; in fact, they are fairly obvious. In particular, a paper by Chaplais (1987) covers all the same ground that I shall be covering here. Nevertheless, on all these points it seems to me that there is more to be said, and I aim to say some of it. After this, there

is only one more feature of the manuscript which I have any thought of discussing. I hope to deal with scribe mu’s statistical summaries (527v–8r) at some later date.<sup>1</sup>

#### 1

The first addition to be discussed is the stretch of text – corresponding to a whole chapter in D and DB – which describes the lands of the bishop of Winchester in Somerset (173v–5v). Of the three counties covered by the C-DnCoSo booklets, Somerset is the only one in which the bishop owned property; so this stretch of text is the only one that we expect to find. Its abnormal character is not instantly obvious. In substance (except for the final sentence), the description conforms with the rest of the C text. It gives the usual information, in the usual arrangement, in the usual form of words. From reading Ellis’s (1816) edition, one would not suspect (until one reached the last few lines) that there was anything odd about it. Only the fact that it starts on a verso page might perhaps seem strange.

In the original, however, as Ker (1977, p. 806) was first to remark, this stretch of text, in two respects, is conspicuously different from the rest of C. First, it was written by a scribe who makes only this one appearance in the manuscript. Though Ker qualified his statement (‘does not seem to occur elsewhere’), the qualification can be dispensed with. The hand is very distinctive, and this stint is certainly unique (Chaplais 1987, p. 75). This scribe is, for instance, the only one who has the tiresome habit, when he is writing numerals, of elongating alternate minims, if there are more than two of them.<sup>2</sup> Thus he writes *il* for *iii*, *lil* for *viii*, *lul* for *xiii*. Less obtrusively done, this might be a good idea; but here it becomes an eyesore. One other detail worth noting is the fact that a red initial near the foot of 173v is the only splash of colour in the manuscript (Ker 1977, p. 807). The C scribes, knowing

<sup>1</sup> ((They are dealt with in chapter 9 (below, pp. 104–6).))

<sup>2</sup> Chaplais (1987, p. 75) pointed out this feature of the script; he also pointed out that the DB scribe occasionally does the same thing. (But he only does it for decorative effect, when he is writing in red: this scribe does it all the time.) In some other features too, such as the treatment of round *d*, there is a distinct resemblance between this and the DB scribe’s hand, pronounced enough to suggest to Chaplais that the former scribe might have been trained by the latter. (His other proposition, that this training took place in Durham, needs to be considered separately. It derives from an assumed dichotomy – ‘If [a scribe] was not attached to a royal department, he must have belonged to an ecclesiastical scriptorium’ (Chaplais 1987, p. 72) – which I consider false. These are not the only possibilities.)

that these booklets would soon be discarded, did not think of adding decoration; this scribe had different ideas. As Ker summed it up, the text written by this scribe, unlike the rest of C, 'appears to be a fair copy' (Ker 1977, p. 805) – more explicitly, as Chaplais put it, 'a fair copy of an earlier version which [was about to be] discarded' (Chaplais 1987, p. 75).

Second, this stretch of text does not occupy a booklet by itself: it was written on some of the blank pages at the back of a booklet (fos. 161–75) which already contained the stretch of text describing someone else's lands – the abbot of Glastonbury's lands in Devon (161r1–8) and in Somerset (161r8–173r5). That description is a normal portion of the C text, written by scribes who worked on it regularly (above, p. 56). The booklet had no anomalous features until it was chosen to accommodate this addition;<sup>3</sup> and it was chosen for no reason, as far as one can see, except that it happened to contain enough blank space.

But we can take the story further than that. The last few lines that this man wrote are – and were intended to be – an explanation of the circumstances in which this addition came to be made. The sentence in question comes at the end of a paragraph describing two small manors, *Lidiarda* and *Lega*, the status of which has evidently been the subject of some disagreement.<sup>4</sup> On the day when king Edward was alive and dead, both manors belonged to a nameless thegn – a free man by definition, but one who enjoyed the specific freedom of being 'able to betake himself to any lord' (*potuit ire ad quemlibet dominum*).<sup>5</sup> Now they belonged to two men: Wulward had two hides worth 480 pence at *Lidiarda*, and Alward had half a hide worth 60 pence at *Lega*. This, it seems, was the statement of the facts reported by the local jurors. But there were certain dues arising from these lands which had always been paid to the (much larger) manor of Taunton, and it was arguable, therefore, that these two places ought to be counted among the dependencies of that manor. This, clearly, was the view of the case preferred by the bishop of Winchester, who happened to be the owner of Taunton. Put into feudal terms, the question at issue was whether the men who now possessed these lands held them from the bishop or directly from the king.

The bishop – whose name was Walkelin – sprang into action.<sup>6</sup> Perhaps he began by expressing his annoyance to the

bishop of Durham, in conversation or by letter. The bishop of Durham, we may imagine, replies regretfully but firmly: he would help if he could, but is bound by his instructions from the king. He has no choice but to forward to the treasury the facts that have been reported by the local jurors, as they appear in the B text. One word from the king, however, would alter the case. If the king orders him to make the correction, then of course he will be delighted to oblige his brother bishop by making it. Time is short, but it may still be possible to put things right before the final text (i.e. the D text) is written up. If Walkelin will speak to the king, when they all meet in Salisbury, perhaps the problem can be resolved to everyone's satisfaction. Walkelin acts on this advice. At Salisbury, with the bishop of Durham at his side, he buttonholes the king, explains the facts to him, and appeals for him to intervene. Thus prompted, the king agrees that he remembers granting these lands to Saint Peter and bishop Walkelin;<sup>7</sup> and he commands the bishop of Durham 'to write this same grant of his in the records' (*ut hanc ipsam concessionem suam in breuibus scriberet*).<sup>8</sup>

The addition in the C text was made in consequence of that command from the king. It was written, presumably, not by the bishop himself, but by a trustworthy scribe sent to Winchester for the purpose (escorted there perhaps by bishop Walkelin, to make sure that he did not get lost). Arriving at the treasury, this scribe would presumably have presented a letter from the bishop of Durham, ordering that he be given access to the booklets which contained the C text for Somerset. After a suitable amount of grumbling, the treasury officials complied; and the bishop of Durham's scribe set himself to work. He had brought his pen and ink with him (red ink as well as black), but he did not have his own parchment. So he looked for a booklet which happened to end with an adequate number of blank pages, and, having found one, copied out this stretch of text, ending with the sentence which authorized him to make this alteration.<sup>9</sup>

*De his terris semper iacuerunt consuetudines et seruitium in Tantone, et rex W(illelmus) concessit istas terras habendas sancto Petro et Walchelino episcopo, sicut ipse recognouit apud Sarisberiam audiente episcopo Dunelmensi, cui*

(who had not thought it necessary to resign from the bishopric of Winchester when he became archbishop). It is said, but only vaguely said, that Walkelin was related to the king. He died in 1098.

