

Chapter 8

The monks of Ely and the records of the survey – Part I

For more than sixty years, it has been understood that the written record of the ‘Survey of the whole of England’ evolved through several versions (Galbraith 1942). The earliest version, the one which I call B, differed from the subsequent versions in being cadastrally organized: the manors which formed the units of the survey were listed county by county, hundred by hundred, village by village. Unlike these subsequent versions – C, D and DB – no part of the B text survives in the original.¹ The existence of such a version could be inferred from the surviving portion of the C text, the version which served as a vehicle for replacing the cadastral organization of B with the feudal organization intended for D (and for the epitome of D that I call DB); but little would be known of the character of B if this were the only evidence available to us.

In fact, by a stroke of good luck, a copy does exist of part of B. Towards the end of the twelfth century, a scribe working in the monastery at Ely made a copy – had both the opportunity and the motive for making a copy – of some portion of the B text. Our luck is not all good, however, because unhappily some part of this copy had been lost before the seventeenth century. The part that survives begins at the beginning of Cambridgeshire, and covers about three-quarters of this county before breaking off in mid sentence, at the foot of a verso page. How much has been lost is uncertain. It is doubtful too whether the scribe was copying directly from the original or from an earlier copy; and in any case the format is one imposed by this scribe, not one intended to resemble the original. Despite these drawbacks, the surviving text appears to be a straightforward transcript – not as accurate as it might be, but not deliberately edited – of a large part of B-Ca; and that makes it uniquely valuable.

Also from Ely, three copies survive of a compilation of extracts from some version or versions of the survey text. I call this text xEl. It covers all six counties in which the abbey of Ely owned land, but deals only with those manors – never more than a small proportion of the total number – in which Ely had an interest. Because of its complexity, this text will need to be discussed at greater length than the copy of B-Ca. But the reader should not let that obscure the fact that xEl is much less important than B-Ca, and that its reliability is much harder to judge. This is not an official text – the sort of text which a copyist might feel obliged to

reproduce as it stood. It is a private text, the property of the monks of Ely; and Ely scribes are unlikely to have felt inhibited from revising and annotating it, as seemed good to them.

Three manuscripts are in question. I call them T, U and V.² (Some readers may wish to know straight away that these are the same manuscripts which Hamilton (1876) called B, C and A respectively.) Each of them contains a copy of xEl; one of them also contains the copy of part of B-Ca. All three were written, in the mid or late twelfth century, in the priory attached to the cathedral church in Ely.³ Presumably they remained at Ely until the mid sixteenth century, when the monks were evicted and their library was dispersed. One of the manuscripts (my V, Hamilton’s A) reappears at the beginning of the next century. By that time it had come into the hands of Arthur Agarde (1540–1615), who gave it to Sir Robert Cotton (1571–1631).⁴ With the rest of Cotton’s library, though not until after surviving various adventures, it found a safe home in the British Museum in 1753. The other two manuscripts reappear towards the end of the seventeenth century, when they were in the possession of Thomas Gale (1635/6–1702). It does not seem to be known how or where he acquired them. Gale’s son, Roger Gale (1672–1744), donated a collection of manuscripts to Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1738; and these two were included in that collection.

The text that I call xEl was printed by Ellis (1816, pp. 497–528),⁵ who knew of the existence of one of the manuscripts

² Hamilton’s (1876) edition of xEl includes facsimiles of one page from each manuscript, lithographed by Frederick Netherclift. They are very pretty, but only accurate up to a point: the image had to be traced from the original by hand. Early attempts at photographic reproduction – such as the Ordnance Survey’s facsimile of ‘Domesday Book’ (1861–3) – were no great improvement.

³ The monastery at Ely was founded by Æthelwold, bishop of Winchester, in 970. Originally it was an abbey, wealthier than most but unexceptional: at the time of the survey it was ruled by abbot Simeon. In 1109 the church became the see of a new bishopric, and the monastery became a cathedral priory.

⁴ As is stated by a note at the foot of the first page: *Ro: Cottoni Libri ex dono Arthuri Agarde* (36r); the date 1609 is written below this, seemingly in different ink. As a Treasury official with easy access to ‘Domesday Book’, Agarde was better placed than anyone else to appreciate the significance of xEl. This manuscript is cited in an essay which he wrote about ‘Domesday’ matters, and which was published later by Roger Gale, the then owner of the other two manuscripts (McKisack 1971, pp. 86–7).

⁵ ((It turns out that Ellis published xEl by mistake. The proof lies in a passage quoted by Prescott (2001, p. 183) from the Record Commission’s minute book. Ellis’s description of the text which he was proposing to

¹ Of the C text roughly one-eighth exists in the original (Exeter Cathedral Library 3500, fos. 25–62, 83–494, 530–1); of the D text, roughly one-sixth (Public Record Office, E 31/1); of the DB text, roughly five-sixths (PRO, E 31/2, fos. 0–372).

in Cambridge, but who chose (unwisely) to base his edition on V, the manuscript which, because it was in the British Museum, happened to be more readily available to him.⁶ The other text, the copy of B-Ca to be found in the same manuscript, remained largely unknown until it was eventually put into print by Hamilton (1876). By way of an appendix, Hamilton also produced a new edition of xEl: like Ellis (unwisely again, and without the excuse of ignorance), he based his text on V.⁷ Variant readings from the two Cambridge manuscripts were cited in the footnotes, with only moderate accuracy; and several shorter texts which follow xEl in the manuscripts were printed for the first time here.

It took almost twenty years before Hamilton's book made any particular impact;⁸ but when it did, the impact was profound. For Round (1895), the publication of this copy of B-Ca opened up a world of new possibilities. In a long, badly organized article (two or three articles packed into one, interrupted by numerous digressions), Round let himself loose on an exploration of this previously unmapped landscape. By the time that he was finished, he had defined the terms for a radical reassessment of almost all the evidence relating to the survey. For Maitland (1897) too, this edition of B-Ca made a world of difference. Many things could be seen with clarity here – things which became frustratingly obscured in subsequent versions of the survey text, and most of all in DB.

My objectives here are unambitious; I aim only to come to grips with the textual evidence. For information about manuscripts from Ely, and about other Ely matters, I have relied very heavily on Blake's (1962) edition of the *Historia Elyensis insule* (see below). Though Blake was only incidentally interested in xEl and not interested at all in B-Ca, his treatment of the manuscript evidence will need to be cited frequently. Perhaps it should also be said that chapters 8–9 are my first and last word on the subject. The comments that follow are not intended as prolegomena for a new edition of xEl or B-Ca or both. There is need for a new edition, more intelligently designed and more accurately executed than Hamilton's, but I have no thought of producing it myself. Here and there, however, I have offered some gratuitous words of advice which I hope may be helpful to anyone who undertakes the task.

print – 'an original return or inquisition ... respect[ing] a portion of the county of Cambridge' – makes it certain that he was speaking of B-Ca, not of xEl. Apparently whoever made the copy copied the wrong section of the manuscript – and apparently Ellis never noticed.)

