Chapter 11
The conduct of the survey: the compilation phase

Before we could think that we had a good grasp on the compilation process, we should need to have the time-scale worked out. That means that we should need to know, for each county, six specific dates: the date of the inception of the C text, the date of its completion, the date of the inception of the D text, the date of its completion, the date of the inception of the DB text, the date of its completion. If these dates were all known (not to the nearest minute, but preferably within a few days), we could make up a table with 33 rows (one for each county) and six columns (one for each category of date). Given the information contained in this table, we could then watch the compilation process unfolding day by day, from the inception of the first C booklet to the completion of the last DB booklet.

It is well that we should be aware of the depth of our ignorance, as long as the awareness does not induce despair. The fact is that we do not know – and have no hope of ever getting to know – a single one of these 198 dates. If we ask, not for actual dates, but for information regarding the sequence of events, we do not know much; but we are not entirely at a loss. It goes without saying that in every row the dates have to increase from left to right: the C text cannot be finished till after it has been started, the D text cannot be started till after the C text has been finished, and so on.[1] In column 5, the order of the entries is mostly known: for thirty counties, with only a few uncertainties, the inception sequence for the DB booklets is reasonably well established. In column 1, the order is partly known: for nine of the same counties, the inception sequence for the C text is also tolerably certain. To the extent that they can be compared, there is a strong (but not perfect) correlation between the order of the entries in columns 1 and 5; for that to be true for two columns so far apart, there must have been a strong correlation between each of the intervening pairs of columns (1 and 2, 2 and 3, 3 and 4, 4 and 5). We shall not go far wrong if we assume that the order of the entries in each column is determined by the order of the entries in the preceding column.[2]

Even when it comes to actual dates, we are not totally ignorant. There are at least a few bounds to be set here and there. For reasons already explained, it is probably safe to assume that none of the dates in the first column (the C-inception dates) was earlier than the beginning of April; if that is true for the first column, it is true for the whole table. Moreover, I think we can be sure that none of the dates in the first column was later than the end of July. By the beginning of August, the last C text, C-So, had not only been begun: it had been finished – or at least it was thought to have been finished, until it turned out that one last-minute alteration had to be made, at the instance of the bishop of Winchester. On the other hand, the fact that it was still worth altering C-So implies that D-So had not yet been started. D-So must be later than the beginning of August; DB-So must be later again; and there are two other counties of which we know that the date in column 5 (the DB-inception date) must be later than it is for Somerset (above, pp. 79–80).

For the C text alone, bounds can be set on both its inception and its completion. The entire C text was written, it seems, between early April and late July – that is, within a period of roughly 100 days. We can take it for granted that the work was started at the earliest possible moment, as soon as the first of the B texts began arriving in the treasury; we are allowed to think that the C text had only just been completed when the bishop of Winchester began lobbying to have some part of the record rewritten. Throughout that period, the scribes would no doubt have been made to work as hard as they possibly could, from sunrise to sunset, day after day, week after week, until the job was done. Since it seems to have been the policy for five scribes (not counting mu) to be participating at any given moment, the labour available amounts, at most, to around 500 man-days. Since the C text can be estimated to have consisted of rather more than 3000 leaves, the rate of production that would have to be achieved would be something in excess of six leaves per scribe per day. For that average to be kept up, the two scribes who bore the brunt of the work (alpha and beta) would presumably have to be writing faster than that. There is scope here for some experimentation; but it does not seem to me at all unlikely that some of the C scribes were producing an average of ten or twelve leaves per day. They had a mountain to climb, but it was not Mount Everest: they were not making a copy of the Bible.

The rate of production of the D text is determined by the rate of production of the C text. It cannot have been faster than that; on the assumption that no avoidable delay was

---

[1] Here I am ignoring the possibility that a stretch of text which was thought to be finished might afterwards be found to need some further work. In many of the DB booklets, it is plain that additions had to be made, sometimes even after the text had been rubricated. There are two reasons why such changes might have become necessary: the DB scribe may have been correcting some error of his own; or he may have been revising the text to bring it into line with a revised version of the D text.

[2] It is only with column 4 that this assumption looks a little risky. If (as I suppose) the D booklets were written in parallel, two or three at a time, the order of completion might differ significantly from the order of inception. To put it simply, the booklet for a small county might be started later but finished sooner than the booklet for a large county.

allowed, it is unlikely to have been much slower. Hence we would expect the production of the D text to occupy a similar span of time, roughly 100 days, offset by however long it took for the first collection of C booklets to become available. To judge from the few surviving booklets, it is unlikely that there were more than three D scribes at work at any given moment; and that would imply that the labour available for the compilation of the D text amounted at most to around 300 man-days. Because the D scribes had a much easier job than the C scribes, that number seems plausible to me. If they were under pressure to complete the job before the king left the country, they would have had to work as fast as possible; if they were not, they could have afforded to slow down a little. Though the DB scribe was coming along behind, one man could not keep up with two or three.[3]

For the DB text a similar allocation of labour would be needed. Once it had been decided that one scribe should do all the work, there was no getting away from the fact that 300 divided by 1 is 300. The scribe could be prevented from slacking, but he could not be made to do the impossible. Working at maximum speed, perhaps he might have been able to produce – this is just a guess – as much as twelve columns per day; but he can hardly have sustained that rate throughout. From discontinuities in the manuscript itself, it seems clear that the work was done in a somewhat spasmodic fashion. There were long periods when the scribe was writing hard; but there were periods as well when he was checking back, planning ahead, or perhaps just scratching his head, wondering how best to escape from some impasse. Without knowing what share of his time was spent on incidental activities like these, it is hard to see how an estimate of his top speed could be converted into an estimate of his average speed.[4] Still, if we suppose that he was writing fairly hard for more than half the time, 300 days would probably be enough.[5] At the earliest, he could not have started work before about June 1086; so it seems that the work would have had to continue over the winter, perhaps reaching completion in the spring of 1087.

---

[3] A rather obvious point, but one which I failed to see (above, p. 23).

[4] ((Thorn and Thorn (2001, p. 72) seem to think that this obstacle can be surmounted, but I remain despondent.))

[5] This estimate is of the same order of magnitude as the one arrived at on the basis of Fairbank's experiments (above, p. 14). As Jenkinson put it, 'we might hope for a speed of about three folios (twelve columns) in two days' (i.e. 6 columns per day); the wording seems to imply that this estimate is on the optimistic side. If the length of the written text is taken to be approximately 1440 columns, it will follow that DB represents 'about 240 days' work', hardly less but quite possibly more (Jenkinson 1954, p. 34). But there is an undeclared parameter here. If Fairbank's speed was measured in minutes per line or lines per hour, as it presumably was, some conversion would have had to be made from man-hours to man-days, and we are not told how this was done. For a civil servant employed in the Admiralty (like Fairbank) or the British Museum (like Jenkinson), there might only be eight hours in a day; but the DB scribe, when he was working flat out, may well have kept going for longer than that, perhaps for twelve hours, perhaps even (light permitting) for sixteen hours. Are we willing to believe that the DB scribe might have reached a maximum speed of around 12 columns (3 leaves) per day? If so, the equivalent maximum speed would be around 30 pages (15 leaves) per day for one of the C scribes, around 24 pages (12 leaves) per day for one of the D scribes.

If the reader thinks that these estimates are crude, I can only say that I agree. But any attempt to understand the compilation process will necessarily involve some estimates of this kind, and it seems to me a step in the right direction if the estimates are made explicit. Any proposed interpretation of the evidence has to stand up to this test: the amount of labour assumed to be available must be roughly the same as the amount of labour assumed to be required. Putting ourselves in the king's place, we want the job to be done as quickly as possible. We accept the fact that to get the job done more quickly means employing more hands to do it, but we do not want to hire hands which cannot be kept busy. If the scribes complain of being overworked, that will not trouble us much. They may grumble as much as they please; they are not going to go on strike.

1

Unlike D and DB, the C text was not intended to be kept for ever. The scribes who wrote it assumed that it would be discarded, piece by piece, as its usefulness was exhausted; and most of it was discarded. By accident part of it survived – the part which was still potentially useful at the moment when use ceased being made of it. By luck it survived for long enough to be carried off to Exeter, where it found a safe home in the church's library. On the C scribes' account as well as ours, that was a fortunate event. Their handiwork did not all vanish. Because a portion of the C text exists in the original, we know how the survey data were taken out of the cadastral frame and put into a feodal frame. We are not reduced to guessing how this was done, from the evidence of D and DB; we can actually watch it happening.

From the evidence of this surviving fragment, some conclusions follow quite directly. The C text originated in Winchester. It was written in the king's treasury, the staff of which, because of the extra work involved, had been expanded far beyond its normal size. Three scribes – I call them mu, alpha and beta – appear to have worked on every section of the C text. Since the same three scribes were responsible for handling the geld accounts, they appear to represent (two of them at least) the treasury's permanent staff. But those three were assisted from time to time by numerous other scribes, and these appear to have been temporary employees, hired only for the duration of the work. They were organized in teams of three, and we can watch these teams (five of them at least) rotating in and out of the treasury, as the operation proceeds (above, pp. 51–2). At any moment, therefore, there would normally be six scribes at work, the three treasury scribes plus one of the teams of hired scribes. But occasionally other scribes pitched in as well, perhaps because they had finished some task of their own and had a little time to spare.

Of the permanent employees, the one who writes least, scribe mu, is probably the man in charge: the tasks which he undertakes seem to be the tasks which he is not willing

to delegate.[6] He supervises the compilation of the C text; he is presumably also responsible (somebody must be) for making sure that the treasury's normal functions continue running smoothly meanwhile. The second, scribe alpha, is a man whose cursive style of writing seems to prove that he has made a career for himself as an administrator.[7]

These two can reasonably be identified with officials whose duties are described for us, some ninety years later, in the *Dialogus de scaccario* (ed. Johnson 1950). The treasurer was the man responsible for all aspects of the department's business which involved the use of writing: scribe mu seems to be that man.[8] Because his duties would sometimes require him to travel, the treasurer had a deputy (called the treasurer's clerk), permanently based in Winchester, who had day-to-day charge of the department: scribe alpha seems to be that man. By the 1170s, the treasurer also had a secretary (called the treasurer's scribe), who had to be capable of writing neatly, at the treasurer's dictation, but was not required to do anything on his own initiative. Perhaps scribe beta was that man, but I do not press the point; it is not impossible that he was a temporary employee who, unlike the others, had been assigned to work at headquarters alongside scribe alpha.

There is, of course, some risk in extrapolating backwards so far from the 1170s; but the risk should not be exaggerated. The treasury was there long before the exchequer existed; cash was flowing into the treasury (and out of it) long before this new apparatus was put in place to monitor the inward flow. In the 1080s, just as in the 1170s, there must have been someone keeping the door (the usher), and there must have been someone standing guard overnight (the nightwatchman). By the 1170s there were two parallel systems at work – one based on tallies, the other on written records – which regulated one another. If we extrapolate backwards far enough, perhaps we reach a period when the treasury was being managed by two illiterate officials (the chamberlains), who conducted all their business by means of tallies;[9] but that period had ended by the 1080s. The geld accounts are proof – the clearest proof that could be asked for – that by this time it was a matter of routine for the treasury's transactions to be recorded in writing. That means that there must have been a literate official (the treasurer) jointly in charge of the department; and this official would have had to have a deputy (the treasurer's clerk), just as his illiterate colleagues did. The only doubtful point, it

seems to me, is whether the treasurer would, in normal circumstances, have been so busy that he needed a full-time secretary.