<sup>7</sup> As the reader will either know or guess, Saint Peter was the patron of Walkelin's cathedral church.

<sup>8</sup> Not in *breuibus suis*, as this passage is sometimes quoted; just in *breuibus*. Used collectively like this, the term *breues* or *breuia* (which in French would be *bries*) seems to mean some assemblage of official records. In the singular (normally neuter) it often means a writ; but it can also mean an itemized list, or something of that sort. (In 1168, for example, the itinerant justices who had just visited Kent submitted to the treasury lists of payments to be demanded individually from at least 90 persons in Milton, at least 75 persons in Canterbury; and these lists are referred to as *br'* for *breue* in the singular, *breuia* in the plural.) A 'brief' should be short; if it cannot be short, at least it should be concise and businesslike.

<sup>9</sup> This passage (175r20–v3) is reproduced by Chaplais (1987, pl. III, a–b), together with the corresponding passage in DB-So (pl. III, c).

<sup>3</sup> But it did acquire one odd feature when (possibly well into the twelfth century) somebody took it into his head to use the blank space on 173r for adding a statistical summary of the abbot's manors in Somerset (173r6–17). This appears to be a loose copy of the corresponding paragraph in the summary compiled by scribe mu (528r). (Some of the variants might suggest that the relationship was not so simple, but in the nature of the case they cannot amount to proof.) It is not clear who made this addition, or when, or why; nor is it clear that we should care.

<sup>4</sup> They are identified by Thorn and Thorn (1980) as Lydeard St Lawrence (about 12 km north-west of Taunton) and Leigh (in the same parish).

<sup>5</sup> This is a legal formula. What meaning it had in the real world is a question that has often been discussed. I have nothing to add.

<sup>6</sup> Walkelin was elected in 1070, after the deposition of archbishop Stigand

*precepit ut hanc ipsam concessionem suam in breuibz scriberet.*

From here this sentence was copied word for word into D-So, and from there it was copied word for word into DB-So (87va). It is clear, therefore, that the especial importance of this passage was recognized both by the D scribes (or at least by the one who worked on this stretch of text) and by the DB scribe; and the presumption is that similar passages elsewhere, if they had existed in C, would be found in D or DB, whichever survives. That none are to be found tends to prove that none existed. Bishop Walkelin, it seems, was the only man who managed to get some portion of the C text rewritten.

Making sure that the facts were stated correctly in the written record was a hollow success in itself; it was the facts existing on the ground which had to be clarified. Wulward and Alward, supported by the local jurors, had denied the bishop's claim that they held their land from him, and the bishop wanted their denial contradicted. We are not told, but are expected to assume, that some order went out notifying the shire court that the bishop's claim had been vindicated by the king.<sup>10</sup>

We know nothing of the sequel, except for one interesting fact. Some years later, a writ was issued by Willelm II reinforcing that previous message (Galbraith 1920, p. 388).<sup>11</sup> The shire court is to know, says the king, that he has been made aware, by the bishop of Durham and by his records (*per breues meos*), that his father granted *Lidiarda* and *Lega* to the church of Saint Peter of Winchester and bishop Walkelin; and he now grants the same manors to the church and bishop in perpetuity.

*W(illelmus) rex Anglorum I(ohanni) episcopo et W(illelmo) Capre uiccomiti et omnibus fidelibus suis Francis et Anglis de Sumerseta salutem. Sciatis me recognouisse per Willelmum Dunelmensem episcopum et per breues meos quod pater meus concessit Lidiard[am] et Legam ecclesie sancti Petri de Wintonia et Walkelino episcopo, et ego similiter eadem maneria concedo predictae ecclesie et episcopo in perpetuum habere. T(estibus) episcopo Dunelm(ensi) et Ranulf(o) capellano.*

There is a hint here that the shire court had thought it doubtful whether the grant by Willelm I was meant to last for all time, or whether it was in the nature of a temporary injunction; the new writ removes that doubt.

Events have repeated themselves. Just as in 1086, the bishop of Winchester has asked the king to act. Now as

<sup>10</sup> Somebody reading between the lines, probably the DB scribe (but possibly one of the D scribes), took this to be the effect: *Modo tenent de episcopo Whuuardus et Aluuardus per concessionem regis W(illelmi)* (DB-So-87va).

<sup>11</sup> The bounds on the date of this writ are the bishop of Durham's return from exile in 1091 and his death on 2 January 1096. (But a date in the latter half of 1088 is perhaps not absolutely out of the question.)

then, the bishop of Durham has been in attendance, helping the king to make up his mind, issuing the orders, verbal or written, which put the king's decision into effect.<sup>12</sup> And the records which were being written in 1086 come back into the picture now: the bishop of Durham can assure the king that the facts of the matter are stated there – meaning, presumably, in D-So.

## 2

Various layers of annotation have accrued around the edges of C. In this section I discuss an assortment of memoranda – fourteen in all – which can be identified as the work of the scribes who were writing the D text, using C as their exemplar. These memoranda are short, relatively few, and scattered through the manuscript. It requires some leap of imagination before one can see that they are interconnected. They are linked together, to some extent (into groups of three and eleven items respectively), by similarities in the wording. But the basic property they share is the fact that they make no sense except on the assumption that the scribes who wrote them were writing a copy of C.

How many hands are represented I have not been able to decide. It was Chaplais's opinion that most of these notes were written in a single hand contemporary with C, but that three of them, 'probably all in one single hand', were significantly later than C, by a margin of 'several decades' (Chaplais 1987, pp. 66–7). It seemed to him, therefore, that C was copied twice, firstly soon after it was written, but then again later, 'some time in the twelfth century'. For my part, I cannot believe that the evidence is strong enough to carry this extra weight. The dating of the script is not a subject on which I expect my opinion to count for much, but it seems to me that we know rather little about the kinds of script that were used in the late eleventh century for writing ephemeral documents (documents which, at the moment when they were written, were not intended to be kept for very long) and might also be used for casual notes like these.<sup>13</sup> Besides, it seems hard to imagine any circumstances in which somebody might have wanted to make a copy of C (or of C-Dn, or of some part of C-Dn) in the twelfth century, when the information was already long out of date, and when copies of extracts from the official records (D or DB) were obtainable from the treasury.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Is it worth asking whether the second man who witnesses this writ, Ranulf the chaplain, had also had some part to play on the previous occasion? Was he the man sent to Winchester?