⁶ Ellis's edition does not include the appendix of shorter texts (65ra–9rb) which follows xEl in V. The opening stretch of the main text (36ra–7rb) was printed again by Ellis (1833, vol. 1, pp. 22–7); the variant readings quoted here come from T, not, as Round (1895, p. 124) supposed, from U.

⁷ Hamilton's edition of xEl was announced by Hardy (1865, p. 36) as being already 'in the course of publication'. Hardy knew that there were two copies of xEl in Cambridge, not just one; he was also aware that V contained a second, unpublished text (but apparently did not understand what it was, nor that Hamilton was planning to publish it).

⁸ To say that it 'took the learned world by storm' (Galbraith 1961, p. 123) is a characteristic lapse into exaggeration.

T = Cambridge, Trinity College O. 2. 41

T is a mid twelfth-century manuscript, catalogued by James (1902, pp. 145–6) and briefly described by Robinson (1988, p. 102). The pages were numbered in the seventeenth century, possibly by Gale; but the numbering is unsatisfactory. It does not cover the first eleven leaves, and it goes wrong about two-thirds of the way through.⁹ For that reason, and for the sake of consistency, I have taken the liberty of introducing my own foliation (Table 22).

The original contents, the work of a single mid twelfth-century scribe, are listed and discussed in the following paragraph; I start by stripping away the accretions due to other hands. The book begins with a calendar (4r–9v), written by a contemporary or not much later scribe; it is too sparse to be of much interest (James 1902, pp. 145–6). Elsewhere, within the body of the book, numerous additions were made by late twelfth-century and later scribes, not just on pages previously blank (44r, 91v, 150r–1v), but also in two whole quires (fos. 44–51, 152–9) apparently inserted for the purpose. With two exceptions (see below), these additions need not concern us any further; but they prove that T was still at Ely in the fifteenth century, and was still occasionally consulted.

The first scribe, whom I call T1, writes an elegant rounded hand. At its best, the script is very good, but it deteriorates considerably when the scribe starts ploughing his way through the tedious statistical data which make up most of xEl.¹⁰ At the moment when it left the hands of scribe T1, the manuscript consisted of 132 leaves and 16 quires (all of 8 except for the last one). The format is uniform throughout, with 23 lines to the page. There are three constituent booklets:

booklet 1 (fos. 12–43): *Libellus quorundam insignium operum beati Aedeluoldi episcopi* (12r–43v), a hagiographical tract concerning the foundation of the monastery at Ely by bishop Æthelwold;¹¹

booklet 2 (fos. 52–91): *Collectio priuilegiorum eliensis ecclesie* (52r–84r), a transcription of royal, papal and other

⁹ The person writing the numbers forgot what he was doing and switched from pagination to foliation; then he remembered and switched back again. (At the moment when he realized his mistake, it would have been easy for him to put the numbering right, but he did not bother to do so.) The upshot was that two of the verso pages were left without a number. A modern hand, perhaps James's, has patched things up by adding two extra labels (187A, 188A).

¹⁰ The page lithographed for Hamilton by Netherclift (above, note 2) is fo. 95r. The page reproduced by Robinson (1988, pl. 62) is fo. 84r (where the first ten lines were written by scribe T1, the rest by scribe T2).

¹¹ The full text was printed, from this manuscript, by Gale (1691); the prologue and the first few chapters were printed again by Blake (1962, pp. 395–7). In the prologue the author represents the work as his Latin translation of an English original: he was assigned this task, he says, by bishop Herveus (d. 1131).

collation	original signature	modern signature	17th-century pagination	proposed foliation
4 wants 1				1–3
8				4–11
8		1	1–16	12–19
8		2	17–32	20–7
8		3	33–48	28–35
8		4	49–64	36–43
8		5	65–80	44–51
8	I	6	81–96	52–9
8	II	7	97–112	60–7
8	III	8	113–28	68–75
8	IIII	9	129–44	76–83
8	V	10	145–60	84–91
8	VI	11	161–76	92–9
8	VII	12	177–90	100–7
8	VIII	13	191–206	108–15
8	IX	14	207–22	116–23
8	X	15	223–38	124–31
8	XI	16	239–54	132–9
12		17	255–78	140–51
8		18	279–94	152–9

Table 22. Collation of Cambridge, Trinity College O. 2. 41. (The seventeenth-century pagination skips two pages in quire 12 (see note 9).)

documents from the Ely archive, beginning with three charters of king Eadgar;

booklet 3 (fos. 92–151): a copy of xE1, followed by several shorter texts relating to the lands possessed or claimed by Ely (92r–149v).

Booklets 2 and 3 are linked together by a sequence of quire signatures (Table 22). Apparently the scribe began by writing booklet 2; then he continued with booklet 3, thinking of it as an appendix to booklet 2. Later, as something of an afterthought, he added booklet 1, intending it to form a preface for booklet 2.

The scribe's primary interest, it seems clear, was in booklet 2; but our interests diverge from his. I list the contents of the cartulary (Table 23) but have little more to say about this booklet. The original text, all written by scribe T1, fills the first four quires and overflows onto the first page of the fifth quire (84r). Only ten more lines were needed to complete the final document (a papal letter dating from 1139), but the scribe made a whole new quire, as if in the expectation that the cartulary would be continued, by himself or by others, as new documents entered the archive. At any rate, that is what happened. A second scribe, T2,¹² added a further batch of documents (84r–9v), the latest of which

dates from 1144; and a third scribe, T3, started adding yet another batch, but broke off in the middle of a word, at the foot of the last recto page (91r). The latest document here dates from 1152 – but we have no idea what other documents the scribe might have added after this one, if he had not been interrupted. His script is appreciably different in aspect from that of the first two scribes, late rather than mid twelfth-century.

These facts were all recognized by Blake (1962, pp. xxxix–xl), who pointed out that they enable the work of scribe T1 to be dated within a very narrow bracket. Of the documents copied by T1, the latest are a batch of papal letters which were issued in Rome at the end of April 1139, but would not have been available in Ely till several weeks after that: it was the arrival of these letters, so it seems, which prompted scribe T1 to think of compiling a cartulary. Of the documents transcribed by T2, the earliest is another papal letter, dated October 1140; and it seems a fair assumption that scribe T1 would have copied this letter too, if it had been available to him. It is certain, therefore, that scribe T1 was at work on booklet 2 after about June 1139, and likely that he had stopped work before about November 1140 (cf. Blake 1962, p. xxxiv). A similar or only marginally later date can be assumed for booklet 3, and (more loosely) for booklet 1.¹³

¹² The change of hand on fo. 84r (above, note 10) was localized vaguely by James (1902, p. 146), determined precisely by Blake (1962, p. xl).