In 1086 the circumstances were so very far from normal that it was necessary to hire a large number of temporary employees. It is a fact of some significance in itself that one could – if one were the king – requisition the services of at least fifteen additional scribes, all of them adequately competent, and some of them quite proficient. Who these men were, where they were found, how far afield one had to go in search of them, are questions for the experts, not for me. Two of them, perhaps three, are known to have been employed, at some point in their careers, copying manuscripts for the bishop of Salisbury;[10] it is permissible to hope that more identifications of this kind may eventually be made, perhaps across the Channel as well as in England. It seems to me best to work on the hypothesis that these scribes were professionals – the sort of specialist who might sometimes find regular employment in the household of an individual patron but might sometimes sell his skill on the open market. On this occasion they were invited or impressed into the king's service, and paid (I suppose) by the day.

From the surviving booklets, we can form some idea of the method by which the C text was compiled. Because the collections that survive were the last to be compiled, we cannot be sure how far the method had been worked out theoretically in advance, how far it was evolved by trial and error as the work proceeded. Even in the early stages, however, there cannot have been time for dithering: somebody had to know what needed to be done, and how the scribes assigned to the task were expected to go about doing it. The basic requirement was for the operation to be organized in such a way that several scribes could work simultaneously, without obstructing one another, and we understand how that objective can be achieved. In principle, the quires of B are made to form themselves into a reception line, and the quires of C are then made to move along this line, shaking hands with each quire of B in turn (above, pp. 45–7). Once it is started, the compilation process develops a momentum which will carry it forward without much thought on the part of the scribes involved, without much supervision.

It is, I think, worth asking the question whether the treasury officials might have had any previous experience of working with an algorithm of this kind. Only one suggestion occurs to me: they could conceivably have done something similar with the geld accounts for some previous year. Suppose that they took a collection of geld accounts and spread them out along a table, in the way that I imagine them spreading out the quires of B. They could then scan through the accounts, excerpting the entries which would

---

[6] Such as the additions made in the second version of the Wiltshire geld account (above, p. 68).

[7] This is the man who wrote the geld accounts for Dorset, Devon, Cornwall and Somerset (above, pp. 61–2).

[8] If that is right, we know his name, Henric, and we know that he had been given some land in Hampshire; but (as far as I am aware) we know nothing more than that. Whether his handwriting tells us anything about his career is a question that I leave for the experts.

[9] It was one of the duties of the treasurer's clerk to write inscriptions on the tallies. Do we have any idea how the tallies might have been distinguished from one another in this hypothetical period when they had no writing on them?

[10] Unlike Webber (1992), I am assuming that these books were originally made for Osmund's private library, and only later given (perhaps bequeathed) to Salisbury Cathedral.

tell them – for each baron, for each county, for each hundred – how many hides of land were held by this man, and how many of these hides were held in domain. By working on tasks like this – relatively small tasks, perhaps of no great urgency – the treasury might have developed the skills that it needed when it came to compiling the C text. This line of thought is all guesswork; but it seems attractive to me – more attractive than the idea that the algorithm was invented out of nothing, on the spur of the moment.

The mechanical procedure that I have described will certainly get the job done; but it is wasteful of time for the C scribes to have to scan through the quires of B over and over again. If that was not obvious beforehand, it would soon become obvious once the work had started. Much time could be saved if some reliable person would read through each quire of B in advance and make an index of its contents. Then, whenever one of the C scribes came looking for a task, he could tell at once, by a glance at the index, whether or not it was worth his while to scan this particular quire.

Perhaps coincidentally, perhaps not, one of the surviving quires of C has an index of the sort that we are thinking might have been made for the quires of B. The quire in question (fos. 456–63) forms one of the omnibus booklets – its title is *Terrae francorum militum in Deuenesira* – used for several short stretches of the C-Dn text: the contents correspond with eleven separate chapters in DB-Dn, plus a paragraph in one of DB-Dn's omnibus chapters. Near the bottom of the first page (456r), in small script, a line of text was added by scribe mu. It comprises these five names:

Osbernus, Giraldus, R. paganellus, Guillelmus de ou, et ansgerus de monte acuto.

Though in fact this index covers only the first three pages, as far as 457r15, the *et* before *ansgerus* seems to prove that it was complete at the moment when scribe mu made it. As soon as the next stretch of text was written (457r16–v11), the index became incomplete. By the time that this quire had been filled up, as far as 462v6, there were seven more names asking to be added to the index; but nobody took any notice.[11]

It is tolerably certain, therefore, that this index was made by one of the C scribes, while the C text was in process of being compiled. The only question is why. From the fact that it was not continued and completed, we may gather that it did not serve any important purpose, as far as the C scribes were concerned. My suggestion is that scribe mu gave this quire of C the same treatment that had been given as a matter of course to the quires of B. He had indexed the quires of B; perhaps for some good reason, perhaps absent-mindedly, he indexed one quire of C in the same way.

This argument is tenuous in the extreme, and the reader is under no compulsion to give it credence. Except in an abstract way, we are never going to know how the C text was compiled; beyond a certain point, that does not matter. We can see that the job was doable; we can see that it was done. The facts to hold onto are these: that the compilation of the C text was a large and complicated business, that a method was devised for dealing with it, and that the job was carried through successfully.

If we could have looked into the office, at a time when the work was running smoothly, we would have seen five scribes in action. Each scribe had part of the B text. He also had one of the booklets which, when finished, would form a component of the C text; this booklet was intended to cover the lands of some given baron within the given county. The scribe's instructions were to scan through this portion of B, stopping when he found a relevant paragraph, and then to copy this paragraph into the C booklet, with some necessary changes. Because the paragraph was being removed from its old frame and inserted into a new one, the opening words had to be modified. We might guess that this was so; in fact we know that it was so. On occasion, the scribe who had just completed a paragraph continued by writing the formula which would begin the next paragraph: '(The same man) has a manor which is called' – at which point there is a change of hand. The scribe was expecting to find another paragraph which would need to be copied; but he had not found it yet, and never did. In the event it was one of his colleagues who found the next paragraph. This formula, then, is a feature of the text which originated with the C scribes: it replaced whatever formula they found in the B text.[12] Once the opening sentence had been reorganized, however, presumably the rest of the paragraph was copied word for word. (Is there any reason why it might not be?)

Finally the stage was reached when every paragraph from B had been decanted into one of the C booklets, and that meant that work on this county was concluded.[13] The logical thing to do at this point would be to set the collection of C booklets aside (until the D scribes requisitioned them) and to start a new collection for the next county. But we know, from the surviving portion of the C text, that this is not what the C scribes did for the last five counties in the queue. Instead of making five collections of booklets, they made only two – one for Wiltshire and Dorset, the other for Devon, Cornwall and Somerset. To put it more exactly, they made a collection of C booklets for Wiltshire, and then, as far as possible, they used the same booklets for Dorset as well, not starting a new booklet except when they had no choice (i.e. when they encountered a baron in B-Do whom

---

[11] At a later stage, the words *in deuenesira* were added by somebody else (not one of the C scribes) at the end of this line. The hand may be the same which inserted the significant words *de episcopo baioccensi* in the Somerset section of the same booklet, at 467r5 (above, p. 78).

[12] Which may or may not have been the same as in B-Ca: 'And of these ten hides …'.

[13] I say nothing about the C scribes' treatment of the entries that they found in B relating to towns. That is a question which might be worth looking at in detail.

they had not encountered in B-Wi). Similarly, they made a collection of C booklets for Devon, and then, as far as possible, they used the same booklets for Cornwall as well, and then again for Somerset as well.

The packing of two or three counties into a single collection of booklets is a very striking feature, but I do not think that it has any deep significance. Though I have continued to ponder over this question, I cannot think of any explanation beyond the one which I suggested before – that the scribes were trying to cut down on their consumption of parchment (above, pp. 42–3). Furthermore, for reasons which will shortly appear, I am satisfied now that it is an adequate explanation. For this option to be available to them, the C scribes must have been well ahead of the D scribes: they had to be sure of being able to complete C-Do before the D scribes were ready to start work on D-Wi, sure of being able to complete C-So before the D scribes were ready to start work on D-Dn. Apparently they were safe in making these assumptions. But the C scribes did not expect this ad hoc arrangement to last. They were taking it for granted that the counties would be unpacked again, when the D text was written; and that is indeed what happened.[14] Taking DB as a proxy for D, we find almost no trace of the peculiar arrangement which the C scribes imposed on the text.

With this policy in place, it is crucially important for the beginning of each new county to be marked correctly in every single booklet. If any county heading is omitted or misplaced, the D scribes will not be able to unpack the counties without making mistakes: any block of text which lacks its proper heading will seem to them to be part of the preceding county. To prevent mistakes of that kind, the C scribes have to be given some rule such as this:

Before you copy any part of the B text into a C booklet, scan backwards through the C booklet until you find a county heading. If the heading that you find is a heading for the current county, all is well: go back to the end and continue. If it is not, a new heading is needed, and you are responsible for making it: go back to the end, write the heading, and then continue.

And they have to be told to obey the rule without fail. Even one mistake will be fatal. If a block of text is added by a scribe who forgets the rule, the county heading may be absent altogether; if a block of text is added afterwards by a scribe who remembers the rule, the county heading will be present, but not in the right place. Unless these errors are corrected in time (the C text does seem to have been checked to some extent), the D scribes are doomed to go wrong, and the DB scribe is doomed to follow them.

Almost without exception, the scribes who worked on the surviving C booklets, C-WiDo and C-DnCoSo, understood the rule and were punctilious about obeying it. But one of the scribes who worked on the C text for Dorset (scribe

omicron) was prone to be careless: in two instances that we know about (above, p. 44), he failed to follow the rule. In one instance the defective heading was completed by someone else; in the other instance it was not, and a paragraph which belonged in Dorset ended up in the wrong county. Accordingly, when we find two stray entries in DB-Wi (69ra, 73va) which properly belong in Dorset, we are justified in suspecting that this was due to some deficiency in the C text, even though the matching C entries do not survive.[15]

Even if the county headings are all in place, a blunder by one of the D scribes may produce a similar result. If this scribe overlooks a heading and continues copying regardless, a block of text will be entered in the wrong county. In this case, however, we would expect the block to be duplicated: we would expect it to appear (wrongly) at the end of a chapter in one county and also (rightly) at the beginning of a chapter in another county. From evidence of this sort, if we could find enough of it, we might be able to work out the order in which the counties were dealt with by the C scribes.[16]

There is a reason why I risk labouring the point. From the evidence of DB it is possible to prove the existence of another collection of C booklets spanning more than one county – four counties, in fact, C-NnWaStOx – in which the county headings were occasionally omitted or misplaced; and the observable consequence of that is what we should expect it to be, that a few of the entries turn up in the wrong DB booklet.[17] The booklet which is most affected, DB-Nn, contains some entries which properly belong in each of the other three. In a vague sort of way these facts are known – they are mentioned, for instance, by Finn (1957, p. 63, 1961, p. 168) – but I am not aware that they have ever been explained. Now that we understand what method was used for compiling the C booklets, now that we understand what risks were associated with that method, the explanation is obvious.

To make sense of the evidence, we simply need to get it tabulated correctly. The overall pattern is shown in Table 36; the details are as follows:

entries in DB-Nn derived from B-Wa: the last entry in chap-

---

[14] The next person who edits the C text will, I hope, follow the same policy and deal with each county separately.

[15] The Werrington case (above, p. 51) is different: what we see there is a portion of the B-Co text being purposely transferred into C-Dn.

[16] The C scribes, not the D scribes. This evidence is not going to tell us whether the D booklet in which the error occurs was written before or after the other one: the observable result will be the same in either case.