<sup>13</sup> Of the scribes who worked on C, there are only two who seem so accustomed to writing such documents that they have developed what I would regard as an informal manner: mu, who sometimes writes informally, and alpha, who always does. Is it not possible that a sample of alpha's work, taken out of context, might also be thought to date from the early twelfth century? There was a time when DB itself was thought by some 'very possibly' to date from about 1130 (Johnson and Jenkinson 1915, p. 94).

<sup>14</sup> Chaplais suggested that this copy was made, possibly for official purposes, 'but more probably for the private use of some religious establishment' (Chaplais 1987, p. 67). I think the suggestion would have to be made more specific than that before it could carry conviction.

There are several aspects of the palaeographical evidence which need to be looked at again, by someone with an eye which (unlike mine) has been properly trained for the task.<sup>15</sup> For the moment, however, I am inclined to assume that these memoranda were the product of one operation, not two. If that is right, the interpretation will not be greatly affected (as far as I can see) by our knowing exactly which notes were written by exactly which scribe.

With respect to their wording, the memoranda divide themselves into two groups. The first group consists of three notes in which the word *scripsit* occurs, with the implicit meaning that what has been written is part of a copy of C. (Some part has already been written; some other part has not.) All three of these notes are associated with C-Dn.

(i) In the booklet (fos. 316–34) describing the lands of Judhel (corresponding to chapter 17 in DB-Dn),<sup>16</sup> along the lower edge of the first page (316r) this note has been added: *Hoc scripsit Ricardus*, ‘Ricard has written this’.

(ii) In the booklet (fos. 399–406) describing the lands of Willelm Capra (corresponding to chapter 19 in DB), along the lower edge of the last page (406v) this has been added: *Hic debet esse hoc quod Iordan scripsit*, ‘What Jordan has written should be here’.<sup>17</sup>

(iii) In the (incomplete) booklet (fos. 411–14) describing the lands of Ruald Adobed (corresponding to chapter 35 in DB), in the outer margin of the seventh page (414r) this note appears: *Usque huc scripsit R*, ‘R— has written as far as this’. The man who wrote this note inserted a paragraph sign into the text to make it clear exactly what he meant: the sign is placed between the words *uocatur* and *Hanecheforda* (414r4).

Notes (i) and (iii) were cited by Ellis (1817, p. 2); he assumed that they were made by the ‘different persons’ (several scribes) employed in the writing of C. They were cited again, and interpreted correctly for the first time, by the author of the comments on two facsimiles of pages from the Exeter manuscript which were published by the Palaeographical Society (Bond, Thompson and Warner 1884–94, plates 70–1). This author pointed out that these notes are plainly not connected with the writing of C itself; he deduced that they were ‘probably the memoranda of persons

engaged on a fair copy’.<sup>18</sup> For Galbraith (1942), that comment took on a more specific significance. It seemed to imply that the DB scribe would have worked from a fair copy of C, not from C itself. In other words, it seemed to imply the existence, for the counties in question here,<sup>19</sup> of a version of the survey text different from both C and DB, comparable rather with D-ExNkSk. On this point, in my view, Galbraith was exactly right.<sup>20</sup>

The evidence is most transparent in the case of note (iii). The original text (414r1–8) was written by scribe epsilon; there is nothing extraordinary about it. Into this text – in the middle of a line, in the middle of a sentence – a different hand inserts a sign, with a matching note in the margin. The message is addressed to all scribes other than R—. It tells them that R— has copied the text as far as the word *uocatur*, and therefore that whoever continues the work should start with the word after this, *Hanecheforda*. In the absence of this note they would not know that; now they do. What happened, one would guess, is that R— arrived at the end of a quire and downed his pen at that point. Either he or his supervisor thought it necessary to make this memorandum, because otherwise the scribe who would be writing the next quire might not be sure where to start. Whatever the precise circumstances may have been, it is clear that this note has nothing to do with the writing of C, and (if anyone thinks this a possibility worth considering) nothing to do with the writing of DB. The copy that was being made was a verbatim transcript of C, or something not very far removed from that.

These notes, in short, are traces of the activity of a team of scribes (two of whom even have names) who are making a fair copy of C-Dn. Since there are only three of these notes (and none at all for any of the other counties), it seems that they were generally not required: most of the time, the transcription proceeded without leaving any trace in the exemplar. Once in a while, however, somebody saw some risk of something going wrong, and made a note in the exemplar in order to stop that from happening. On just these few occasions, it was necessary for the other scribes to know

<sup>18</sup> ‘At the foot of f. 316 is the memorandum “hoc scripsit Ricardus”; and on the margin of f. 414, in another hand, “usque huc scripsit R.” As both these notes are in different hands from those of the text, 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’ (Bond *et al.* 1884–94, letterpress to plates 70–1). This comment was quoted repeatedly but never quite accurately by Galbraith; so I reproduce it here in full.

<sup>19</sup> Strictly speaking, the conclusion is valid only for Devon; how far to generalize from that is a separate issue.

<sup>20</sup> The pity is that he immediately coupled this idea with two other notions which seem to me thoroughly wrong – that the production of C and the production of D were decentralized operations, and that D existed for no purpose except to serve as a source text for DB. Both of these errors have had pernicious consequences. The second has caused Chaplais (1987, p. 66) and others to doubt the existence of D. Why waste time making a fair copy? Why not let the DB scribe work directly from C? This line of argument seems to me to start from a false premise, the idea that D was optional, and I do not propose to discuss it. But I would ask the reader to bear it in mind that one cannot disprove the existence of D by collating C and DB, no matter how minutely one does it.

<sup>15</sup> Once it is understood that the C text and the D text were both compiled centrally, a question arises which did not arise before. Can any of the scribes who made additions in the surviving portion of the C text be identified with scribes who worked on the surviving portion of the D text (Rumble 1987)? If the answer turns out to be yes, that will prove the point that C and D were produced in the same place. If the answer turns out to be no, that will tell us something (I am not sure what) about the arrangements involved in the production of the D text. Either way, we need to know.

<sup>16</sup> In the same booklet, along the outer edge of 317r, somebody wrote the word *probatio*, ‘trial’ (Ellis 1817, p. 2). I have no explanation for this.