¹³ Robinson (1988, p. 102) regards the change of hand on fo. 84r as merely the start of a new stint, not implying a significant lapse of time; on this view T1 was probably at work after 1144, as T2 certainly was. That is

The survey of the whole of England

Trin. Coll.	BL Cott.	Blake		
O. 2. 41	Tib. A. vi	1962		
52r-4v	—	ii.5	Eadgar	Sawyer 779
54v-5v	—	9		780
55v-7v	— 99r-v	39		781
57v-9r	99v-100r	58	Æthelred	907
59r-60v	100r-1r	82	Cnut	958
60v-2v	101r-2v	92	Eadward	1051
62v-3v	102v	93	Victor II	Jaffé-Loewenfeld 4350
63v	102v-3r	95	Eadward	Sawyer 1100
63v-4v	103r	116	memorandum	
64v	103v	117	Willelm I	Bates 122
64v-5r	103v-4r	120		120
65r-v	104r	121		119
65v-6r	104r	122		121
66r	104r-v	123		124
66r-v	104v	124		123
66v-7r	104v-5r	125		127
67r	105r	126		125
67r-v	105r	127		126
67v-8r	105r-v	136	memorandum	
68r-v	105v	iii.2	Paschalis II	Jaffé-Loewenfeld 6212
68v-9r	105v-6r	3		6213
69r-v	106r	4		6211
69v-70r	106v	5		6210
70v-1v	106v-7v	6	Henric I	Johnson and Cronne 919
71v-2r	107v-8r	7		1048
72r-v	108r	10		931
72v	108r	11		1543
72v-3v	108r-v	12		1656
73v-4r	108v-9r	13		1500
74r	109r	15		1499
74v	109r	16		1421
74v-5r	109r-v	18		1542
75r-v	109v	19		1501
75v-6v	109v-10v	26	bishop Herveus	
77r-8r	110v-11r	55	Innocentius II	Holtzmann 17
78r-9v	111r-12r	54	bishop Nigel	
79v-82v	112r-13v	56	Innocentius II	Holtzmann 21
82v-3r	113v	65		22
83r-v	114r	66		23
83v-4r	114r	67		24

84r-v	114r-v	68		27
84v-8r	114v-16v	85	Lucius II	35
88r-9r	116v	79		36
89r	116v-17r	84		37
89r	117r	80		39
89r-v	117r	81		38
89v	117r-v	83		40

90r	117v	95	Eugenius III	63
90v-1r	117v-18r	105		69
91r	118r	104		71

	118v	91	archbishop Teodbald	Saltman 98
	118v-19r			99
	119r-v	90	bishop Nigel	
	119v-20r	106	archbishop Teodbald	Saltman 100
	120r	134	bishop Nigel	

Table 23. Contents of the cartulary initiated by scribe T1. (Changes of hand are denoted by broken lines.)

More is at issue here than just a question of dating. To the extent that this manuscript had an author, scribe T1 deserves the credit. As far as the evidence goes, he was the man who decided that the time had come to create a cartulary – who chose these documents (not all so obviously important that they would choose themselves), put them into this sequence, and supplied a title for the whole collection – and who decided to append a copy of xEI to it. Large and small, the decisions made by scribe T1, while he was working on this manuscript, exerted an influence on later generations. They helped to give a definite shape to the monks' conception of their communal history.

U = Cambridge, Trinity College O. 2. 1

U is a later twelfth-century manuscript, also catalogued by James (1902, pp. 79–82) and briefly described by Robinson (1988, pp. 100–1).¹⁴ As well as numbering the quires, James had some thought of introducing a new foliation, but he did not follow through with this plan. Like everyone else, I have used the seventeenth-century foliation, presumably Gale's, which replicates a late medieval foliation written in Roman numerals; it ignores the first 14 leaves but from then onwards is perfectly correct (Table 24).

This manuscript is important, most of all, because it contains the earliest copy – partly a working draft – of the *Historia Elyensis insule*, 'History of Ely island', a lengthy history of the church and monastery compiled by one of the monks and completed, in its original form, soon after 1170. I refer to this work as HEI from here onwards. In fact there are two full-scale versions of HEI, as well as several derivative versions. The original version, represented by U, was revised and expanded into a second version, represented by a manuscript known as the 'Liber Eliensis', the property of the dean and chapter of Ely, which I cite (on the few occasions when it will need to be cited) as W. Where these versions need to be distinguished, I call them HEI/U and HEI/W; but in general the reader should assume that I am speaking of the earlier version. Reasonably enough, Blake (1962) chose to print the longer version of the text, as it appears in W (which he called F).¹⁵ But the version represented in U (Blake's E) can be reconstructed (to a fairly

not impossible; but I do not see that Robinson has any solid reason for thinking that her interpretation is preferable to Blake's.

¹⁴ ((Another brief description is given by Love (2004, pp. lii–iii). Unlike me, she sees a change of hand at 233r, i.e. at the beginning of the final quire.))

¹⁵ HEI/W is a conflated text, largely derived from U (Blake 1962, p. xlii) but with numerous interpolations derived from other sources. For example, many passages from the *Libellus* (above, p. 82), appearing only in shortened form in U, appear word for word in W: the author of HEI/W took his cue from U but went back to U's source for the unabbreviated text. (The source, I assume, was T. Blake (1962, p. xxxiv) thought differently, on the evidence of a single variant (in a passage missing from U) which is, at best, ambiguous. It seems to me that T has the authentic reading (*Summonetur Wlnothus; adduxit secum...*), and that the phrase appearing only in W (ed. Blake 1962, p. 99) is to be read as an addition made there (a rather clumsy interpolation by the author of HEI/W), not as an omission from T.)

close approximation) from the footnotes in his edition.

Like T, U begins with a calendar (quires 1–2), a more interesting specimen than the one in T.¹⁶ On internal evidence, this calendar is certainly from Ely, and of about the same date as the rest of the manuscript; but the scribe who wrote it seems to occur only here, not in the following booklets.