[17] For example, there was a hundred in Staffordshire called Cuttlestone hundred. (The spelling varies. Probably it ought to be *Cudoluestan* or something similar, but more often than not that elides into *Coluestan*.) In DB as a whole, there are thirteen blocks of text which carry the heading 'In Cuttlestone hundred'. All of them ought to occur in DB-St, but in fact only ten of them do. Three have gone astray: one turns up in DB-Nn (222vb), and two turn up in DB-Wa (243ra, 243rb). It is obvious, therefore, that things went wrong during the compilation phase: the hundred headings were in place, but some of the county headings were not. From this evidence alone, we could tell that the C scribes dealt with these counties either in the order NnWaSt or in the order WaNnSt.

	B-Nn	B-Wa	B-St	B-Ox
DB-Nn	219–29	222va 224r 226rb 227va	222vb 226rb	221ra 224vb 226rb
DB-Wa	—	238–45	239rb 243ra 243rb	238va 244ra
DB-St	—	—	246–51	250rb 250rb
DB-Ox	—	—	—	154–61

Table 36. Entries misplaced in DB because of headings omitted in C-NnWaStOx.

ter 10 (222va); the last two entries (added at the foot of the page) in chapter 19 (224r); the last entry in chapter 36 (226rb); the last entry in chapter 46 (227va)

entries in DB-Nn derived from B-St: both entries in chapter 16 (222vb); the next-to-last entry in chapter 36 (226rb)

entries in DB-Nn derived from B-Ox: the last seven entries in chapter 4 (221ra); the last four entries in chapter 23 (224vb); the last entry in chapter 35 (226rb)

entries in DB-Wa derived from B-St: the last four entries in chapter 12 (239rb); the last entry in chapter 27 (243ra), duplicated in DB-St (250ra); the last entry in chapter 28 (243rb)

entries in DB-Wa derived from B-Ox: the next-to-last entry in chapter 3 (238va); the last entry in chapter 37 (244ra)

entries in DB-St derived from B-Ox: the next-to-last entry in chapter 12 (250rb);[18] the last entry in chapter 12 (250rb), duplicated in DB-Ox (160va)

Though some of these items of evidence may seem ambiguous, taken one by one,[19] they are more than numer-

ous enough to make a pattern. The negative indications are equally significant: there are no entries in DB-Wa derived from B-Nn, none in DB-St derived from B-Nn or B-Wa, none in DB-Ox derived from B-Nn, B-Wa or B-St. For these four counties, I think we can say with certainty that the DB text was derived, through D, from a collection of C booklets which covered precisely these counties, in precisely this order. By the criterion explained above, the errors which involve duplication are likely to be the fault of the D scribes; but most of the errors appear to have been due to deficiencies in C itself.[20]

Because the county headings were omitted or misplaced more frequently here than they were in C-WiDo or C-DnCoSo, it seems likely that a change of policy had occurred, the implications of which were at first not fully understood by the people who had to implement it. Up until now, it would appear, the C scribes had been dealing with each county by itself: they compiled a collection of C booklets for a single county, and then they set it aside until the D scribes were ready to deal with it. They were under instructions to make sure that each booklet began with a heading which gave the name of the baron and the name of the county concerned, and usually they remembered to do so. On that policy, however, it would not matter much if some of the headings were missing: the name of the baron could be found in the first paragraph, the name of the county in the accompanying booklets. Now it would matter greatly. Once it had been decided to pack two or more counties into a single collection of C booklets, the headings became indispensable.[21] Mostly the scribes understood that; but some either failed to grasp it, or failed to remember it when the moment came.[22]

If we look more closely, we can prove that there was indeed a change of plan, and that it occurred while the C scribes were at work on the text for Warwickshire. Consider the case of Hugo de Grentemaisnil. Hugo owned land in three of the counties in question – nothing in Staffordshire, but several manors in each of the others. Three blocks of text would have existed in C, and the corresponding blocks in DB occur at 224va (for his lands in Northamptonshire),

---

[18] This entry and the next one should each be a separate chapter, but DB does not number them (nor index them) as such.

[19] There are, for example, three entries relating to the village of Mollington in Oxfordshire – one entry in DB-Ox (157rb), but also one each in DB-Nn (226rb) and DB-Wa (244ra). Since the centre of the village was, in the nineteenth century, only about three miles from the border with Northamptonshire and only about one mile from the border with Warwickshire, it is conceivable that DB gives an accurate description of the situation, as it existed in 1086, and that the county borders here were realigned at some later date. As a matter of fact, it is known that part of this parish – the part which in 1086 belonged to Osbern son of Ricard (244ra) – was reckoned to be part of Warwickshire in the thirteenth century (*Book of fees*, pp. 508, 948) and later; but then the possibility arises that the border may have been adjusted precisely in order to make it conform with the evidence (supposedly infallible) of DB. These are questions for local historians to answer; but I hope it will be remembered that there are two stray entries to be accounted for, not just one, and that they both occur (unlike the entry in

DB-Ox) at the end of a chapter.

[20] To see how this works out in detail, the reader will need to reconstruct the C-NnWaStOx text for thirteen individual tenants: the bishop of Worcester, the bishop of Coutances, the church of Thorney, the church of Saint-Rémi, earl Roger, the count of Meulan, Turkil, Hugo de Grentemaisnil, Willelm Pevrel, Willelm son of Ansculf, Willelm son of Corbucion, Gislebert de Gand, and Osbern son of Ricard.

[21] It is not impossible that the same sort of thing had been done before to some extent; it is more likely than not, for example, that Derbyshire was packed into the same collection of C booklets as Nottinghamshire. We are not going to know that this happened unless something went wrong – unless the C scribes or the D scribes bungled the job.

[22] If we were inclined to put all the blame on one scribe, the culprit would have to be one of the major scribes (because more than one successive county is affected); but I see no reason why we should so inclined. It seems to me more likely that the blame was shared by a number of minor scribes, who (like omicron) had not absorbed their instructions fully before they joined in with the work.

242ra–b (for his lands in Warwickshire), and 224vb (for his lands in Oxfordshire). Because of the omission of the county heading, the third block of text has got itself displaced into the wrong DB booklet. If all three blocks had occupied a single C booklet, the absence of a heading would have caused the third block to attach itself to the second one, and the Oxfordshire lands would be included in DB-Wa. But in fact they are included in DB-Nn. The bishop of Coutances is in the same case as Hugo: the block of text covering his Oxfordshire lands (221ra) has attached itself to the block for Northamptonshire (220va–1ra), even though the bishop owned a manor in Warwickshire too (238vb).

It follows that the C scribes must have created two booklets for each of these men: they made a C-Nn booklet; then they made a C-Wa booklet; and then they turned the C-Nn booklet into a C-NnOx booklet. When they compiled the C-Nn text, they were still making a separate collection of C booklets for each county; and at first they thought that they were doing the same with C-Wa. (That is why they started fresh booklets for the bishop and for Hugo.) But then the policy changed. The C-Nn booklets (which had been set aside but not yet removed from the office) were reactivated; and the scribes were instructed that they should, from now on, make use of an existing booklet whenever possible, rather than starting a new one. That policy was followed for the rest of C-Wa, and then for C-St, and then again for C-Ox.

It seems that somebody (perhaps scribe mu) had done some calculations and come to an alarming conclusion: at the current rate of consumption, the C scribes were going to exhaust their allocation of parchment before they reached the end of their task. The existing procedure was visibly wasteful – in many booklets there were several blank pages at the end – and that wastage would have to be reduced. By packing counties together, parchment was saved, but only at the risk of dire consequences if any county heading was omitted. In fact, a number of mistakes did occur – not a large number, but enough that we can understand what was happening. Unaware of these failings (the fact that the errors were not corrected implies that they were not detected), the C scribes applied the same procedure to the next five counties – not to all five at one go, but first to two of them (C-WiDo) and then to the final three (C-DnCoSo).

One other change in procedure occurred during the compilation of the C-Ox text – apparently very soon after the start of this job. Up until now, the C scribes had been under instructions to include any hundred headings that were needed. Apparently they were inclined to be slack about this (though some of the headings which have gone missing may have been included in C and then dropped at a later stage), but in principle the rule was followed. When one of the C scribes found an entry in B, he did not copy it at once. He scanned backwards through B, looking for the hundred heading which governed this entry; then he copied the heading; and only then did he copy the entry itself. The new rule which had been introduced for making sure that the county headings were in place (see above) was a modified version

of the rule which had been followed from the beginning for making sure that the hundred headings were in place. While the C scribes were working on C-Wa and C-St, they were expected to apply both rules; when they started work on C-Ox, for a while the same was still true. But then the procedure was simplified. From now on, the scribes were permitted to drop all the hundred headings (and perhaps in return they had to promise to be especially careful about the county headings). The upshot is that in DB-Ox there are very few hundred headings, and those only for a few of the hundreds that existed.[23] In DB-Wi and the booklets after that, hundred headings are altogether absent; and we know that their absence here is not the fault of the D scribes or DB scribe: it is a feature derived from the C text.[24]

It seems to me that we can say for certain which counties, in which order, were the last nine to be dealt with by the C scribes:

```
        (1)     (2)
         |       |
C:  ..... Nn Wa St Ox Wi Do Dn Co So
```

The two changes in procedure affecting the C text can be mapped onto this sequence: (1) the decision to save parchment by packing more than one county into a single collection of booklets; (2) the decision to save time by omitting the hundred headings. This second change was, I suppose, a delayed consequence of the first one. Because of the extra time that the scribes were now having to spend on the county headings, the work would certainly have slowed down to some extent, perhaps to an worrying extent; if they were told to forget about the hundred headings, that would speed things up again.

There is a coda to the story of the C text. The coda may not be of much importance in itself; but without it there would have been no chance for any C booklets to survive.

The D scribes, when they had finished with some instalment of the C text, did not throw it away: they returned it to the treasury scribes, who had some further use to make of it. If this final operation (whatever it was) had been completed, the C booklets would all have been discarded; because it was interrupted, some of the C booklets had some chance of surviving, and did indeed survive (above, pp. 53–5). More

---

[23] I take it that these were the hundreds which came at the beginning of the B text; but I do not have the local knowledge needed for working this out in detail.

[24] The solitary heading that occurs in DB-Wi is only there because it had got itself welded into the text: the passage *vi hid' in RUSTESELLE* appears in blundered form as *vi hid' in HUND' de WRDERUSTESELLE* (69rb). The solitary heading that occurs in DB-Dn is a mirage: in fact these words are part of the preceding sentence (*Huic m' pertin' ii v' t'rę et dimid' In TAUETONE HUND'*), but the scribe, arbitrarily, wrote them in capital letters, with the result that they look like a heading for the next paragraph (101va). A similar mirage appears in DB-Do (75vb).

precisely, the facts are these. By the time that it was interrupted, the operation had been completed on all counties except the last five, and was in the process of being performed on Wiltshire; no C booklets survive for any of these counties (29 in number). The four counties at the end of the queue had not yet been touched; the C booklets survive for these, except for any C-WiDo booklets which contained (as many did) some portion of the C-Wi text. With regard to the last three counties, it had already been decided that Somerset should be dealt with before Devon and Cornwall, and the C-DnCoSo booklets had been sorted into two stacks accordingly. But then the operation came to a stop and never started again.

The surviving geld accounts make a pattern correlated with this one. For all counties except the last five, no geld account survives. For Wiltshire uniquely, a version of the geld account survives (in three successive copies) which is later than stage 2 of the survey. For each of the last four counties, a version of the geld account survives (the version that I call ch) which dates from between stage 1 and stage 2 – which was created specifically to inform the commissioners responsible for finalizing the B text what discrepancies the treasury had found between the original geld account and the interim version of the B text (above, pp. 65–6). That correlation is our only clue to the nature of this final operation on which the treasury scribes were now engaged. They were making use of the C text; they were also making use of this (ch) version of the geld account.