<sup>17</sup> This note seems first to have been cited by Thorn and Thorn (1985, note Exon. 17, 5), but they did not decipher it fully. It is difficult to read in the microfilm copy; I print it as it was printed by Chaplais (1987, p. 67).

what one scribe had already done, so that they did not go astray. Whether or not they were all written by the same hand, these notes should presumably be read as instructions from the man in charge, choreographing the work of his subordinates; and they make good sense if they are read in that way.

The second group of memoranda, eleven in all, is characterized by the use of the word *consummatum*, 'finished'. In nine cases, the words *Consummatum est* are written across a blank page occurring at the back of a booklet.<sup>21</sup> Most of these messages, perhaps all of them, were the work of just one man, but the style varies from a fairly neat minuscule to an untidy display script. The same two words appear on the blank recto (155r) at the front of another booklet;<sup>22</sup> but here they were, originally, part of a much longer message, the rest of which has been erased.<sup>23</sup> Finally, in one place the note *Consummatum est usque huc* is written in the margin against the end of a stretch of text relating to Devon, before the beginning of a stretch relating to Somerset (490r).<sup>24</sup> More precisely it comes at the point which coincides with the end of the final chapter of DB-Dn. Its meaning seems clear enough: 'The end of D-Dn, but not yet the end of D.'

Most of these messages are associated with the Somerset text,<sup>25</sup> and we can work things out a little more carefully for this county.<sup>26</sup> If we are willing to assume that the or-

<sup>21</sup> The pages in question are: 209v, 370v, 387v, 449v, 451v, 455v, 467v, 474v, 494v. The microfilm copy that I have used omits 455v, probably because the photographer took it to be blank. That the note *Consummatum est* appears on this page is stated by Ker (1977, p. 804) and by Thorn and Thorn (1985, note Exon. 17, 5), who, however, add the comment 'perhaps erased'. Like the photographer, Whale (1905, p. 264) and Finn (1957, p. 49) seem both to have overlooked it. ((I forgot to check this point later, when I had a chance to consult the original.))

<sup>22</sup> This booklet (fos. 155–60) is irregular (Ker 1977, p. 805). It began as a quire of four leaves (fos. 156–9), with the text starting at the top of 156r ('Land of bishop Giso in Somerset'). The scribe (theta) who came to the middle of the quire continued across the opening, from 157v onto 158r, as if thinking that two more leaves would be sufficient; but then he found that he needed more space, and so wrapped an extra sheet around the outside of the quire. Thus the booklet now begins with a blank leaf (fo. 155), onto the recto of which this note was written. (There is also a caption on this page. *GISONIS Ep'i*.)

<sup>23</sup> The final word is decipherable as *Wite*, and presumably the note in its original form referred to fo. 116 ('Land which used to be Ulward Wite's in Somerset'). It said, I suppose, something to this effect: Finished except that some decision needs to be made with regard to the lands of Ulward Wite. Those lands in DB are entered at the end of chapter 1.

<sup>24</sup> According to Thorn and Thorn (1985, note Exon. 17, 5), this marginal note was 'definitely written ... by the scribe of the surrounding entries', i.e. by the scribe whom I call alpha. In my opinion the hand is certainly not his.

<sup>25</sup> The exception is 209v, the last page of a booklet which relates to Cornwall alone; it corresponds with DB-Co's chapter 4. There are hints – the fact that the C booklet was written entirely by alpha, the fact that in DB this chapter is transposed with chapter 3 – suggesting some irregularity about this stretch of text. The C booklet, I suspect, is a substitute, rewritten or recompiled by alpha after the original booklet had been rejected. It is not impossible that the corresponding chapter in D was, for some accidental reason, the last part of D-Co to be written.

<sup>26</sup> ((This and the following paragraphs have been revised. At the time when I first wrote them, I thought it reasonable to assume that D's chapter

C booklets	DB-So chapters	notes
83–92	1	
93–107	1	
113–15	1	
116	1	
154	3	
121–53	5	
155–60	6	155r
185–7	7	
161–75	2, 8	
188–90	9	
191–2	10	
193	14	
194–8	11, 12, 13, 15, 16	
282–5	17	
286–7	18	
210–81	19	
288–315	20	
422–36	21	
441–5	22	
345–55	24	
356–65	25	
366–70	27	370v
335–44	30	
—	33	
371–5	35	
382–7	28, 36	387v
452–5	37	455v
376–81	38	
437–40	26, 40	
446–9	23, 29, 34, 39, 41, 42	449v
468–74	43	474v
450–1	44	451v
456–67	4, 31, 32, 45	467v
475–80	45, 46	
481–94	47	494v

Table 19. Annotations made in C-So by a scribe at work on D-So.

der of the chapters in D-So was, approximately, the same as it is in DB-So, we can arrange the C booklets relating to So into a sequence which matches them up, approximately, with D (Table 19). (In some cases, a single C booklet corresponds with more than one chapter of DB; in such cases, it is the highest-numbered chapter which counts, because the C booklet would not have been finished with until the corresponding chapter in D had been written.) With the evidence presented in this form, it becomes obvious enough that the scribe who wrote these messages in C was the man who was writing the latter part of D-So.

order was correlated quite tightly with DB's. For reasons explained in chapter 11 (below, pp.133–4), I do not think that now. But some loose correlation can safely be assumed – chapters which occur towards the end of DB-So are likely to have occurred towards the end of D-So too – and that is sufficient for the purposes of the present argument. In particular, the last chapter in DB is likely to have been the last chapter in D as well.)

As far as I can see, these messages did not serve any serious purpose: the scribe was just amusing himself.<sup>27</sup> There is one particular moment which we can visualize. Having finished the final chapter of D-So (or, to put it more cautiously, the chapter corresponding with the final chapter in DB-So, probably the final chapter in D-So too), the scribe turned to the back of the C booklet that he had been copying from and scrawled his parting words across the foot of the page:

C O m S v m A t v' e' .