Apart from the calendar, U's contents are briefly as follows:

booklet 1A (fos. 1–106): HEI, Books I–II (1r–106v);

three inserted leaves (fos. 107–9): a table of contents covering the whole of the rest of the manuscript, booklets 1B–C and 2–3;

booklet 1B (fos. 110–51): HEI, Book III, as far as the middle of chapter 92 (110r–51v);

booklet 1C (fos. 152–78): the remainder of HEI, Book III (152r–76r), followed after two blank pages by one segment of the xEI text (177v–8v), the segment that is missing from the next booklet;

booklet 2 (fos. 179–214): a copy of xEI (179r–207v), largely the same as in T except that one segment of the text is missing, followed by two documents that do not occur in T (207v–9v, 210v–13v);

booklet 3 (fos. 215–40): six hagiographical tracts (215r–40v).

Three scribes can be identified who wrote long stretches of text.¹⁷ Scribe U1 (Blake's hand A) wrote the first and larger part of booklet 1A (1r–76r), as far as the middle of Book II, chapter 90. He thus established a format for the book, with 29 lines to the page, which subsequent scribes were obliged to conform to, more or less closely. Since this stretch of text includes the table of contents for Book II (43v–6r), it is clear that the whole of Book II was already in existence (presumably in the form of a working draft),¹⁸ and that the change of hand after 96r, coinciding as it does with the turn of a leaf, means nothing more than what it obviously means – that the task begun by this scribe was continued by someone else. The same scribe, U1, wrote the copy of xEI in booklet 2 (179r–209v),¹⁹ including one of

¹⁶ This is the calendar collated as C by Wormald (1946, pp. 8–19). It is later than 1170 (because it includes the feast of Saint Thomas archbishop and martyr), but probably not much later (because it does not include obits for Henric II or bishop Galfrid, who both died in 1189). The page for October is reproduced by Robinson (1988, pl. 85).

¹⁷ As far as booklet 1 is concerned, I am mostly following Blake's (1962, pp. xxiii–iv) lead; what is said about booklets 2–3 is mine, and Blake is not answerable for it.

¹⁸ As Blake (1962, pp. xlii–iii) pointed out, the order of the chapters advertised here is not quite the same as in Book II itself, even in the portion written by U1: some rearrangement took place, after this list was drawn up, before the draft was copied into U.

¹⁹ Hamilton's edition includes a facsimile of a page (179v) from booklet

The survey of the whole of England

collation	modern signature	17th-century foliation	James's foliation
8	1		1–8
6	2		9–14
8	3	1–8	15–22
8	4	9–16	23–30
8	5	17–24	31–8
8	6	25–32	39–46
8	7	33–40	47–54
8	8	41–8	55–62
8	9	49–56	63–70
8	10	57–64	71–8
8	11	65–72	79–86
10	12	73–82	87–96
8	13	83–90	97–104
8	14	91–8	105–12
8	15	99–106	113–20
three		107–9	121–3
10	16	110–19	124–33
8	17	120–7	134–41
8	18	128–35	142–9
8	19	136–43	150–7
8	20	144–51	158–65
8	21	152–9	166–73
8	22	160–7	174–81
10	23	168–77	182–91
one		178	192
10	24	179–88	193–202
10	25	189–98	203–12
8	26	199–206	213–20
8	27	207–14	221–8
10	28	215–24	231–40
8	29	225–32	241–8
8	30	233–40	249–56

Table 24. Collation of Cambridge, Trinity College O. 2. 1. (The leaves numbered 229–30 by James (a sheet from a fourteenth-century music book) are a late insertion between quires 27 and 28. Two similar leaves, which he did not number, form flyleaves at the front of the book.)

the documents not present in T.

Scribe U2 (Blake's hand B) wrote the rest of booklet 1A (76v–106v), as far as the end of Book II, and the first section of booklet 1B (110r–25v), as far as the end of Book III, chapter 43 (125v23).²⁰ Up to this point, U seems to be a fair copy, replacing an earlier draft; from this point onwards, however, U itself begins to look like a draft, with chapters being added in piecemeal fashion. How much of this stretch (125v–51v) was written by scribe U2, how much (if

anything) was written by other hands, is difficult to decide (Blake 1962, p. xxiii); I have not looked at it closely enough to form an opinion of my own. The presumption is, in any case, that only one brain was at work. Like Blake (1962, p. xlvi), I take it that booklet 1B would originally have continued as far as the end of Book III. As things stand now, however, this final section of HEI is a fair copy, booklet 1C, written by a scribe who had not contributed previously.

This man, scribe U3 (Blake's hand C), was responsible for giving the book its present shape. He wrote the whole of booklet 1C (fos. 152–78), substituting three new quires for the latter part of booklet 1B.²¹ He also wrote the whole

2, showing approximately the same stretch of text as the facsimile of T (above, note 10). There are no other published reproductions of scribe U1's work, as far as I am aware.

²⁰ I do not know of any reproduction showing this scribe's work.

²¹ A page written by scribe U3 (175v) is reproduced by Robinson 1988,

of booklet 3 (fos. 215–40), the collection of hagiographical tracts. Between these two new booklets he inserted booklet 2, the copy of xEl written some time previously by scribe U1. It was scribe U3 who connected the beginning of this booklet with the end of booklet 1C, by adding the stretch of text (177v–8v) which in T forms part of xEl but which U1 did not include. And finally it was scribe U3 who added one more document (210v–13v) in the space available at the end of booklet 2.²²

The final section of HEI's Book III, recopied by this scribe, presumably from U2's draft, carries the story forward as far as 1170. The author, speaking in the first person singular, explains that he was expecting to conclude his work with the death of bishop Nigel in 1169; but now he feels compelled to add a final chapter, giving a brief account of the life and death of the holy martyr, Thomas archbishop of Canterbury. From this it is clear that HEI was completed soon after 1170, possibly, as Blake (1962, p. xlvi) suggests, during the five-year interval when the see of Ely was vacant, 1169–74. We can thus be certain that scribe U3's contribution is later than 1170; but we cannot say how much later. We may suspect that scribe U1's contribution – the one which interests us – is earlier than 1174, but we cannot say how much earlier. The compilation of the chronicle is likely to have extended over several years, perhaps with some changes of plan along the way. Probably the author started work while bishop Nigel was still alive, not deciding till after the bishop was dead that his death would be a fit point at which to end (changing his mind again, however, after archbishop Thomas was murdered). But it does not seem possible to say how many years he spent on his task, or when he first began.²³ For our purposes, these uncertainties do not seem to matter much. I assume a date of about

pl. 86.