Because it involved some version of the survey text and some version of the current geld account, I think we have to infer that some further, final checking of the geld account was being carried out.[25] As far as the survey was concerned, the treasury's participation had come to an end as soon as the C text was completed; but the treasury could never lose interest in the geld. Somebody (scribe alpha, at a guess) was going through the accounts again, looking to see if anything had slipped through the cracks when the data were translated from the cadastral frame into a new one. What he was doing, I suppose, was drawing up a list, for each county in turn, of the number of hides for which each of the king's barons owed geld. He was assuming, in other words, that the collection of the geld was about to be feodalized. The old system was to lapse. From now onwards the king's barons would be responsible for paying the geld, and they would pay it through the sheriff. The treasury had one last chance to make sure that the king would not be losing anything, when the new system started up.[26]

Though I do not have any clear idea how this checking operation worked, I suspect that it petered out when it did because the absence of hundred headings from the last collections of C booklets made it qualitatively more difficult. Perhaps the checker managed to fight his way through Oxfordshire but admitted defeat in Wiltshire. Perhaps he gave up on Oxfordshire, tried the next county in the hope that it might be easier, discovered that it was not, and gave up altogether. At first, no doubt, it was possible to believe that the work had only been suspended, not abandoned; but the survival of these booklets is the proof that it did not start up again.

2

There are three surviving D booklets, covering one county each: Essex, Norfolk, Suffolk. They add up to 451 leaves, probably about one-sixth of the total number. It is possible to estimate the sizes of the missing booklets, though only rather crudely (Table 5); for three counties it would be possible to reconstruct the D text, after a fashion, by interpolating between C and DB; but nothing that we can do will alter the fact that only three booklets survive in the original. This is not a satisfactory sample. With four or five booklets – especially if they were scattered across the map, and therefore presumably distributed over several stages of the D scribes' imaginary journey – we should not have to feel inhibited from generalizing. With only three booklets, for three counties juxtaposed on the map, it is hard to be sure whether something that is true for all or some of these three was true for D as a whole.

On the other hand, we have no reason to think that there was, originally, anything extraordinary about these particular booklets (or, further back, about these particular counties). These booklets survive by virtue of an accident which, on any straightforward view of the case, did not occur till later, perhaps much later: they survive because part of DB was either never completed or else completed but subsequently lost (below, p. 142). At the moment when they were writing these booklets, the D scribes had no way of knowing that. They could not be aware that in a hundred years' time the D booklets would mostly have vanished, and that only three – these three – would still exist. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, I think we have to assume that the surviving booklets are approximately representative, and that these three counties took their places in the queue approximately where we would expect to find them – not far from Cambridgeshire, not far from Kent – at every stage, at least up until the completion of the D text.[27]

So far as we are willing to assume that the entire D text was thought of as a unit, some degree of uniformity is to

[25] But that will not explain one fact which seems to need explaining. How did it happen that two C booklets were within arm's reach of the DB scribe while he was writing DB-So (above, pp. 76–9)?

[26] As was pointed out long ago by Ballard (1906, pp. 249–50), there is no doubt but that the system did change: the only question is when. In 1130, and at least for a few years previously, the geld accounts appearing in the exchequer rolls were the product of this new system. County by county, each baron was liable for some known number of hides: he was responsible for paying the money to the sheriff (unless payment had been forgiven), and the sheriff was responsible for forwarding it to the treasury.

We hear nothing of the sort of arrangements which existed in 1086.

[27] If that is assumed to be true for the C text, one modest but not quite vacuous prediction follows: the D text ought to include the hundred headings. It does.

be expected. To the extent that they resemble one another (and, furthermore, to the extent that they resemble the C booklets), the three surviving D booklets should be typical of the whole collection. Nothing very exciting follows from that. All three booklets are largely composed of quires of eight; the dimensions are the same throughout; the ruling, though not very carefully done, was generally for 24 lines. The main text, beginning on the verso of the first leaf, was written in single column; there is no pronounced variation of format within or between booklets. When the main text was complete, the first page was used for adding an index, laid out in three or four columns. Then, with red ink, the chapters were numbered off: matching numerals were inserted against each item in the index and (always in the outer margin) against the first line of the chapter itself. The other rubrication may perhaps have been added at a slightly later stage;[28] the colophon at least was presumably a finishing touch, added just before this batch of three booklets was sent off to be bound.

In principle, the production of the D text was an easy job. The C scribes had done the hard work; the D scribes just had to make a fair copy. They took the C booklets, sorted them into the order that they thought best, and then copied out the text continuously, chapter after chapter, into a single booklet. Just by accident, it would occasionally happen that the start of a new chapter coincided with the start of a new quire; but in general the structure of the manuscript would not show any congruence with the structure of the text. Finally one of the scribes compiled the index, copying it onto the first page of the first quire, and with that the job was done.[29] The ordering of the chapters originated with the D scribes, and so did the index which codified that ordering; but the main text, as far as we can judge, would have been something close to a verbatim transcript of the C text. There was no motive for omitting anything; there was no opportunity for adding anything (unless the D scribes sometimes referred back to the B text, as quite possibly they did).

The basic decision which had to be made by the D scribes was the one which determined the order of the chapters. If we could work this out in detail, no doubt it would appear that the order was created partly by the C scribes, partly by the D scribes. Merely by forming the C booklets into a stack, the C scribes were imposing an order; they could not help but do that. The only question would be whether the order was haphazard (the accidental order, perhaps, in which the booklets had been completed) or whether some thought was put into it. If the order was haphazard, the

D scribes might need to do a large amount of shuffling before they could put the booklets into a satisfactory sequence. (But even then some pieces of the previous ordering might survive, just because there was no particular reason for changing them.) On the other hand, if the C scribes had already sorted the booklets into an order which seemed sensible to them, the D scribes might not feel obliged to do much shuffling; in the extreme case, they might simply accept the order proposed by the C scribes. However that may be, it was the D scribes who took the action which fixed the order. By writing out the text, they gave practical effect to the decisions which had been made, regardless of who had made them.

Anyone acquainted with the structure of the DB text, replicated in booklet after booklet, will be surprised, perhaps even shocked, by the comparatively careless and inconsistent way in which the D text is organized. The king comes first – but on that point we would not expect to encounter any difference of opinion. There is a tendency for important people – bishops and abbots, counts and earls – to occur near the front of the queue, but they are not grouped together and sorted into order with anything like the same punctilio as in DB. In DB the rule is clear that clerics take precedence over laics. Among the clerics, the ordering is, up to a point, predictably hierarchical: archbishops come before bishops, bishops comes before abbots, abbots come before abbesses, and so on. Among the laics, counts and earls (in Latin the title is the same for both) come first. The structure of the DB text is a topic which will need to be discussed in greater detail, when the time arrives (below, p. 137), and I am trying not to anticipate that discussion more than can be helped. For the moment these comments should suffice.

Here, for example, are the first twenty chapters in D-Nk, as they are listed in the index:

1   *Willelmus rex*
2   *Ep'c baiocensis*
3   *Com' de maurit'*
4   *Com' Alanus*
5   *Com' Eustachius*
6   *Com' Hugo*
7   *Rob' malet*
8   *Willelmus de War'*
9   *Rog' bigot*
10 *Willelmus ep'c*
11 *Osbertus ep'c*
12 *Godricus dapifer*
13 *Hermerus de ferer'*
14 *Abb' de Sc'o E'*
15 *Abb' de eli*
16 *Abb' Sc'i B' de ramesio*
17 *Abb' de Hulmo*
18 *Sc's Stephanus de cadomo*
19 *Willelmus de escois*
20 *Radulfus de bello fago*

---

[28] The rubrication of D-ExNkSk is described by Jenkinson (1954, pp. 45–6), with the suggestion (based on some apparent variation in the quality of the ink) that 'it may have been done in two stages'. Rumble (1987, pp. 80–1) regards the running heads (all of the ones on verso pages, most or all of the ones on recto pages) as the work of the same scribe who wrote the colophon, his scribe 7; unless I have missed it, he does not say who did the numbering.

[29] The D indexes are (as one would expect them to be) almost perfectly correct. There would be no need to say this were it not for the fact that the same cannot be said of the DB indexes (below, p. 137).

Putting ourselves in the DB scribe's place, we are not going to feel at all satisfied with this arrangement. According to our sense of protocol, the two English bishops (chapters 10–11) should come directly after the king, and the abbeys (chapters 14–18) should follow the bishoprics. In DB-Nk, if it was ever written, the chapters would presumably have been rearranged at least to this extent:

1	*Willelmus rex*
10	*Willelmus ep'c*
11	*Osbertus ep'c*
2	*Ep'c baiocensis*
14	*Abb' de Sc'o E'*
15	*Abb' de eli*
16	*Abb' Sc'i B' de ramesio*
17	*Abb' de Hulmo*
18	*Sc's Stephanus de cadomo*
3	*Com' de maurit'*
4	*Com' Alanus*
5	*Com' Eustachius*
6	*Com' Hugo*
7	*Rob' malet*
8	*Willelmus de War'*
9	*Rog' bigot*
12	*Godricus dapifer*
13	*Hermerus de ferer'*
19	*Willelmus de escois*
20	*Radulfus de bello fago*

The conclusion seems clear enough. As long as the king came first, the D scribes did not care much about the order of the chapters; nor did they care much whether the order in one booklet was consistent with that in another. The DB scribe thought differently. He saw it as part of his task to put the chapters into a better sequence – a sequence which would satisfy his sense of decency, and which would also be consistent from county to county. By and large he was successful in doing that. In order to do it, however, he had to be prepared to rearrange the text in a very drastic fashion. The ordering of the chapters in DB is an ordering created by the DB scribe; the ordering in D may have been – not only may have been but probably was – considerably different from this.[30]

I see no escape from this conclusion, except by resorting to the gratuitous assumption that the surviving D booklets may not be representative; and that is precisely what we cannot allow ourselves to do. But I concede that the conclusion is unwelcome. It means that we have no basis for reconstructing the order of the chapters in D, even with respect to those counties for which the C text survives. We can go a long way towards reconstructing the individual chapters as they appeared in D, by collating C with DB. But even in these counties – even where the evidence is at its best – we are, I fear, never going to know how the chapters were

organized with respect to one another. And that is bad news for anyone who might think of producing a new edition of part of the C text – of C-Dn, for example. Once the separate stretches of text have been transcribed from the manuscript, how should they be arranged? There is no given order, no order which is obviously the right one. If we knew, more or less exactly, the order in which the booklets were copied by the D scribes, it would, I think, be perfectly fair for an editor to put them back into that order. Since we do not know this, nor have any hope of knowing it, what other policy might this editor follow? Is there any satisfactory answer to that question?[31]

According to Rumble (1987), five scribes participated in the writing of these booklets.[32] Their contributions are listed in Table 37.[33] There is, I emphasize, nothing original here: though I have arranged it differently, the information is all taken straight from Rumble's description. Two of these men, scribe 1 and scribe 2, who both copied out long stretches of the text, seem also to have shared the responsibility for putting it into its final form; it was these two who wrote the indexes. As for scribe 1, who made numerous additions and corrections throughout, he was probably the man in charge; but his status (unlike scribe mu's) was not so elevated that he could not pitch in and write many pages himself. The other three scribes, by contrast, seem just to have been following instructions, and probably we should regard them (like most of the C scribes) as temporary employees.

None of the scribes who worked on D can be identified with any of the scribes who worked on the compilation of the C text: of that I feel fairly confident. But there are numerous additions and annotations in C which I have not looked at closely, and perhaps it may turn out that some of these were written by scribes who wrote some part of D. It is much to be hoped that someone will look at the evidence again with that thought in mind; I have not attempted it myself. The person who does it will have to be someone who (unlike me) is so intimately acquainted with the D scribes' work that he or she can hope to recognize the hand even from a

---

[30] As the reader may notice, this means that I am, with some disappointment, rejecting a suggestion of Galbraith's which I was formerly inclined to accept (above, p. 43). I discuss the point elsewhere (below, p. 139).