The moment when that message was written – the scribe by this time was forgetting how to spell – marked the end of the entire compilation process, as far as the D text was concerned. There may have been some checking still to be done; the DB scribe still had his own task to complete. For this scribe, however, the agony was over.<sup>28</sup>

If D-So survived, I infer, the last section of it would prove to have been written, all or mostly, by the scribe who recorded his progress by writing these gleeful messages in the C booklets. Towards the end the script would probably deteriorate, and spelling mistakes would multiply. The same scribe was apparently involved in the writing of D-Dn, on the evidence of 490r, and of D-Co, on the evidence of 209v. If those booklets survived, his hand would probably be represented there too. In D-Dn, furthermore, the end of the chapter describing the lands of Judhel ought to coincide with the end of a scribal stint (the name of the scribe being Ricard); the start of another chapter, the one which followed the chapter for Willelm Capra, ought to coincide with the start of a quire written by a different scribe (whose name was Jordan); another quire (written by R—) would end about two-thirds of the way through the chapter describing the lands of Ruald Adobed, with the word *uocatur*,<sup>29</sup> and the next quire would be somebody else's work. It seems that the writing of D-Dn was not a straightforward business, and we might expect that irregular quires and blank pages would be the proof of that.

These are empty predictions, because there is not the slightest chance of them being put to the test. Even so, I think we are entitled to hold on to two points. First, whatever predictions we think we can make are not fulfilled by DB. The manuscript which was being written when these notes were added to C was not DB; it was the copy of C which

the C scribes were expecting would be made, namely D. (At the very least we can be sure that it was written by a team of scribes, like the surviving D booklets, and that it was something close to a verbatim transcript of C.) Second, it seems tolerably certain that D-So was the last of the D booklets to be written. It was the DB scribe who changed the order of business here, by dealing with Somerset before he dealt with Devon and Cornwall. For the D scribes as for the C scribes, Somerset represented the end of the line. As work on Somerset neared completion, the celebrations could begin.

### 3

Two passages, respectively seven and eleven lines long, written on pages left blank by the C scribes (153v, 436v), are the work of the DB scribe. A note in Ellis's introduction draws attention to these entries,<sup>30</sup> but says nothing of their possible significance. The credit for making them known belongs to R. Welldon Finn, who published a short paper on the subject, illustrated with good photographs of the passages in the Exeter manuscript and of the corresponding passages in DB (Finn 1951).<sup>31</sup> Rather sadly, though Finn understood that this evidence meant something important, he did not even come close to understanding what that something might be. In this article, as in several books which he wrote later, on and around the subject of DB, he was labouring under false assumptions from which he never managed to break free.<sup>32</sup> It makes no difference that these were Galbraith's assumptions, not his own. The end result was the same.

He took it for granted, first, that DB was the work of a plurality of scribes.<sup>33</sup> On this view, what DB represents is the style of script and the technical terminology cultivated inside a government department. The scribe who wrote these passages in the Exeter manuscript was someone who had been trained in that department; but there was no way of knowing whether he had also been involved in the writing of DB.<sup>34</sup> Finn was trying to fit this evidence into the

<sup>27</sup> The C scribes too, when they saw the end approaching, became a little light-headed. While they were working on C-So, they entertained themselves by competing to see who could make the fanciest paragraph signs. The phenomenon was noted by Finn (1959, p. 364), but he does not seem to have asked himself what it might mean.

<sup>28</sup> Perhaps it needs to be said (I have not seen it said before) that *Consummatum est* was the scribe's idea of a joke. These were the last two words spoken by Christ from the cross (John 19:30). The previous word, I would guess, was on the scribe's mind as well: *Sitio*, 'I need a drink'.

<sup>29</sup> Comparing this quire with Ricard's stint would tell us whether R— was the same man or not. In the absence of D, we are never going to know that.

<sup>30</sup> 'The hand-writing and colour of the ink of pages 153 b. and 436 b. are distinct from the rest of the Manuscript' (Ellis 1817, p. 2, note 1).

<sup>31</sup> Some parts of this paper sound to me as if they were written or rewritten by Galbraith; but there is no note acknowledging help from anyone.

<sup>32</sup> Here and elsewhere, I have tried to give Finn any credit that he deserves, but I cannot say that I learnt much from reading his books. There are some useful ideas; but they never seem to be fully thought out, and often they are so allusively presented that it is hard to understand what he really means. In a word, the problem is that he let himself be bullied by Galbraith.

<sup>33</sup> It is, we are told, 'obvious that a considerable number of clerks were employed upon the production of the exchequer Domesday' (Finn 1951, p. 561). There was no exchequer at the time. Not to quibble, we can impute to the treasury, which did exist, the characteristics which Finn imputed to the exchequer.

<sup>34</sup> These passages, he says, were 'obviously produced by a royal curial scribe' (Finn 1951, p. 562). That is fair enough; but the rest of the sentence is gratuitous: 'and possibly by the one who wrote the corresponding entries in the exchequer Domesday'. Whether this scribe wrote the corresponding

overall interpretation proposed by Galbraith (1942). That interpretation is based on the assumption that DB was a departmental product; it collapses if one takes the view that DB was the work of an individual scribe. Unlike Galbraith, Finn was at least consistent in this respect. He never gave up the idea that DB was a collaborative effort. Second, he assumed, again like Galbraith, that the Exeter manuscript originated in Exeter. This assumption never had anything in its favour beyond its supposed coherence with the first assumption. A manuscript produced in a government department would have used the same sort of script and the same sort of language as DB; because the Exeter manuscript does not, it must have been produced somewhere else;<sup>35</sup> so why not assume (to keep things as simple as possible) that it was produced in Exeter?<sup>36</sup> Reading Finn's books, I do not find that he ever doubted this, or saw that it might be doubted.

For Finn, therefore, the first question that had to be answered seemed to be this: how could a government scribe get his hands on this Exeter manuscript? There were only two possibilities (Finn 1951, p. 564). Either Mohammed or the mountain must have moved. Possibly 'an official' had been sent to Exeter; in that case the next step would be to wonder why. Or possibly the manuscript had been sent to Winchester but then 'returned' to Exeter. In his later writings, Finn hints at the explanation which he preferred: he suspected that a team of government scribes had travelled around the country, visiting Exeter and some other places where similar manuscripts existed, compiling DB on the spot. This would square the circle: the production of DB could be regarded simultaneously as a centralized and as a decentralized operation. But he never developed this argument far, presumably because he knew that Galbraith would not accept it.<sup>37</sup>

All of this is either wrong or beside the point. DB was not the work of a team of robots: it was the work of just one man. The Exeter manuscript did not originate in Exeter: it was written in the treasury at Winchester. Once these facts are known – and I do not think that facts is too strong a word – the question that puzzled Finn does not arise. Instead we need to look at the evidence afresh. Once we do that, the explanation is obvious. These passages written into C by the DB scribe are exactly what they look like. They are trials – draft versions of passages which the scribe was about to enter in DB.