²² The table of contents (107r–9v) inserted at the front of Book III, written by a similar but (in my opinion) not the same hand, reflects the shape imposed on the end of the manuscript by scribe U3. The last few entries (109vb) are as follows:

Passio sanctissimi Thome martyris cantuariensis archiepiscopi.
Descriptio terrarum ecclesie sancte æd'eld' in uolumen protensum.
Vita beate Sexburge.
Vita sancte Ermenilde.
Vita sancte Archengote uirginis.
Vita sancte Werburge uirginis.
Vita beate Æd'elberge uirginis.
Vita alme uirginis Withburge.

The first of these entries refers to the final chapter of HEI; the second covers xEl; and the rest relate to the hagiographical tracts in booklet 3. Of the six saints in question here, three belonged to Ely, and the others were sisters or daughters of Ely's saints. Saint Audrey, Ely's patron saint, is the subject of HEI's Book I, and accounts of her miracles are woven into Books II–III. (Four of the tracts found in U are among those edited, from this and other manuscripts, by Love (2004, pp. 134–88, 12–22, —, 26–50, —, 54–66); the two that she omits consist just of excerpts from Beda.)

²³ Some lapse of time is implied by the apologetic remarks in the preface to Book II (ed. Blake 1962, p. 63). Blake thought it possible that the compilation of HEI might have taken more than forty years. Because HEI/U is the work of one man, and because the preface to Book I already includes a prospectus for Books II–III, I do not find that credible; many authors have had to apologize for taking longer than expected to finish a book. But it might well have taken 5–10 years to research and write a book as big as HEI.

1170 for scribe U1, which may err on the late side, and a date of about 1180–1200 for scribe U3, which may err on the early side.

Booklet 2 is linked with the first part of booklet 1A, to the extent that both the hand and the format are the same. That does not prove conclusively that this booklet was, at the moment when scribe U1 wrote it, intended to form an appendix for HEI; it could have been scribe U3 who decided that; but probably we are safe in assuming that this had been the intention all along. More specifically, we need to note that one segment of the xEl text will have to be considered separately from the rest. This is the segment giving lists of names, for fourteen hundreds in Cambridgeshire and three in Hertfordshire, of the men who had sworn to the truth of the facts reported from their hundred.²⁴ Because the hand is different, it can be stated as a matter of fact that this segment has a different history from the rest of xEl. How far the difference goes is a question we shall have to come back to. But it is clear straight away that conclusions drawn from this stretch of text cannot be assumed to apply to xEl as a whole.

V = British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi, fos. 36–120

Tiberius A. vi is a composite volume, consisting of three very different and quite unrelated items put together by Cotton.²⁵ In the fire which came close to destroying the Cotton Library in 1731, this book suffered some damage, mostly along the top edge. When it was repaired, the leaves were cut and mounted one by one. From discontinuities affecting the seventeenth-century foliation, it appears that a few of the leaves – blank leaves, one would assume – may have been discarded at the same time.

The item of interest here is a portion of a late twelfth-century manuscript from Ely. When the leaves were cut, nobody thought to keep any record of the original collation; as it now stands, the manuscript consists of 85 single leaves, divisible into three booklets (Table 25). Excluding some additions made by later hands (69v–70v, 118v–20r), the contents are as follows:

booklet 1 (fos. 36–70): a copy of xEl (36r–69r), largely the same as in T, followed by three blank pages;

booklet 2 (fos. 71–98): a copy of part of the B version of the survey text (71r–98v), defective at the end;

booklet 3 (fos. 99–120): a copy of the cartulary (99r–118r),

²⁴ It is explained in the footnotes to Hamilton's edition of xEl that in U this segment comes before the title; but nothing is said about the hand being different, nor about a new quire starting at this point.

²⁵ The other contents are: the 'B' manuscript of the 'Anglo-Saxon Chronicle' (fos. 1–35), described by Ker (1957, pp. 249–50) and edited by Taylor (1983); and a fourteenth-century chronicle in French (fos. 121–99), entirely unoriginal (Taylor 1957, pp. 430–2).

collation	17th-century foliation	modern foliation
thirty-five	38–72	36–70
twenty-eight	76–9, 90–113	71–98
twenty-two	118–39	99–120

Table 25. Collation of British Library, Cotton Tib. A. vi, fos. 36–120. (The seventeenth-century foliation jumps from 79 to 90, but there is no significance in that: the man numbering the leaves lost count, writing 90 insted of 80.)

largely the same as in T but defective at the beginning, followed by five blank pages.

The manuscript is later than 1152, on the evidence of booklet 3 – appreciably later than that, to judge from the style of the script. Hamilton (1876, p. xiii) suggested a date of about 1180. I would be inclined towards a later date, perhaps closer to 1200; but the only opinion to be trusted is the opinion of someone closely acquainted with the products of the Ely scriptorium,²⁶ and that description does not apply to me. As far as I can see, an exact date is not going to be needed for present purposes.

For all three booklets the format is consistent – two columns and 31 lines to the page – and the original text is all the work of one man, scribe V1, writing a bold but rather uneven script.²⁷ The headings and coloured initials have all been supplied. It seems clear enough that all three booklets were intended to belong together; but it is doubtful whether the existing order, fixed by Cotton’s binder, was the order that the scribe had in mind. There are no clues in V itself (quire signatures, table of contents, medieval foliation), but comparison with T suggests that booklet 3, the cartulary, was meant to come first, not last (and perhaps that V originally began as T does, with a copy of the *Libellus*). This is speculation; but it is not an unlikely idea that Agarde or Cotton might have changed the order of the booklets, so that V began with the beginning of something, rather than in the middle.

With regard to booklet 3, the cartulary, it is as certain as these things can be that V was copied from T, at a time when T already contained the additions made in that manuscript by scribes T2 and T3 (Table 23). The point was proved by Blake (1962, p. xl). To repeat the most obvious fact, in V the final document breaks off unfinished, in the middle of a word, just as it does in T; but here the break comes in the middle of a line (118rb11), not at the foot of a page.²⁸ The presumption is that V’s booklet 1 was also copied from

T. There does not appear to be any evidence which tells against this view; there are some positive facts which tend to confirm it.²⁹ If V consisted only of these two booklets, it would have no textual value whatever. Its value is confined to the text in booklet 2, of which this copy is the only one in existence.

Unlike the scribes who worked on U, scribe V1 had no authorial or editorial ambitions; he was simply making a copy. To judge from the work he did in booklets 1 and 3, he was not the most accurate of copyists, but he did not take it upon himself to make improvements in the text. As long as his copy looked good on the page, he was satisfied. We may assume that the same applies to booklet 2, the unique copy of B-Ca. Because the rubrication is all in place, we may assume, furthermore, that the scribe completed the task (however he defined it) that he had set for himself.