[31] There is an unsatisfactory answer. What Ellis did, in a desultory fashion, was to arrange the C text in parallel with the DB text; and this hypothetical editor may have no choice but to do the same with C-Dn (though do it more systematically). That arrangement will be convenient, for the purpose of comparing C and DB, but it will not have any authenticity. In principle one ought to be rearranging DB so as to line it up with C, not vice versa.

[32] I do not count Rumble's scribe 4, who makes only one small contribution (D-Nk-110v8–10), filling in a space left vacant by scribe 2 (Rumble 1987, pl. VII (a)). By the standard that I have applied to the C booklets, this does not entitle him to a number. In any case it cannot be said for certain that he was part of the original team: this addition could have been made at some later date, as long as either B-Nk or C-Nk was still in existence.

[33] This table omits the first page of each booklet. The index to D-Ex (laid out in four columns) was supplied by scribe 1 (1r), the index to D-Nk (three columns) by scribe 2 (109r); the index to D-Sk (three columns) was begun by scribe 2 but mostly written by scribe 1 (281r).

few scribbled words. I confess to having hoped that there might be some intersection, enough to indicate that both texts were compiled in one place. But such evidence, if it existed, would not exactly prove the point (because scribes have legs and can move from place to place); and certainly the absence of such evidence does not disprove it. Because only small fractions of either text survive, a scribe might have written both a large part of C and a large part of D without our knowing anything about it. The circumstantial evidence is strong enough by itself: since C was written in the treasury, since D was intended to be kept in the treasury, we can take it for granted that D was written in Winchester. What we have to infer, it seems, is that the D text was compiled in a different office from the C text: there was interchange of documentation between these offices, but (as far as we can tell) no interchange of personnel.

Having come so far, it seems to me that we can go a little further. The compilation of the D text was, I suggest, the responsibility of a different official, of higher status than the treasurer; and presumably that has to mean the chancellor (whose name was Girard).[34] It is not to be thought that the chancellor would have participated personally in the writing of the text: his duties required him to stay close to the king, and his supervision would have had to be exerted from a distance. What happened, it seems, is that the conduct of the work was delegated to two reliable employees, scribe 1 and scribe 2, detached from the king's household for the duration of the job. They were provided with accommodation in Winchester, separate from but in proximity to the office where the C text was being compiled; they were also provided with some extra help, in the shape of a few hired scribes. We might perhaps hope to recognize the chancellor's hand, if it appeared, as a hand which made comments or corrections overruling scribes 1 and 2; and no such hand occurs. But I do not think it unlikely that the rubrication was added by the chancellor himself, who would thus have been putting his stamp of approval on every finished page. And is it not positively likely that the chancellor himself was the man who added the colophon?

As far as we can imagine it, the division of labour among the D scribes involves no such complications as those with which the C scribes had to contend. In the simplest case, each county is dealt with by a single scribe. Two or three scribes can be at work side by side, each on a different D booklet.[35] Assigning a task means giving the stack of C

D-Ex

1v–8v	scribe 1
9v–16v	scribe 1
17v–99r	scribe 1
99r	scribe 3
99v–103v	scribe 1
104r–7v	scribe 3

D-Nk

109v–56r	scribe 2
157r–9v	scribe 3
159v–72v	scribe 5
173r	scribe 1
173r–6r	scribe 2
176r–v	scribe 5
176v–8v	scribe 2
178v–9v	scribe 5
179v–81v	scribe 2
182r–v	scribe 1
183r–90v	scribe 6
191r–3r	scribe 1
193r–208v	scribe 5
209r–22r	scribe 1
222v–34v	scribe 6
235r–73v	scribe 6
273v–9r	scribe 1
279r–v	scribe 2
279v–80r	scribe 1

D-Sk

281v–88v	scribe 2
289r–90r	scribe 1
290r–v	scribe 5
291r–4v	scribe 2
294v	scribe 1
294v–7r	scribe 2
297r	scribe 1
297r–8v	scribe 2
298v	scribe 1
298v–354r	scribe 2
354r	scribe 1
354r–6r	scribe 2
356v–78v	scribe 5
378v	scribe 1
379r–88v	scribe 5
388v	scribe 1
389r–449v	scribe 5
450r	scribe 2

Table 37. Scribal stints in the surviving D booklets, as they were identified by Rumble (1987).

[34] Though the evidence is thin, it is sufficient to prove that Girard served as chancellor from 1082×7 till 1087×91 (Galbraith 1931, Bates 1998, pp. 101–2, Burton 2004). This is the same man who became bishop of Hereford in 1096, archbishop of York in 1100; he died in 1108. Two people who are known to have taken an early interest in the work of the survey – Walkelin bishop of Winchester (above, pp. 72–3) and Simeon abbot of Ely (above, pp. 121–2) – had one thing in common beyond the fact that they were brothers: they were also both uncles of Girard's.

[35] Whether it would be feasible to seriate the surviving booklets, with respect to their order of inception or completion, is not clear to me. Perhaps

booklets for a specified county to a specified scribe. There is no interference between one task and another. Of course it is not compulsory for each task to be completed by the same scribe who started it: at any moment, for one reason or another, a task may be handed over to a different scribe, or one task may be exchanged for another: the task is still the same task, even if someone else is now responsible for it. Unless such contingent changes of hand supervene, the entire D booklet will be written by one scribe, except for any corrections and additions which may subsequently need to be made.

Having completed one such task, the scribe takes possession of the next available stack of C booklets and starts writing the D text for that county. If no new stack is available, he does not have to stay idle: he can join forces with one of his colleagues. All that is necessary is for the stack of C booklets to be split into two portions: the scribe who was already at work on this county continues with his portion of the stack, and the scribe who has now joined him begins copying the other portion. Unless the first scribe takes some preventive action, that plan will produce two booklets, perhaps with several blank pages at the end of this scribe's last quire. The second scribe does not need to worry about that; in fact he will probably prefer to leave some blank pages at the end, in case there are any additions which may have to be made.

Of the surviving booklets, D-Ex is the most straightforward. The first two quires are disjunct; but from the third quire onwards (17v–103v) the text was copied out continuously, nearly all of it by scribe 1. With D-Sk a different plan was followed. The first portion of the text (281v–356r) was mostly written by scribe 2, with occasional interventions by scribe 1; the second portion (356v–449v) was mostly written by scribe 5, again with occasional interventions by scribe 1.[36] Apparently the stack of C booklets was divided roughly in half, so that two scribes could work simultaneously, each making a separate booklet. But the discontinuity between these booklets has been adroitly disguised. Scribe 5 began at the beginning of a chapter (which, when the chapters were numbered, became chapter 14), on the first leaf of a quire; but he started on the verso (356v), leaving the recto blank. (Scribe 2 did the same in his first quire, but not for the same reason: there the first recto was being reserved for the index.) With the help of some luck, this made it possible for scribe 2, as he approached the end of the preceding chapter, to lay off the text in such a way that he had something left to write onto this recto page (356r).

As soon as he did that, the disjunction was hidden, and as if by magic two booklets were turned into one. The remaining booklet, D-Nk, is more of a puzzle. Put bluntly, the question is this: why did the D scribes make such heavy going of the Norfolk text? It might be worth someone's while to look at this booklet more closely, but I have nothing constructive to say about it.[37]

Overshadowed by DB, this surviving fragment of the D text has never received its fair share of attention, and I am conscious of having failed to do it justice. If things had worked out as the D scribes expected them to, the D text would have become the basis for all future discussion, and we should not be taking much notice of DB. As things are, anyone aiming to write a balanced account of the records resulting from the survey will need to make a special effort to give D the largest share of space, DB the smallest share. In comparison with D, for as long as D survived, DB had no more value than an epitome of DB has now in comparison with DB. Just as an epitome of DB – such as PRO, E 36/284 (Hallam 1986, pls. 15–16) – might be handsomer than DB, so DB might be handsomer than D; but it did not have any authority.

The D text was intended to be the permanent record of the survey. Completed, rubricated, bound up in (so it seems) six massive volumes, it was expected to inspire the admiration of future generations. On the last page of the last county in each volume,[38] written in red ink and capital letters, possibly by the hand of chancellor Girard himself, this inscription was addressed to posterity:

ANNO MILLESIMO OCTOGESIMO SEXTO AB INCAR-
NATIONE DOMINI, VIGESIMO VERO REGNI WILLELMI,
FACTA EST ISTA DESCRIPTIO, NON SOLVM PER HOS
... COMITATVS SED ETIAM PER ALIOS.

It will be recalled that a contemporary writer, speaking of the survey, used very similar language (above, p. 108).

But if posterity lapsed into ingratitude, even for an instant, the monument that had been so laboriously constructed might vanish. Sooner or later, that moment came, and somebody decided to discard, not all six, but five of these volumes. Only one volume was kept, and that one only by default. If the corresponding DB booklets had existed at that moment, this volume would have vanished too; because they did not exist, it had to be allowed to survive. We are left with a fragment of the D text, and we have to be grateful

---

we could risk assuming that Norfolk and Suffolk were kept together at every stage; for these two counties the question would then be whether D-Nk is earlier or later than D-Sk, and for Essex the question would be whether D-Ex is earlier or later than the other two. Possibly those questions are answerable. But I see no hope of being able to decide whether we are dealing with a tight sequence (such as ..NkSkEx..) or with a loose one (such as ..Ex..SkNk..), and that is probably the question which matters most.

[36] It looks as if scribe 2 and scribe 5 were under instructions to omit any paragraph which they thought problematic, leaving a suitable number of blank lines (they could calculate this number from the number of lines in C) so that the missing text could be inserted later by scribe 1.

[37] It might be suggested, for example, that the C scribes had packed these two counties into a single collection of booklets (with Sk before Nk, hypothetically), and that the D scribes had no trouble dealing with the first county but found it hard work to unpack the second one. I do not find this suggestion convincing myself – the sort of difficulties which might be expected to result, if this hypothesis were true, do not seem to match up with the sort of difficulties which the D scribes were encountering – but perhaps there may be something in it.

[38] The colophon to D-ExNkSk (450r) is reproduced by Rumble (1987, pl. V (b)). ((Also by Thorn and Thorn (2001, ill. 31).))

for that. For the rest we are left with a condensed version of the survey text – rearranged, abbreviated, reworded – which was not originally intended to stand alone.

3

In the writing of C and D, speed was the prime consideration. Teams of scribes were set to work, in large enough numbers to get the job done within the shortest practicable span of time. DB is a different case. This is a calligraphic manuscript, designed and executed by a single scribe.[39] He was working by himself, not in a busy office. He had time to think, and made the most of it. In many respects, the DB text is a vastly more impressive piece of work than D, more ambitious, more thoroughly thought out, more successfully executed. As soon as it came to be understood that DB was the work of an individual, it ought to have become clear too that he was a man possessed of much originality; but that realization, it seems to me, has not sunk in fully even now.[40] One of his creations was a system of phonetic spelling, based on the system used for French, which could be applied to English names. (The French system could already cope with Breton names; the new system had to be capable of coping with Welsh and Cornish names too.) He designed it, not for his own benefit, but for the benefit of those of his colleagues who did not know much English. By using this system, he hoped, they would, when reading out some document, be able to pronounce the names well enough to make themselves understood – well enough not to be sniggered at by the natives. Though possibly none of the elements was new, the system as a system was; and government scribes in England spent the next hundred years debating its merits and demerits.[41]

Another strong contrast between D and DB results from the same sort of systematizing urge, felt and given effect by the DB scribe. It has already been said (above, p. 133) that the order of the chapters is loosely and inconsistently organized

in D, tightly and consistently organized in DB. Since this question is directly relevant, and since it has seldom been discussed (and never with any insight), I propose to work through it in some detail; and the example that I take is the next-to-last index written by the DB scribe, the index for DB-Dn (Table 38).[42] For the moment it will do no harm to assume that the index is perfectly correct, i.e. that the items in the index correspond one-to-one with the chapters in the main text. (In fact the index has some defects, but that will not become relevant till later.)