By and large, the DB scribe did not make himself a written draft. To the extent that it existed, the draft existed only in his head. Imagine him at the moment when he is about to write one more paragraph in DB. In his memory, there is

entries in DB, whether he wrote any entries there at all – these questions, on Finn's view of the case, are not decidable.

<sup>35</sup> The same goes for D-ExNkSk, which is 'obviously not an exchequer production' (Finn 1951, p. 561).

<sup>36</sup> Why not Salisbury? asks Webber (1989), echoed in advance by Chaplais (1987, pp. 67–8).

<sup>37</sup> But Chaplais (1987, pp. 70–1) was willing to consider it.

a sequence of formulas adding up to a standard paragraph; the last few paragraphs that he has written will remind him what this pattern looks like, if he needs reminding. In his source text, D, there is a paragraph (also conforming to a pattern, though not the same as his) which contains the relevant items of information (and some irrelevant items too). To compose his next paragraph, he inserts the facts that he takes from D into the template that he is carrying in his head. As he composes, he writes.

This is a risky procedure, but the DB scribe was not short of self-confidence. Nor was he an out-and-out perfectionist. He expected to make some mistakes; he expected to have to mar the appearance of his manuscript by making some corrections. Up to a point, he was willing to take the risk of writing something that he might regret having written. But sometimes the risk was higher than he could tolerate. Perhaps the next paragraph posed some particular problem; perhaps he had been away from work for some time, and wanted to be sure that he was back in the swing of things before he reverted to his normal *modus operandi*. In these circumstances, he did what any sensible person would do. He rehearsed. He found a piece of scrap parchment, wrote out a trial paragraph or two, and then read through what he had written. If he was satisfied with the result (sometimes, perhaps, he was not satisfied and decided to repeat the experiment), he copied his draft into DB, possibly making some small improvements as he did so. We have no idea how often this happened. We only know that it happened at least twice while the scribe was working on DB-So; and we only know that because on these two occasions the piece of scrap parchment which came to hand was a blank page on the back of a C booklet.

The details are as follows. (i) At the moment when the DB scribe was about to start work on DB-So's chapter 4, 'Land of the bishop of Bayeux', he had within reach the C booklet (or part of the C booklet) corresponding to chapter 5, 'Land of the bishop of Coutances'. This booklet (fos. 121–53) comprises six quires. The last three pages of the last quire (152v–3v) were left blank by the C scribes; the blank page at the back (153v) is where the DB scribe wrote his draft of chapter 4. (ii) At the moment when he was about to start work on chapter 33, 'Land of Robert son of Gerold', he had within reach the C booklet corresponding to chapter 21, 'Land of Roger de Corcelles'. This booklet (fos. 422–36) comprises two quires. The last two pages of the second quire (436r–v) were left blank by the C scribes; the blank page at the back (436v) is where the DB scribe wrote his draft of chapter 33.

The textual evidence is presented in Tables 20–21. With regard to chapter 4, we are lucky enough to have the C text surviving as a proxy for the D text.<sup>38</sup> Thus we can say that

<sup>38</sup> The paragraph in C uses a number of special-purpose abbreviations which the reader may not be familiar with. In extended form it would read: *Samson capellanus habet (de episcopo baiocensi) unam mansionem quae uocatur Coma, quam tenuit Liuuinus Comes die qua rex Eduuardus fuit uiuus et mortuus et reddidit gildum pro viii hidis, has possunt arare*

**scribe theta in C (467r5–14)**

Samson capellanus h't (*de ep'o baiocensi*) i mans' que uocatur Coma, quam ten' Liuuinus Comes die qua rex E f u 7 m 7 redd' gildum pro viii hid', has poss' arare viii carr'. Inde h't Samson in d'nio v hid' 7 iii carr' 7 uill' iii hid' 7 ii carr'. Ibi h't S x uill' 7 vi bord' 7 (v)ii seruos 7 ii roncinos 7 7 vi animal' 7 xx porc' 7 c oues 7 xxv capras 7 lx agr' nemusculi 7 xl agr' prati 7 xl agr' pascue, 7 ual& (l' redd') per annum x lib', 7 quando Samson recepit, ualebat tantundem. Huic addita est i mansio que uocatur Turnietta, quam ten' Aluuardus (pariter) die qua rex E f u 7 m' 7 redd' gildum pro iii uirg', has potest arare dim' carr', 7 ual& per annum xiiii sol', 7 quando S recepit, ualebat tantundem.

**DB scribe in C (153v)**

Ep's BAIOCENS' ten' COME 7 Sanson de eo. Leuuinus (com') tenuit TRE 7 geldb' pro viii hid'. T'ra e' viii car'. De hac t'ra s't in d'nio v hid' 7 ibi iii car' 7 vii serui 7 x uill'i 7 vi bord' cum ii car'. Ibi xl ac' prati 7 xl ac' pasture 7 lx ac' silue minute. Valuit 7 ual' x lib'. Huic adiunct' e' TVRNIE. Aluuard tenuit pro Man' TRE 7 geldb' pro iii virg' t're. T'ra e' dim' car'. Valuit 7 ual' xiiii solid'.

**DB scribe in DB-So (87vb)**

Ep's BAIOCENSIS ten' COME 7 Sanson de eo. Leuuinus (com') tenuit TRE 7 geldb' pro viii hid'. T'ra e' viii car'. De ea s't in d'nio v hid' 7 ibi iii car' 7 vii serui 7 x uill'i 7 vi bord' cum ii car'. Ibi xl ac' prati 7 xl ac' pasture 7 lx ac' silue minute. Valuit 7 ual' x lib'. Huic M adiuncte s't iii uirg' t're in TORNIE. Aluuardus tenuit TRE pro uno M 7 pro tanto geldb'. T'ra e' dim' car'. Valuit 7 ual' xiii sol'.

Table 20. Three versions of DB-So chapter 4.

there is nothing in the final version (DB-87vb) which could not derive from the draft version (153v), while the final version has one numerical error (*xiii* for *xiiii*) from which the draft is immune.<sup>39</sup> The differences in wording are slight,

*viii carrucae. Inde habet Samson in dominio v hidas et iii carrucas et uillani iii hidas et ii carrucas. Ibi habet Samson x uillanos et vi bordarios et (v)ii seruos et ii roncinos et et vi animalia et xx porcos et c oues et xxv capras et lx agros nemusculi et xl agros prati et xl agros pascuae, et ualet (uel reddit) per annum x libras, et quando Samson recepit, ualebat tantundem. Huic addita est una mansio quae uocatur Turnietta, quam tenuit Aluuardus (pariter) die qua rex Eduuardus fuit uiuus et mortuus et reddidit gildum pro iii uirgatis, has potest arare dimidia carruca, et ualet per annum xiiii solidos, et quando Samson recepit, ualebat tantundem.* The corrections are by the original scribe, with the exception of the first one, made by another hand (which I cannot identify). These interpolated words are missing from Ellis's (1816) edition, and from the excerpt printed by Finn (1951, p. 562). But they are, of course, crucially important if we want to know why this paragraph became a separate chapter in D-So, or why Sanson's claim to an exemption from geld was disallowed (above, p. 64).