Through no fault of his, what we see when we look at this booklet is not what the scribe would have wanted us to see. At the upper margin and outer corner, the leaves have been eroded by fire, and the parchment is discoloured and distorted; although Hamilton managed to decipher most of the damaged passages, here and there some parts of the text have been destroyed. Before that, before it came into Cotton’s possession, booklet 2 was already defective, not just at the end, where it breaks off in mid sentence at the foot of 98v, but also between fos. 96 and 97. It can be proved (see below) that four leaves have gone missing here; so we can feel fairly sure that booklet 2, at the moment when Cotton acquired it (and presumably already at the moment when Agarde acquired it), consisted of three quires of eight and a fourth quire from which the four inner leaves had dropped out. From the end of the fourth quire onwards,³⁰ all the rest of this booklet had been lost.

Up to a point, it is fairly easy to estimate the quantity of missing text, with the help of DB-Ca.³¹ If we compare DB-Ca with the surviving part of V, we find, roughly speaking, that one line in DB corresponds with two lines in V – partly because V has shorter lines, partly because the B text includes some categories of information which are absent from DB. If DB has a paragraph five lines long, the matching paragraph in V will be about ten lines long.³² Thus,

²⁹ For example, the word *terre*, turned up at the end of a line in T (148vb17), easy for a copyist to overlook, and in fact omitted from V.

³⁰ As was first noted by Hardy (1865, p. 36), the text breaks off in the middle of this sentence: *Et vii istorum homines re(gis) e(dwardi) fuerunt, viii h(idas) et iam u(irgam) habuerunt, et vicecom(iti) re(gis) v auras ...* (98vb). The missing words can be restored as *et i inuuardum reddebant*: the factual information comes from the corresponding paragraph in DB, the formula from the previous paragraph in B.

³¹ Here and elsewhere (especially in Appendix I), I shall be using the paragraph numbers introduced by Rumble (1981), not just for DB-Ca, but also for the corresponding entries in B-Ca and xEl-Ca.

³² In counting the lines of V, I ignore two elements of the B text which are not represented in DB: the list of jurors for each hundred, and the overall assessment for a village divided into two or more manors. With those elements excluded, the multiplier comes out as a remarkably consistent

²⁶ When, for example, did the spelling *c* for *t* in words like *inquisicio* start to catch on in Ely?

²⁷ The page lithographed by Netherclift for Hamilton (above, note 2) is fo. 71r, the beginning of booklet 2. I do not know of any other reproductions.

²⁸ A second scribe, V2, began the additions that he wanted to make on the verso (118v), leaving this document unfinished.

for the missing portions of V, if we count up the number of lines in DB and multiply by two, we ought to get a reasonably accurate estimate of the number of lines in V. The question is of no great consequence, and I do not propose to discuss it in detail, only to report the conclusions that I have come to. (1) Between fos. 96 and 97, it is, I think, quite certain that four leaves have been lost (fos. 96A–D).³³ (2) After fo. 98, I calculate that the missing portion of the survey of Cambridgeshire would occupy six whole leaves (fos. 98A–F) and some small part of a seventh (fo. 98G). But here we are extrapolating into a void, without any means of knowing how far we have gone adrift.

After the end of the survey of Cambridgeshire, what, if anything, came next? In xEl (see below), the excerpts from the survey of this county are followed directly by excerpts from a description of the town of Cambridge. There is a parallel passage in DB–Ca (189r); but the details were mostly dropped from DB, and only a few snippets of interest to Ely found their way into xEl. Did V contain the full text of this description of Cambridge, appended to the survey of Cambridgeshire? Whatever the answer to that may be, a larger question comes next. Did V stop after dealing with this one county, or did it continue with another? These questions are worth asking, even if there seems to be little hope of answering them. They are, indeed, worth asking for that very reason. We need to remember how much uncertainty has resulted from the loss of part of this unique manuscript.

The fact is that we have lost more than a quarter, perhaps much more than a quarter, of the text that scribe V1 was intending to preserve for posterity. Out of courtesy, we need to make some effort to visualize V as the scribe wrote it, as he meant us to see it. But sooner or later our attention has to shift. Beyond a certain point, we lose interest in knowing what was true of V; instead we want to know what was true of V's exemplar. What was the manuscript which scribe V1 had in front of him, and how and when did it become available in Ely?

2

Though the nature of V's exemplar is a question which cannot be answered all at once, it has to be the simplest hypothesis that scribe V1, when he made his copy of B–Ca, was copying from the original – from the actual manuscript

factor, approximately 1.94. In reconstructing the missing parts of V, we shall need to top up the estimate appropriately, after performing the multiplication, so as to allow for the presence in V of these elements absent from DB.

³³ I pose the question thus: how many lines ought to occur in V between the beginning of para. 14/49 (96vb30) and the end of para. 14/56 (97ra10)? Summing the entries in DB (including these two) which ought to have counterparts here (Appendix I), I get a total of 248 lines. Multiplied by 1.94, that gives 481 lines; topped up (as explained in the previous note), that becomes 510 lines. This is the answer to the question as it was put. Subtracting the number of surviving lines (two at the bottom of 96vb, ten at the top of 97ra) and dividing by the number of lines per leaf ($4 \times 31 = 124$), I get 4.016 as the estimated number of missing leaves.

which had been submitted to the Treasury, in mid 1086, by the commissioners responsible for finalizing the report for Cambridgeshire. We cannot expect to prove this: we cannot rule out the idea that V was a second-hand copy (or an *n*th-hand copy, $n > 1$) of B – in which case it would follow that not all of its errors need be scribe V1's fault. It is not obvious why anyone would have thought it worthwhile to make a copy of B; but the thought occurred to scribe V1, and so might perhaps have occurred at some previous date to someone else. The most we can say is that there is no reason not to think that V was copied directly from the original – and in the nature of the case a double negative is as close as we can get to a positive. When we have to deal with copies, rather than originals, ambiguities of this kind are inescapable.

V's copy of B–Ca is not our only resource. DB is another proxy for B, and one which has the advantage of being intact. The entries here have been reorganized, shortened and reworded; but the factual information should all be derived from B, and (errors aside) should all agree with V. From Ely, two other sources are available, though both consist only of excerpts of limited scope. First, all the paragraphs of B in which Ely is mentioned are represented by parallel entries in xEl, some of which, because they agree word for word with V, must have been copied word for word from B (see below). Second, with one exception, all the paragraphs of B which recite the names of the jurors for a given hundred recur in a segment of text which got itself connected with xEl. If V had never been written, or if it had been lost or destroyed, it would still be possible, from this other evidence, to arrive at a vague reconstruction of B–Ca; and that is what we are reduced to doing, for those stretches of text which do not survive in V. An outline reconstruction of the complete text, based on V, xEl and DB, is presented below (Appendix I).