Up to a point, the organizing principles behind this index are obvious. The most basic distinction is the one between the king and everybody else. Line 1 is reserved for the king; his name alone is written in capitals. Lines 2–52 are available for everybody else. Unlike the D scribes, the DB scribe has some definite rules in mind: he has applied them in other counties, and now he applies them here. Clerics are given precedence over laics, bishops over monasteries, English bishops over Norman bishops, English monasteries over Norman monasteries,[43] male monasteries over female monasteries.[44] (Few women appear in the indexes: those who do are normally put in the lowest possible place.) These rules do not determine the order fully – they do not explain why Tavistock comes before rather than after Buckfast, for instance, or why Le Mont-Saint-Michel comes before rather than after Saint-Étienne – but in broad terms they work well enough (lines 2–13). Among the laics, earls and counts are given precedence (lines 14–15); then we come to a large crowd of lesser barons. One is a woman; predictably she is placed last (line 45). Some of the others are important men, of a status not much inferior to an earl's; but of course their importance is not necessarily reflected by the extent of their holdings in this or any other single county. This part of the index (lines 16–44) has a carefully worked-out structure, and no trace of anything like it can be found in the D indexes. The items are grouped by initial letter, in what seems to be an arbitrary order (B, I, W, G, R, T, A, O), and they are also grouped by name (Willelm, Walter, Robert, Radulf, Alured).[45] Towards the end

---

[39] I refer to the DB scribe as 'he' for convenience only; I do not mean to say that 'he' must have been a man.

[40] The discussion of the place-name evidence by Sawyer (1956) is flawed for this reason. There are some references to 'the scribe of DB' or 'the DB scribe' (pp. 488–9), but these should apparently be taken to mean 'the scribe who wrote the matching entry in DB': in general it seems to be assumed that DB was written by several 'scribes' who all used the same 'set hand' (pp. 495–6). (Similarly, in his review of Jenkinson (1954), Sawyer (1954) makes one cryptic allusion to Fairbank's proposal – 'the scribe(s)' – but then implicitly rejects it with the remark that 'it is very difficult to detect changes of hand' in DB.) Yet the distinction is obviously crucial. If DB was written by several scribes, its orthography must be, in Galbraith's terms, a curial orthography evolved over the previous twenty years. If DB was written by one man, its orthography must be novel. The same point was made by Rumble (1985, pp. 48–9); but he agreed with Sawyer that there was something 'Old English' about this new system, and that seems mistaken to me. As far as I can judge, the DB scribe knew English well, but only as a spoken language.

[41] One person who disapproved of it was the man who compiled an epitome of DB-Ke (below, p. 144). He made a point of giving the place-names a much more English look – and by doing so declared that in his opinion the DB scribe had simplified the spelling too far.

[42] The numbers are mine: they refer to the lines, not the items, but that distinction makes no difference except in line 47. All the numbering in DB, both of the items in the index and of the chapters in the main text, was added afterwards, in red, and therefore I ignore it: I am discussing the index as it was originally written. Errors affecting the numbers are a separate issue: they are annoying, especially for an editor, but I do not see any significance in them.

[43] There is a query about line 10. As a matter of historical fact, it is clear that the lands described in this chapter belonged to the cathedral church in Rouen, which was served by canons, not monks. If that had been what the DB scribe was trying to say, however, we would expect the item to be worded differently (perhaps *Canonici rotomagenses*) and placed further down the list. He may possibly have thought – what Ellis (1833, vol. 1, p. 481) understood him to mean – that the church in question was the monastery of Notre-Dame-du-Pré, on the southern outskirts of Rouen; I cannot say whether that is likely or not.

[44] There is only one female monastery represented here, La Trinité in Caen (line 13).

[45] Again the order seems arbitrary: why not put Walter before Willelm (as is done, for instance, in DB-So), Radulf before Robert (as again is done in DB-So)? Note also that there is one exception to this rule: the two Ricards

HIC ANNOTANTVR TENENTES TERRAS IN DEVENESCIRE.

1 *REX WILLELMVS*
2 *Ep's de Execestre*
3 *Ep's Constantiensis*
4 *Eccl'a Glastingberie*
5 *Eccl'a de Tauestoch*
6 *Eccl'a de Bucfesth*
7 *Eccl'a de Hortune*
8 *Eccl'a de Creneburne*
9 *Eccl'a de Labatailge*
10 *Eccl'a de Rotomago S' Mar'*
11 *Eccl'a de Monte S' Michael'*
12 *Eccl'a S' Stefani de Cadom*
13 *Eccl'a S' Trinit' de Cadom*
14 *Comes Hugo*
15 *Comes Moritoniensis*
16 *Balduinus uicecomes*
17 *Iudhel de Totenais*
18 *Willelmus de Moion*
19 *Willelmus Chieure*
20 *Willelmus de Faleise*
21 *Willelmus de Poilgi*
22 *Willelmus de Ow*
23 *Walterius de Douuai*
24 *Walterius de Clauile*
25 *Walterius*
26 *Goscelmus*
27 *Ricardus filius Gisleberti comit'*
28 *Rogerius de Busli*
29 *Robertus de Albemarle*
30 *Robertus Bastard*
31 *Ricardus filius Torulf*
32 *Radulfus de Limesi*
33 *Radulfus Pagenel*
34 *Radulfus de Felgheres*
35 *Radulfus de Pomerei*
36 *Ruald Adobed*
37 *Tetbaldus filius Bernerii*
38 *Turstinus filius Rolf*
39 *Aluredus de Ispania*
40 *Aluredus brito*
41 *Ansgerus*
42 *Aiulfus*
43 *Odo filius Gamelin*
44 *Osbernus de Salceid*
45 *Vxor Heruei de Helion*
46 *Giroldus capellanus*
47 *Girardus   Godeboldus*
48 *Nicolaus*
49 *Fulcherus*
50 *Haimericus*
51 *Will's et alii seruient' regis*
52 *Coluin et alii taini regis*

Table 38. The index for DB-Dn. (In the manuscript the names are arranged in two sub-columns, the second of which starts with line 27.)

(lines 46–52), the logic at work is less obvious; but we may doubt whether it is accidental that the three G's come together, two of them sharing a line. In Devon, as in many other counties, a number of tenants occurred who held one or a few small manors directly from the king. They were, in a technical sense, the king's barons, but they were not important people. The D scribes seem not to have objected to making as many short chapters as might be needed, with the result that the D indexes tend to be very long; the DB scribe seems to have more inclined to cut things short by making one or two omnibus chapters at the end, and that is what happens here (lines 51–2).[46] These differences (especially the last one) could be said to be matters of degree: the DB scribe did not always follow his own rules; the D scribes did vaguely defer to a similar etiquette. Nevertheless, the differences add up to a very pronounced contrast.

Suppose that the index for D-Dn was about as haphazard as the index for D-Nk (above, p. 133). Starting with this index, how does the DB scribe go about reorganizing it? In principle, he has to follow some such procedure as this. He takes a strip of parchment, long enough for the purpose, wide enough for two columns. In column 1 he makes a copy of the existing index, exactly as it stands in D-Dn (except that he spells the names as he prefers to spell them).[47] In column 2 he is going to compile his own draft index: each time he adds a name to this new list, he will cancel it from column 1. He starts with the king, of course; then he deals with all the bishops; then with all the monasteries; then with all the earls and counts. By this time he has made 15 entries in column 2 and has cancelled 15 entries here and there in column 1. Now he is ready to start dealing with the barons. The first uncancelled item in column 1 is *Balduinus uicecomes*; so he adds that name to his list and cancels it from column 1. Next, he scans through the rest of column 1, looking for another *Balduinus*; failing to find one, he scans through column 1 again, looking for another *B*; failing again, he moves on. He finds the next uncancelled item in column 1, *Iudhel de Totenais*, adds it to column 2, cancels it from column 1, and then scans twice through the rest of column 1 as before, looking first for another *Iudhel* and then for another *I*. Both scans having failed, he moves on again. By now the first uncancelled item in column 1 is *Willelmus de Moion*; so he adds this name to column 2 and cancels it from column 1, in the usual way. Then he scans through the rest of column 1, looking for another *Willelmus*, and this time the scan pays off. In fact he finds four more Willelms, and each of them in turn is added to column 2, cancelled from column 1. Having disposed of all the Willelms, he scans through column 1 again, looking for another *W*, and once again the scan pays off. The *W* he finds

are not brought together.

[46] The C scribes, for practical reasons, had resorted to making a number of omnibus booklets (above, p. 43). The DB scribe, for reasons of his own, was adopting a similar policy; but the contents of his omnibus chapters do not coincide in detail with those of the C booklets.

[47] I take it that the DB scribe was forbidden to make marks in D: therefore he needed a copy.

1	*WILL' REX anglorum*
15	*L. archiep'c*
18	*Ep's tedfordensis*
19	*Feudum eiusd' ep'i*
20	*Ep's rouensis*
16	*Ep's baiocensis*
22	*Ep's ebroicensis*
14	*Abb' sc'i Etmundi*
17	*Abb' de ramesia*
21	*Abb' de eli*
23	*Abb' de bernai*
24	*Abb' de ceterith*
2	*Comes moritoniae*
3	*Comes Alamus*
4	*Comes Hugo*
5	*Comes Eustachius*
6	*Rob' malet*
36	*Rob' greno*
40	*Rob' filius corbutionis*
44	*Rob' de todeneio*
7	*Rog' Bigot*
8	*Rog' pictauensis*
29	*Rog' de otburuill'*
38	*Rog' de ramis*
11	*Rad' de bella fago*
33	*Rad' baignardus*
43	*Rad' de Limeseio*
50	*Rad' de felgeriis*
25	*Ricardus filius comitis gisl'*
34	*Ranulfus piperellus*
39	*Ranulfus f'r ilgeri*
9	*W. de Scoies*
26	*W. de uuarenna*
30	*W. f'r eiusd'*
47	*W. de archis*
41	*Galt' diaconus*
45	*Galt' gifart*
10	*Hermerus de ferreris*
31	*Hugo de monteforti*
49	*Hugo de grentemesnil*
12	*Frodo f'r abb'is*
13	*Godricus dapifer*
32	*Goisfridus de magna uill'*
27	*Suenus de essessa*
28	*Eudo dapifer*
35	*Albericus de uer*
37	*Petrus ualoniensis*
42	*Tihellus de herion*
48	*Drogo de beureria*
46	*Comitissa de alba marla*

Table 39. The first fifty items from the index for D-Sk (281r) put into a DB-like order. (One of the Willelms (line 30) is the brother of one of the Rogers (line 29).)

is a Walter, *Walterius de Douuai*; when the time comes to look for another Walter, again he will succeed. So the first Walter will move up to follow the last Willelm, and the second Walter will move up to follow the first Walter. And so on. Finally, when every entry in column 1 has been cancelled, the new index is complete.[48] (It should be of the same length as the old one: if it is not, something has gone wrong.) Applied to the first fifty items (i.e. the first two columns) of the index for D-Sk, this algorithm produces the result shown in Table 39.