<sup>39</sup> This error was noted by Finn (1951, p. 563). It is, by the way, the only demonstrable instance of an uncorrected error for which the DB scribe is personally to blame.

**DB scribe in C (436v)**

ROBERTI FILII GEROLDI. IN SVMMERSETE.

Robertus ten' CERLETONE (7 Gozelinus de eo). Godman tenuit TRE 7 geldb' pro v hid'. T'ra e' xii car'. In d'nio s't ii hid' 7 ibi iii car' 7 vii serui 7 iiii uill'i 7 xv bord' 7 iii coscez cum viii car'. Ibi molin' redd' v sol' 7 l ac' prati. Pastura iiii quar' lg' 7 iii quar' lat'. Silua dimid' leu' lg' 7 tntd' lat'. Valuit x lib'. Modo vi lib'. Idem Robertus ten' ..... Vitel tenuit TRE 7 geldb' pro x hid'. T'ra e' x car'. De ea s't in d'nio iiii hid' 7 ibi iii car' 7 viii serui 7 iiii coliberti 7 xi uill'i 7 xvii bord' cum v car'. Ibi xxx ac' prati 7 c ac' pasture. Silua iii quar' lg' 7 ii quar' lat'. Valuit xviii lib' quando R recep'. Modo redd' x bacones 7 c caseos.

**DB scribe in DB-So (97ra)**

TERRA ROBERTI FILII GEROLDI.

ROBERTVS filius Girold ten' de rege CERLETONE 7 Godzelinus de eo. Godman teneb' TRE 7 geldb' pro v hid'. T'ra e' xii car'. In d'nio s't iii car' 7 vii serui 7 iiii uill'i 7 xv bord' 7 iii coscez cum viii car'. Ibi molin' redd' v sol' 7 l ac' prati. Pastura iiii quar' lg' 7 iii quar' lat'. Silua dimid' leu' lg' 7 t'ntd' lat'. Valuit x lib'. Modo vi lib'. Ipse Robertus ten' ..... Vitel teneb' TRE 7 geldb' pro x hid'. T'ra e' x car'. In d'nio s't iii car' 7 viii serui 7 iiii coliberti 7 xi uill'i 7 xvii bord' cum v car'. Ibi xxx ac' prati 7 c ac' pasture. Silua iii quar' lg' 7 ii quar' lat'. Quando recep': ualb' xviii li'. Modo redd' c caseos 7 (x<sup>cem</sup>) bacones.

Table 21. Two versions of DB-So chapter 33.

and I do not see that there is much to be gained from discussing them in detail. But one point at least is worth noting. In the draft version, the DB scribe is found using a formula – *De hac t'ra s't in d'nio .. hid' –* which he had used for a time while working on DB-Wi before deciding to replace it with something simpler – *De ea s't in d'nio .. hid' (above, Fig. 5).*<sup>40</sup> In copying his draft into DB, he makes the same change here. With regard to chapter 33, neither C nor D is available, and the two versions that survive can only be compared with one another. Even so, there is one difference between them of which the sense seems clear. In the draft version, as in both versions of chapter 4, he uses the formula *tenuit TRE et geldb'*; in the final version he replaces this with *teneb' TRE et geldb'*. This change reproduces a transition that occurred precisely while he was working on DB-So (above, Fig. 6).

In the absence of any indication to the contrary, I think we can be confident that the obvious explanation is the right one. In both cases, what we have been calling the draft

<sup>40</sup> Unless anyone thinks they can prove that D's wording differed significantly from C's, in ways which brought it closer to DB's, there is a larger lesson to be learnt from Table 20. Apparently it was the DB scribe's choice to use the formula *De hac terra s't in d'nio*, his choice again to replace it with *De ea s't in d'nio*. The wording that we find in DB, the changes of wording that we find in DB, were not dictated by the source text. They were the result of decisions made by the DB scribe himself.



version is indeed the earlier version; and what we have been calling the final version was indeed copied from the draft version. The scribe was at liberty to glance back at D-So, if that was what he wished to do, but there is nothing to prove that he did.

How far to extrapolate from these facts is difficult to decide. Because in one case the C booklet corresponds to a chapter not yet written, in the other to a chapter written some time before, it may be fair to assume that the DB scribe had the whole collection of booklets available to him. On the other hand, because both cases relate to one county, it may be too much of a stretch to assume that he dealt with every county in the same way. Nevertheless, for Somerset at least, we know what was going on. While he was working on DB-So, the DB scribe had his source text, D-So, to hand; he also had some or all of the booklets containing the source text for his source text. All three versions of the survey text that were centrally produced – C, D, DB – were brought together for some interval of time, within the DB scribe’s reach.

Presumably this means that the DB scribe has some thought of checking with C if he came across any passage in D that he mistrusted; but how far he actually did this is hard to say. The fact that he made no corrections in C counts for nothing. He would not have had any means of detecting errors in C, other than errors which were obvious but trivial (grammatical slips, spelling mistakes, and so on); and he would not have had any motive for correcting these. The only proof that these booklets passed through his hands is the trial paragraphs written on two blank pages. That is the only usefulness which we know he found in these booklets. For the DB scribe, the C booklets were waste parchment, or on their way to becoming such. The C scribes would have thought this conclusion a trifle premature. Fortunately for us, they had it in mind to make some further use of the C booklets. If that had not been the case, none of this evidence would have had any chance of surviving.