To appreciate how much difference it makes whether V survives or not, imagine what the situation would be if the stretch of text covering the first two hundreds had been lost (Table 26). We should still have the hundred headings and the names of the jurors; we should still have entries in xEl relating to three of these villages; but for the rest we should have to try to work out how DB's entries fitted into this framework – a problem which is, in general, only approximately soluble. (And even if we could put the entries back in place, we could not hope to retrieve the original wording.) Because V has not been lost, we know all the answers without having to work them out. Much that would be uncertain if V did not exist becomes certain because it does.

In its formal properties, V cannot be thought to have resembled its exemplar. The layout used in this booklet – short lines arranged in two columns, coloured initials and so on – is the same as in the other two booklets; presumably the scribe would have used this format whatever the exemplar looked like. There is nothing here which invites the thought that it might have been imitated from the earlier manuscript. Though it seems a safe guess that the lines in the exemplar

B-Ca/V	B-Ca/xEl/T	B-Ca/?/T
CAMBRIDGESHIRE	CAMBRIDGESHIRE	
Staploe hundred	Staploe hundred	Staploe hundred
jurors' names		jurors' names
Kennett		
Badlingham		
Chippenham		
Snailwell	Snailwell	
Exning		
Burwell		
Soham	Soham	
Fordham		
Isleham		
Wicken		
Cheveley hundred	Cheveley hundred	Cheveley hundred
jurors' names		jurors' names
Silverley		
Ashley		
Saxon		
Ditton		
Ditton	Ditton	
Kirtling		
Cheveley		

Table 26. Reconstructing B-Ca with or without the evidence of V.

were longer than the lines in V, I do not find any error in V which might have been caused by the scribe dropping a line. In V, quite frequently, words and short phrases are misplaced – some examples of this are cited by Round (1895, pp. 15–16) – as if notes added in the margins of the original were being imported into the text by an unintelligent copyist; but I cannot see any pattern here. With the help of xEl and DB, we can make some progress in detecting and correcting V's errors; whether we think that these errors are all to be blamed on scribe V1 depends on whether we think that he was copying directly from the original.

For monitoring V1's performance as a transcriber, the best evidence comes from the copy which he made of xEl, if we can assume (as surely we can) that he was copying from T. As far as I have checked, the most obvious trait is a tendency to lengthen shortened words: he often writes *dominio* where T has *d'nio*, *homines* where T has *ho'es*. He is more inclined than T to write verbs in full, numbers as words instead of numerals. Sometimes this tendency results in errors – *potest* for *pot(uerunt)*, *manet* for *man(erium)*, *hund'* for *h(idis)* – which do not redound to his credit. On the whole, however, considering the length and the tediousness of the text that he was copying, his copy is a respectable piece of work. It is also worth noting that he seems to alter the spelling of place-names as a matter of course: if he recognizes the name, he spells it as he would normally spell it, not as he finds it spelt in his exemplar. Probably he did the same in making his copy of B-Ca; but of course it cannot be taken for granted that he treated every exemplar with the same degree of respect or disrespect.

If V can be trusted on this point, B had no title. Scribe V1 left three lines blank, as if with the thought that somebody might like to invent a suitable heading, but nobody ever did. There is no preamble; the text begins, as it means to continue, in a brisk and businesslike fashion:

In Cambridgeshire.
 In Staploe hundred.
 These are the men who swore . . . (a list of eight names).
 In this hundred Kennett defended itself for 3.5 hides in the time of king Edward . . .

and then it launches into its description of the manor coinciding with this village. When it comes to a village divided into two or more manors, the text takes on this shape:

In this hundred Burwell defended itself for 15 hides.
 Of these 15 hides the abbot of Ramsey holds 10.25 hides . . .
 Of these 15 hides Alan holds 2.5 hides from count Alan . . .
 Of these 15 hides Gaufrid holds 1.25 hides from count Alan . . .
 Of these 15 hides the nuns of Chatteris hold 0.5 hides . . .
 Of these 15 hides Hardwin de Escalers holds 0.5 hides . . .

Once Burwell's 15 hides have all been accounted for, the bulldozer moves on to the next village – and so on, and so on, manor by manor, village by village, hundred by hundred, until finally there is not (or would not be, if the text were complete) a single acre of land in Cambridgeshire of which we do not know who holds it, and whether he holds it directly from the king or from one of the king's barons. From reading B, much more than from reading DB, one gets a sense of the inexorable force that was driving the sur-

vey forwards. Straight questions were put; straight answers were expected. There was to be no tolerance for delay or indecision.

In B, as in DB, the basic unit of inquiry is the manor. Most of the questions being asked are demands for information relating to a given manor; and the same questions are repeated for every manor in turn. For example, the abbot of Ramsey's manor in Burwell is described in these terms:

And of these fifteen hides the abbot of Ramsey holds ten hides and one virgate from the king. There is land there for sixteen ploughs; there are four on the domain and twelve for the villains. There are three hides in domain and forty acres. Forty-two villains and a half, eight slaves, meadow for ten ploughs, pasture for the village's livestock, two mills (paying) six shillings and eight pence. Livestock on the domain: two spare oxen, a hundred sheep, twenty-five pigs, four horses. All sources of profit included, it is worth sixteen pounds; when (the abbot) got possession, (it was worth) sixteen pounds; in the time of king Edward, twenty pounds. This manor has always belonged and (still) belongs to Saint Benedict's church.³⁴

The wording of the text, though at first it is slightly unstable,³⁵ soon settles down into a shape which repeats itself in paragraph after paragraph. Occasionally some fact turns up for which the usual formulas will not suffice; but as soon as this fact has been disposed of, the pattern reasserts itself.

In one important respect the pattern fails. As was recognized by Round, the king's own manors – more precisely those manors which belonged to king Willelm because they had formerly belonged to king Edward – are not recorded in the B text as we have it. The next village after Burwell is Soham, assessed at 11 hides, and one of the manors here happened to belong to the king. We are given no description of it. Instead we find this note:

Of these 11 hides the king has 9.45 hides in his brief,³⁶

after which the other four holdings in Soham are described in the normal way. Seven more manors belonging to the king are similarly omitted from the B text, as it appears in

³⁴ *Et de his xv hidis tenet abbas de Ramesio x hidas et i uirgam de rege. Terra est ibi xvi carrucis, iiii^{or} in dominio et xii uillanis, et iii hide in dominio et xl acre, xlii uillani et dimidius, viii serui, pratum x carrucis, pastura ad pecuniam uille, duo molendina de vi solidis et viii denariis, pecunia in dominio ii^o animalia ociosa, c oues et xxv porci, iiii^{or} runcini. In totis ualentis ualet xvi libras, et quando recepit xvi libras, tempore regis Edwardi xx libras. Hoc manerium semper iacuit et iacet in ecclesia Sancti Benedicti.* Based on V-72ra, but checked for the formulas against other entries in B/V and for the facts against DB (para. 7/9).