It is not likely that the DB scribe proceeded in this purely mechanical fashion. The task is a small one, easier to perform than to describe, made easier still by practice; no doubt he allowed himself to take short cuts. To the extent that he did work mechanically, the order of the items in column 2 will be dictated by the order of the items in column 1. It would be possible for us, given the index of D-Dn, to construct our own version of an index for DB-Dn, just as we have done hypothetically for DB-Nk (above, p. 134) and DB-Sk (Table 39), in the expectation that our version would not be grossly different from the DB scribe's version. But the process cannot be reversed. Given the index of DB-Dn, we cannot reconstruct the index of D-Dn. Some partial sequences can be recovered, but they cannot be fitted back together again to make a single sequence. Among themselves, the five Willelms ought still to be in the same order as in D; among themselves, the four Radulfs similarly. But it is quite impossible to say where any Willelm stood with respect to any Radulf.

There is a reason why it is important to grasp this point. It often happens that the DB index does not tally exactly with the DB text.[49] These discrepancies are slight, and to me they seem epiphenomenal. If the DB scribe was juggling with 40 or 50 chapters, it is not surprising that he sometimes lost track of what he ought to be doing. Now and then, he made a change that he had not been intending to make, or omitted to make a change that he had been intending to make – and failed to adjust his draft index correspondingly. There is, in my view, nothing more to it than that. For Galbraith, however, these discrepancies formed the basis for a different conclusion. They meant, he thought, that the DB scribe was copying the indexes from D, rather than making new indexes of his own (Galbraith 1961, pp. 192–3). At one stage I thought that this suggestion (despite being open

---

[48] The D scribes could have achieved the same result with less effort, simply by shuffling the C booklets. (The reader may wish to work out an algorithm for them.) They could have; but they did not.

[49] In DB-Dn, the anomalies are as follows. (i) There is a short chapter – *Quod tenent clerici de rege* (104rb) – which is neither numbered in the main text nor listed in the index. (ii) The last paragraph in chapter 24 is a special case – a manor held jointly by Walter de Clavile and Goscelm (above, pp. 43–4) – and the DB scribe was in two minds how to deal with it. The wording is the wording that he uses for a new chapter (*Walterus et Goscelmus ten' de rege . . .*), but he makes no heading for it. Line 25 in the index seems to refer, inaccurately, to this paragraph. (iii) The last paragraph in chapter 25 is another special case (above, p. 44). Again the wording, but only the wording, suggests that this is a new chapter (*Goscelmus de Execestre ten' de rege . . .*). There is no matching item in the index.

to various objections) might possibly have some truth in it; but I do not think that now.

From Galbraith's point of view, one of the best examples is the index that accompanies DB-Yo (Table 40, col. 1).[50] If we compile our own index for DB-Yo in the normal way, by scanning through the text and making an item for each chapter in turn (that is, if we do what we might expect the DB scribe to have done),[51] the result, even supposing that we model it as closely as possible on the actual index, will diverge considerably from it (Table 40, col. 2). Some of the differences are discretionary (such as whether to refer to the count of Mortain by name, or whether to spell this name Rotbert or Robert), and by calling them that we are saying that they do not signify. But there is also some substantive variation. Two chapters are not in the positions where the index tells us to look for them (items 25–6); two chapters occur in the text which are missing from the index;[52] and one chapter advertised in the index (item 4) is missing from the text.[53]

Given the existence of serious discrepancies like these, Galbraith inferred that the DB indexes were not indexes compiled in the normal way, after the completion of the text. Each had to be a copy of a preexisting index; divergences between the index and the text had to be the consequence of changes introduced by the DB scribe during the writing of the DB text. With all of that I agree; I do not see how the facts could be explained in any other way. But Galbraith then jumped to the conclusion that the preexisting index could only have been the index which accompanied the D text, and with that I do not agree.[54] Despite their differences in detail, the two indexes shown in Table 40 do not differ in basic design: the structure prefigured by the DB index and the structure displayed by the DB text both show the tight organization which is characteristic of DB, uncharacteristic of D. The changes made by the DB scribe

were (so it seems to me) far more drastic than Galbraith imagined. The DB index is a copy of the map which he had made to guide himself through the maze. But then, when he came to write the text, it occasionally happened that he took a slightly different route from the one which he had mapped out for himself in advance.

There does not seem to be any excuse that we can make, on the scribe's behalf, for the omission of chapter 4, 'Land of the abbot of York'. Galbraith (1961, pp. 198–9) suggested that this chapter was eliminated deliberately, because it turned out that the abbot held none of his lands directly from the king; but that is proved wrong by evidence put on record by the DB scribe himself. His epitome of B-Yo (PRO, E 31/2, fos. 379ra–382rb) confirms what we are told in DB-Yo, that the abbot held some of his land from Berengar de Todeni (314ra);[55] but it also reports the existence of five manors held by the abbot directly from the king (explicitly so in three cases, implicitly so in the others), and these manors ought to form the contents of the missing chapter.[56] There are some mitigating circumstances – the task was a difficult one (far harder than Galbraith supposed), and this was the scribe's first attempt at it – but the fact remains that he managed to lose a whole chapter, and that any checking which he may have done afterwards failed to detect the omission.[57] Even if every chapter of DB was checked against the corresponding chapter of D, it might still escape attention – and in this case apparently it did escape attention – that a chapter of D had been dropped.

In principle at least, the method employed for rearranging the contents was reliable. Once he had his draft index to guide him through it,[58] the DB scribe could begin on the body of the text. Now the hard work started. For each paragraph in turn, he used the information that he found in D to fill in the blanks of a template that he carried in his head; and then he transferred this filled-in template to the page in front of him. The facts all came, all had to come, from D. The choice of which facts to include, the decision as to how to organize them, the creation of suitable formulas – these are all due to the DB scribe himself. In detail he changed his mind from time to time, and that is what makes it possible to reconstruct the sequence in which the

---

[50] This is the first index written by the DB scribe, and it differs in some details from what was going to become the normal pattern: (i) it occupies the whole width of the column, rather than being divided into two sub-columns; (ii) the first item is the same as the chapter heading, *TERRA REGIS*, rather than *REX WILLELMUS*; (iii) the other items are in the genitive case, rather than in the nominative. With respect to point (i) DB-Yo is unique; with respect to points (ii) and (iii) DB-Yo is resembled only by DB-Li. These peculiarities do not affect the issue under discussion.

[51] The reader who repeats this experiment will find that it is perfectly straightforward. There is only one place where some pause for thought may be needed. Chapter 2 begins properly at the top of 302va, but a section of this chapter has been supplied on the previous page.

[52] One of these chapters has the look of being an appendix: if this were the only discrepancy, no doubt we should write it off as a special case.

[53] On top of these discrepancies, the numbering of the chapters in the text is doubly defective: it jumps from XIII to XV and from XXIIII to XXXV. The net result is that (apart from chapter 1) there are only five chapters which have the same number in the text as in the index.

[54] Even on Galbraith's own terms, the conclusion does not really seem to fit. For him, I should have thought, it would make more sense to suggest that the indexes in the surviving D booklets were, like the rubrication, only added as an afterthought – after it had been decided that these three booklets (originally intended to be discarded with the rest) were going to have to be kept.

[55] The land which he held from a tenant of earl Hugo's, Willelm de Perci (305ra), is listed as the earl's (380va), without mention of the abbot or of Willelm.

[56] *In Lestingham (Abb') ii c'. . . . In Apeltun (Abb') ii c'. . . . In Spantune . . . (Rex et ab' de eo) i car'. . . . In Apeltun (Abb' de rege) ii c'. In Normanebi . . . (Abb' de rege) iii c'* (380vb).

[57] In DB-Nm he blundered even more seriously than here; but there he noticed his mistake, and put it right, after a fashion (Galbraith 1961, p. 195).

[58] I do not think it important to decide when exactly a fair copy of the index was written into DB – whether it was written prior to the main text, or whether it was inserted afterwards, into a space left vacant for the purpose. Whatever may be true for the fair copy, the draft would have been in existence before the main text was started.

1	*TERRA REGIS*		1	*TERRA REGIS*
2	*Archiep'i eboracensis, & canonicorum ac hominum eius*		2	*Archiep'i eboracensis*
3	*Ep'i dunelmensis & hominum eius*		3	*Ep'i dunelmensis*
4	*Abbatis de eboraco*			
5	*Hugonis comitis*		5	*Hugonis comitis*
6	*Rotberti comitis de moritonio*		6	*Comitis moritoniensis*
7	*Alani comitis*		7	*Alani comitis*
8	*Rotberti de Todeni*		8	*Roberti de Todeni*
9	*Berengerii de Todeni*		9	*Berengarii de Todeni*
10	*Ilberti de Laci*		10	*Ilberti de Laci*
11	*Rogerii de busli*		11	*Rogeri de Busli*
12	*Roberti malet*		12	*Roberti malet*
13	*Willelmi de warenna*		13	*Willelmi de Warene*
14	*Willelmi de perci*		14	*Willelmi de Perci*
15	*Drogonis de heldrenesse*		15	*Drogonis de Beurere*
16	*Radulfi de mortemer*		16	*Radulfi de Mortemer*
17	*Radulfi pagenel*		17	*Radulfi pagenel*
18	*Walterii de aincurt*		—	*Goisfridi de Lauuirce*
19	*Gisleberti de gant*		26	*Goisfridi alselin*
20	*Gisleberti tison*		18	*Walteri de Aincurt*
21	*Hugonis filii Baldrici*		19	*Gisleberti de Gand*
22	*Erneis de burun*		20	*Gisleberti tison*
23	*Osberni de arcis*		25	*Ricardi filii Erfasti*
24	*Odonis balistarii*		21	*Hugonis filii Baldrici*
25	*Ricardi filii Erfasti*		22	*Erneis de Burun*
26	*Goisfridi Alselin*		23	*Osberni de Arches*
27	*Alberici de coci*		24	*Odonis arbalistarii*
28	*Gospatric*		27	*Alberici de Coci*
29	*Terra tainorum regis*		28	*Gospatric*
			29	*Tainorum regis*
			—	*Rogerii pictauensis*

Table 40. Two indexes for DB-Yo: the index provided by the DB scribe (298vb) and an imaginary index, modelled on the first one, representing the actual contents of the text.

booklets were written (Table 41).[59] Even so, he achieved a high degree of consistency, from paragraph to paragraph, from chapter to chapter, from county to county. And he did it all himself. Once, just once, another scribe had the temerity to add a short paragraph (above, pp. 30–1); but he was promptly chased away and never allowed to touch the manuscript again (at least not till after the DB scribe had finished with it). The more one understands what the DB scribe's job involved, the more respect one has to feel for him. Above all, one admires his stamina. Month after month after month, he kept working away at his task, until it was nearly finished.