4

From what we now know, we can try working out the sequence of events. Starting with Somerset, we can take it as given that C-So was earlier than D-So, and that D-So was earlier than DB-So:

C-So  
           D-So  
                   DB-So

We also know that Somerset was the last of the last five counties to be dealt with by the C scribes, and that the DB scribe had two more counties to deal with after he had finished with Somerset; so we can add four more entries in the first column, two more in the third:

C-Wi  
 C-Do  
 C-Dn  
 C-Co  
 C-So  
           D-So  
                   DB-So  
                   DB-Dn  
                   DB-Co

This is not an achievement to boast about. If it could be completed, this table would have 99 rows, with one entry in each row and 33 entries in each column; the table that we know enough to construct has nine rows, and the columns contain five, one and three entries respectively. Though it may be possible to make a little more progress than this,<sup>41</sup> I cannot imagine that we shall ever come close to tabulating the sequence of events in full. The worst news is that we have no clue how much overlap existed between the compilation of one version and the next – how soon D was started with respect to C, how soon DB was started with respect to D.

But there is some good news too. The intervention by the bishop of Durham’s scribe can be placed precisely in this sequence of events. It must be later than C-So;<sup>42</sup> it must be earlier than D-So.<sup>43</sup> There would have been no point in rewriting this stretch of the C text if D-So had already been written: the scribe assumed, and assumed correctly, that there was still time for the substitution to be made. Furthermore, we know – because the scribe tells us so – that this intervention resulted from a meeting between the king and the bishop of Winchester attended by the bishop of Durham. By a stroke of luck we can discover, from other evidence, exactly when that meeting occurred.

The king’s movements, during the middle months of 1086, are sketched out for us by a well-known piece of narrative which survives as part of the ‘E’ text of the ‘Anglo-Saxon Chronicle’ (Swanton 1996, pp. 216–17). The king was at Winchester for Easter (5 April), at Westminster for Whitsun (24 May); and then ‘afterwards he travelled about so that he came to Salisbury for Lammas’ (Saturday 1 August),

and his council came to him there and all the men occupying land

<sup>41</sup> As for the second column, we can be sure that D-Dn and D-Co were later than C-So, fairly sure that they were earlier than D-So. But we have no means of determining which of the two was the earlier: for all we know, the D scribes may have decided to dispose of Cornwall before dealing with Devon. If these booklets were included in the table, therefore, they would have to be marked with queries.

<sup>42</sup> Strictly speaking, we cannot be sure that C-So had been completed. We only know that this stretch of text is later than two of the C booklets: the booklet which it superseded, and the booklet into which it was written. We are permitted to believe, if we wish, that the C scribes were still at work on some of the other booklets. But I do not see why we should wish to.

<sup>43</sup> Again we are free to believe, if we wish, that the D scribes had already got started on D-So. It is the chapter corresponding to DB’s chapter 2 which we know had not yet been written.

who were of any account over all England, whichever man's men they were, and all submitted to him and were his men, and swore him loyal oaths that they would be loyal to him against all other men.

From Salisbury the king travelled south to the Isle of Wight, intending to cross into Normandy; he stayed there for some time; and then he made the crossing.

This meeting in Salisbury was an extraordinary event.<sup>44</sup> The chronicler knew that, and did his best to explain the significance of the occasion, as far as he understood it. For present purposes, the chronological implications are the only point which counts. It is obvious that the meeting must have been planned well in advance; probably the place and the date were decided at Westminster, in late May. The king then set out on a tour of the country, organizing his itinerary around the necessity of arriving in Salisbury towards the end of July; and all the other people required to attend – those who had been present at Westminster and those who were now being notified – were expected to plan their movements around the same necessity. They should arrive in Salisbury, without fail, before 1 August.

The bishops of Winchester and Durham would certainly have been summoned to this meeting. If they wanted to waylay the king, this was a good opportunity, and perhaps the only opportunity for which they could plan ahead.<sup>45</sup> To put it differently, we know for a fact that the interview took place in Salisbury, and therefore – as was emphasized by Holt (1987, p. 44) – we can say, with virtual certainty, that it happened on or very close to 1 August. The king had other places that he wanted to visit, so he was visiting them during June and July; but he also wanted to get back to Normandy, so he headed south as soon as the Salisbury meeting was over. He stopped in the Isle of Wight for a time, perhaps only while he was waiting for favourable weather, and then he was gone. After that, anyone who needed to speak to the king would have had to follow him across the Channel. Plus or minus a few days, 1 August is the latest possible date, and to all appearances the only possible date, for the bishop of Winchester's interview with the king.<sup>46</sup> Immediately afterwards (presumably within a few days), the bishop of Durham's scribe made the short journey to Winchester

and performed the task that he had been sent there to perform.

C-Wi  
C-Do  
C-Dn  
C-Co  
C-So

August 1086

D-So

DB-So  
DB-Dn  
DB-Co

At this point in the sequence of events, C-So was already in existence. If we can be sure (as I think we can) that Somerset was the last county to be dealt with by the C scribes, that conclusion implies a much larger one: the entire C text had been compiled before the beginning of August. The D text, though possibly begun, had not yet been completed. As of early August, D-So did not yet exist. When it was brought into existence, some time later, it incorporated the revised text that had been added in C by the bishop of Durham's scribe. It was a scribe involved in writing the latter part of D-So who amused himself by writing messages (nearly there, nearly there, nearly there) into his exemplar. Both DB-So itself and the trial passages written into C by the DB scribe are later than D-So; the DB-DnCo booklet is later still.

As far as the C booklets are concerned, this is how the story continues. After the DB scribe had finished with them, they were used in some further operation which required them to be sorted into stacks, but which was interrupted and not completed (above, p. 53): the booklets which survive are those which did not relate to any of the counties (up to and including Wiltshire) on which this operation had been performed before the interruption occurred. After some further lapse of time, the abandoned stacks of booklets were put together and bound up to make a book; and that is the book which – unwisely rearranged when it was last rebound – survives to this day in Exeter.

<sup>44</sup> ((There is more to be said on this topic later (below, pp. 120–1).))

<sup>45</sup> It is possible, I think, that the bishop of Durham, in anticipation of this meeting with the king, has ordered the treasury officials to send him the C booklet relating to the lands of the bishop of Winchester in Somerset. Then, once the king has given them *carte blanche*, the two bishops work over the text together, deciding what revisions are needed. When the bishop of Durham's scribe sets out for Winchester, he takes the C booklet with him. His instructions are to write out a clean copy of the emended text, and then to destroy the original. That would explain – what does seem to need explaining – why he copied out the whole stretch of text afresh, rather than making corrections to the original.

<sup>46</sup> It may seem obvious now that the meeting at Salisbury mentioned by this scribe is to be equated with the meeting at Salisbury reported in the English chronicle; but it was far from obvious before this section of C was discovered to be a last-minute addition. As far as I am aware, Holt (1987), citing Ker (1977), was the first person who had ever made the connection.