³⁵ This is a point, noticed by Galbraith (1961, p. 126), which might be worth investigating more closely. The difficulty will be in deciding how much of the fluctuation originated in B, as the commissioners' scribes adjusted themselves to their task, and how much of it in V, as the Ely scribe adjusted himself to his.

³⁶ *De his xi h(idis) habet rex ix h(idas) et dimi(diam) vi ac(ras) minus in breui suo (V-72va, para. 1/1).*

V.³⁷ Possibly a note of the omission was intended to appear each time; in the text as it survives, however, there is only one more note of this kind.³⁸ Otherwise the only clue that we get is the fact that the assessments reported for the component manors fail to add up to the assessment reported for the village. With only three words to go on, *in breui suo*, we can hardly hope to understand exactly what was meant. But my guess would be that these entries were cancelled in the B text (occasionally with a note explaining why) some time after the compilation of the C text,³⁹ and that the scribe of V, or some previous scribe (whichever scribe it was who copied directly from B), omitted them because they were cancelled, without thinking that perhaps it might be better to include them nevertheless (if they were still decipherable).

3

From the answers that were recorded, it ought to be possible to reconstruct the questions that were being asked. We can do that; we can do much more than that. From the B text for any single county, it ought to be possible to arrive at a reconstruction of the program which governed the entire survey (Table 27). The questionnaire at the heart of the program is (if we wish to use this expression) the commissioners' terms of reference; but we need to tread carefully here. These are the terms of reference issued to the commissioners responsible for the survey of Cambridgeshire, as they were given effect by those commissioners. How far the instructions varied from county to county, how much room there was for differences of interpretation, or for outright misunderstanding – these are questions for which as yet we have no adequate answers.

For each hundred as such, the only information recorded is the jurors' names; for each village as such, the only information recorded is the total number of hides for which it has to pay geld. In subsequent versions of the survey text, this information all drops out. Once the text had been reorganized on feudal lines, there was no place in it for any data above the level of the individual manor. The information which had to be dropped from the main text could have been collected into appendices; but that did not happen. In C, in D, in DB, it is only from incidental remarks that we learn of the jurors' existence; we never learn their names. Again, we are never told what the total assessment is for

³⁷ In DB-Ca the stretch of text corresponding to the 'king's brief' is paras. 1/1–9. Except for the last one, the places in question all fall within the scope of the surviving portion of B-Ca.

³⁸ *Et de his viii h(idis) et xl ac(ris) habet rex i h(idam) et iii uir(gas) in breui suo (V-95vb, para. 1/8).*

³⁹ There is no indication in the surviving C booklets that the king's manors had been given special treatment in the B text. On the contrary, the C booklets covering the king's manors seem to have been compiled at the same time as all the rest, from the same source text, by the same scribes. So the absence of such entries from B-Ca/V should probably be taken to imply, not that they were never present, but rather that they were removed from the text at some later stage.

The survey of the whole of England

```
for each county
  for each hundred in this county
    who are the men who swore?
    for each village in this hundred
      how many hides did it answer for TRE? how many now?
      for each manor
        who holds it? if not from the king, from whom?
        how many hides? (Report the TRE number, regardless
          of whether the current number is the same.)
        how many ploughs does the land suffice for?
        how many ploughs on the domain? how many ploughs
          for the villains?
        how many hides of domain? (Do not answer this
          question unless some deduction of danegeld has
          been claimed.)
        if there are fewer ploughs than the land suffices
          for, how many more might be made on the domain?
          how many more for the villains?
        how many villains, bordars, slaves?
        anybody else worth mentioning?
        how many mills? and what are they worth?
        any other assets worth mentioning?
        how much meadow?
        how much pasture?
        how much livestock -- cows, sheep, pigs, horses --
          on the domain?
        altogether how much is the manor worth?
        how much was it worth when the man who holds it got
          possession?
        how much was it worth TRE?
        who held it TRE? on what terms? did the king get
          anything from him?
        if there is any current dispute, get the jurors to
          give you a statement of the facts. (Do not try
          to arbitrate; your remit is just to report.)
      next manor
    next village
  next hundred
next county
```

Table 27. A reconstruction of the program governing the survey.

any village. In the case of a village (like Kennett) which comprises only one manor, of course the assessment of the manor is the same as the assessment of the village; but DB does not tell us explicitly that this is the only manor that needs to be counted. In the case of a village (like Burwell) divided into several manors, DB does not give us the total at all. We can recover it (errors aside) by tracking down the corresponding entries in the relevant chapters of DB and adding up the assessments recorded there; but we have to do that for ourselves, without any guidance from DB.

It is an established fact, therefore, that some of the information assembled and set down in writing by the commissioners conducting the survey was systematically omitted from C, and hence from D and DB. This is important: it means that the B text was not altogether superseded by these subsequent versions. The omission of the assessment figures was given great emphasis by Galbraith (1942) – it seemed to him to prove that the survey was not especially concerned

with matters affecting the geld – but I think that he was missing the point. The assessment information is still to be found in DB – in an arrangement which, though certainly less convenient for some purposes, would presumably not have been adopted unless it had been thought preferable for some other purposes.⁴⁰ It is the omission of the jurors' names which carries greater significance, because it was irreparable. These names had not been recorded for no reason: they had been recorded because it might become necessary to know who was legally answerable for the truth of the statements vouched for by some given hundred. If it turned out that the facts had been misrepresented, the jurors

⁴⁰ Galbraith, towards the end of his life, appears to have thought that his exposure of the 'geld fallacy' was the chief contribution he had made to 'Domesday' scholarship. That is rather sad, because the 'geld fallacy' is not a fallacy at all. What Galbraith insisted on finding inexplicable had in fact been explained long before, by Ballard (1906, pp. 249–50) – admittedly not the most credit-worthy source, but one which Galbraith was prepared to trust implicitly when it came to Eyton's conjecture.

were the men on whom retribution would fall first. Therefore it cannot be true (as has sometimes been thought) that the commissioners' report was thrown away as soon as the D text had been brought into existence. Even after that, the B text still had some value of its own: it would retain that value, perhaps not for ever, but at least for as long as there was any likelihood of litigation resulting from the survey. For that reason it had to be kept; and that means, by the way, that the B text would still have been available, for some length of time, should anyone have wanted to consult the assessment information in its original, unfeodalized arrangement.