Nearly but not quite finished. There are various indications which seem to prove that the scribe did not succeed in completing the manuscript to his own satisfaction. Some of these deficiencies were, very probably, beyond the DB scribe's control. In several booklets, for example, more or less frequently, we find blanks in the text where we expect to be given the potential number of ploughs – the number of ploughs that would exist on this manor if it were being exploited to the maximum. Where this information is missing, the presumption is that it was missing from D, and perhaps from B as well. The fact that the DB scribe left a blank – advertising the deficiency rather than disguising it – tends to prove two things: that he (like scribe mu) attached some especial importance to this number; and that he entertained some idea that the missing information might become available. Apparently he thought it possible that some further inquiry might take place. Then again, it has often been remarked – originally, I think, by Maitland (1897, pp. 177–8) – that there is blank space at the beginning of DB-Mx which looks as if it was intended for a description of London, blank space at the beginning of DB-Ha which looks as if it was intended for a description of Winchester. It is possible that the DB scribe ought to have written these descriptions but delayed doing so until he ran out of time. But it is also possible that he had been told to leave spaces here – that the original survey had failed to produce an adequate description of London or of Winchester, and that some further inquiry was under contemplation. In the end, those signs of incompleteness which are certainly the

---

[59] Though I have continued trying, I have still not been able to work out a satisfactory seriation for the aspect 2 booklets (above, p. 17). One feature which I have looked at is the spelling of the [ly] sound in French, particularly in the name *tailgebosc*. The spellings that occur in DB-Ca are the same that occur in DB-Bd, but DB-Ht and DB-Bu use the -ilg- spelling which is standard from this point onwards (as in *batailge*). It seems from this that we should seriate either MxBdCaHtBu or MxBdCaBuHt; hence the adjustment which I have made in this table.

aspect	counties	binding sequence	17th-century foliation	alternative foliation
1	Yorkshire–Lincolnshire	26	297–372	1–76
1	Nottinghamshire–Derbyshire	25, 24	280–96, 272–9	77–101
1	Huntingdonshire	17	203–8	102–7
2	Middlesex	10	126–31	108–13
2	Bedfordshire	18	209–18	114–23
2	Cambridgeshire	16	189–202	124–137
2	? Hertfordshire	11	132–42	
2	? Buckinghamshire	12	143–53	
	?			
	?			
	?			
3	Kent	1	0–15	160–75
3	Sussex	2	16–29	176–89
3	Surrey	3	30–6	190–6
3	Hampshire	4	37–55	197–215
3	Berkshire	5	56–63	216–23
4	Gloucestershire–Worcestershire	14	162–78	224–40
4	Herefordshire	15	179–88	241–50
4	Shropshire-Cheshire	23	252–71	251–70
4	Staffordshire	22	246–51	271–6
4	Warwickshire	21	238–45	277–84
5	Northamptonshire	19	219–29	285–95
5	Leicestershire	20	230–7	296–303
5	Oxfordshire	13	154–61	304–11
5	Wiltshire	6	64–74	312–22
5	Dorset	7	75–85	323–33
6	Somerset	8	86–99	334–47
6	Devon–Cornwall	9	100–25	348–73

Table 41. Revised seriation of the DB booklets.

DB scribe's fault turn out to be very few: an entry in DB-Do which breaks off in mid sentence (above, p. 31), marginal additions here and there which lack their finishing touches of red ink. Small imperfections of this kind – such as spaces for coloured initials which were never supplied – occur in many medieval manuscripts, and generally no one would think that they carried much significance. Nevertheless, the flaws do visibly exist; and they mean that it must have been doubtful for a time, to anyone who looked at DB, whether the manuscript was still a work in progress, or whether it had already been finished, as far as it ever would be.

The chief deficiency – the absence of booklets for three whole counties – is of a different order of magnitude. It does, to be sure, demand some explanation. If we came across a manuscript copy of the Bible which omitted Exodus, Isaiah and Luke, we should certainly want to know why. The answer might turn out to be bathetic, but the question would have to be put. Here, however, we do not even know what question we ought to ask. The fact that the booklets do not exist does not prove that they never existed. Are we to explain why these booklets were not produced? Or are we to explain why they were not bound up with the other booklets, when DB was made into a book? From references to these counties in some of the other booklets – a

reference to Essex, for example, in DB-Ke-9ra – we might perhaps infer that the scribe was at least intending to deal with them too; but we would probably be willing to take that much for granted, without asking for evidence. The question is whether the intention was fulfilled.

The more I think about this, the more inclined I am to believe that all three booklets were written, but that one or all of them went astray, during the span of time that elapsed before DB was bound.[60] Unfortunately, the more I think about it, the less able I am to see how the point could be proved either way. It is unimaginable how we could prove that the booklets never existed. It would take a miracle to prove that they did once exist. There might survive – from Ely or Bury or some other monastery – a copy of some extract from DB-Sk, which in substance would agree with the corresponding paragraph in D-Sk, but which in form and

---

[60] It is not inconceivable that the difficulties encountered in seriating the aspect 2 booklets (above, note 59) are partly due to the loss of the following booklets. For the sake of argument, suppose that DB-Ht was the last of the aspect 2 booklets to be written, and that the next booklet to be written was DB-Ex (which, for one reason or another, does not survive). Comparing DB-Ht with DB-Ex, it might be fairly easy to identify some features of the text which start appearing in the former and persist into the latter. With the loss of either booklet, it would become much harder to see which features carry the information that we need.

wording would proclaim itself to be the work of the DB scribe. But any such extract, if it existed, would surely have been discovered and published by now. The miracle is not going to happen, and I think we have to accept the fact that we are doomed to everlasting ignorance. There are two options. Wailing and gnashing of teeth is one; the other is to think ourselves into the frame of mind where this becomes just one more of the many things that we should like to know but never shall. I recommend option B.

Towards the beginning, the DB scribe may have been hard on the heels of the D scribes, taking delivery of each new D booklet almost as soon as it were finished. Towards the end, he must have been well behind. The last D booklets to pass through his hands had probably been finished several months before. Even so, the order in which the scribe dealt with these counties is correlated closely with the order in which they had been dealt with by the C scribes:

```
C:    ..... Nn Wa St Ox Wi Do Dn Co So
D:                                   So
DB:   .. St Wa Nn Le Ox Wi Do So Dn Co
```

and for that to be true it must also have been correlated, not less but perhaps more closely, with the order in which they had been dealt with by the D scribes. To put it briefly, the completion order for the last D booklets cannot have been very different from the inception order for the last DB booklets.[61]

However, we have reason to think that the D booklets did not retain that order when they were bound (above, pp. 29–30). Five of these booklets went to make up one volume by themselves (D-WiDoSoDnCo); four were kept together and included in another volume (D-CaHuBdNnLeWaStShCh); but D-Ox became separated from the rest, becoming part of a third volume (D-MxHtBuOxGlWoHe). At the moment when it came into the DB scribe's hands, D-Ox was still keeping company with the D booklets completed at about the same time as it: it had not yet been bound, nor even put into proximity with those other booklets with which it was going to be bound. If that was true for D-Ox, it must also have been true for six other booklets at least (D-Mx, D-Ht, etc.); and if that much is true, it does not seem risky to assume that the D booklets were all still unbound when the DB scribe got hold of them.[62]

[61] It need not be assumed that the correlation was perfect, only that it was close. In fact the signs are that D-So was the last booklet to be completed by the D scribes, just as C-So had been the last text to be begun by the C scribes, and that the order here was changed by the DB scribe (above, p. 79).

[62] For Galbraith, the D booklets were not intended to be bound at all (they were meant to be discarded as soon as their contents had been distilled into DB); so for him it went without saying that the DB scribe, when he dealt with D, was dealing with loose quires. This is the closest that I can come to ending (as I should like to do) on a note of agreement with Galbraith.

Hence it appears that the man in charge of the D text held off from having the booklets bound until after the DB scribe had finished with them. It was only then that he sorted the booklets into six stacks, putting them into a new order, very different in some respects from the order of completion, and sent these stacks off to the binder. If it is safe to infer, from the wording of the colophons in the D volumes (supposing the sole survivor to be typical), that these colophons were written and the volumes bound while the king was still alive, that will give us a bound on the date of DB: it will follow that DB was completed sooner than September 1087. By this argument, the whole operation, from the inception of C to the binding of D, would have been completed within less than eighteen months, perhaps not much more than twelve months; and that span of time would have included – would have purposely been prolonged to include – as much time as was needed for the writing of DB.

Though the argument is tenuous, the conclusion is unobjectionable, as far as I can see. The compilation process was the expression of innumerable small decisions, but these were all consequential on two large ones. At some moment it was decided that the results of the survey would need to be translated, county by county, into a feodal frame. At some moment (perhaps the same, perhaps later) it was decided that the feodalized results would need to be condensed into a single volume. In the end it can only be a guess that these decisions, the two large ones and all the small ones which followed from them, were concatenated into a single sequence of events; but is this not a better guess than any other?

Consider the alternatives. First, one might agree that the compilation process was a single sequence, each stage being integrated with the stage before it, and yet disagree about the time-scale. I doubt whether anyone will think it possible that the process might have been completed in a shorter time than I suggest, but it might have taken much longer.[63] Second, more radically, one might question the assumption of concatenation. Instead of a single process, one might argue that there were two or three separate stages, each of which was thought for a time to be the final stage. The survey was conducted, the B text was compiled, and that was the end of the matter. Some time later (and possibly this would mean in the reign of Willelm II), it was decided that the information contained in B was of little use as it stood, but would still be useful, despite the lapse of time since its collection, if it could be put into a different frame. By way of the C text, the D text was compiled, and again that was the end of the matter. Some time later again (and by now perhaps we are in the reign of Henric I), it was decided that D was of little use as it stood, and that the information, so far as it still had value, should be condensed into a single volume. The DB text was compiled, and once again that was the end of the matter (until peo-

[63] Of course there is more at issue here than just the date of DB. Would the machinery of government have come to a stop, as Galbraith was inclined to assume, as soon as a king died? Or would it have continued functioning, to some degree, under its own momentum?

ple started making epitomes of DB). Is there anything here which seems at all attractive?

On one point I refuse to budge. It seems to me quite clear, from the evidence of the surviving C booklets, that concatenation is a valid assumption for C and D. On the one hand, we can be sure – we can almost see it happening – that the production of C was coordinated with the progress of the fieldwork stage of the survey, and with the writing up of the accounts for the current geld. On the other hand, the production of C makes no sense in itself, only as a step towards the production of D.

If that much is agreed, the scope for disagreement is reduced to two points. First there is a quantitative question. Counting from the moment when it was decided that the survey should be started, how long did it take before the D text was completed – so far completed that it was ready to be delivered to the binder? Was the work done in the shortest practicable time, i.e. within a matter of months, or was it allowed to drag on for several years? One question arising from that is whether we accept the inference that the colophon of D-ExNkSk, because it seems to see no need to distinguish between Willelm I and Willelm II, was written no later than September 1087.[64] Of course there is room for doubt (an anticoncatenationist might think of suggesting that this colophon was copied from the matching B volume), but do we feel at all inclined to take advantage of that room?

Then there is a qualitative question: was the production of DB concatenated with the production of D, or was it a separate undertaking, decided on and executed at some later (perhaps considerably later) date?[65] There is, as I have said, some slight reason for thinking that the DB booklets were written before the D booklets were bound; but that evidence will not convince anyone who is predisposed to doubt it. More impressive is the fact that the DB scribe is known to have laid his hands on some of the C booklets, and to have occasionally used a blank page in C for writing a trial version of some paragraph which he was about to transfer from D into DB (above, pp. 76–9). But of course we do not know exactly when or exactly how that came to pass. It is conceivable, I suppose, that the C booklets were, by this time, ten or twenty years old and just happened to be lying around. But do we have any motive for preferring that to the more obvious interpretation, that all three versions of the text were, in the DB scribe's own view of the matter, links in a single chain?

There is evidence from Kent which seems to me to prove that DB existed (or, if one wishes to put it very cautiously, that at least one DB booklet had at least been begun) within three years of the survey. The evidence comes from that same collection of documents (above, p. 111) which originated (so I suppose) in archbishop Lanfranc's chancery. One of them, perhaps just a small slip of parchment, had been used for writing out a few short paragraphs which can be identified – beyond doubt, I think – as edited extracts from the first few pages of DB-Ke (above, p. 34). It seems safe to conclude that DB (or part of DB) was already in existence, no later than May 1089, and that it was already possible for someone with the right connections to gain access to the original and to copy extracts from it.

Another document included in the same collection is also derived from DB. As it survives (Lit. E 28, fos. 5vc–7ra), it is a copy of an epitome of DB-Ke reorganized to take account of the fact that the bishop of Bayeux has forfeited his lands. Therefore it is later than May 1088. The author of this text was not trying to bring the survey up to date; only a new survey could do that. Instead he is asking the question what DB-Ke would have looked like, in outline, if the bishop had lost his lands before the survey, rather than shortly afterwards. More specifically, he is trying to work out what assets have fallen into the king's hands in consequence of the bishop's failed rebellion – what assets have thus become available for redistribution. None of the property repossessed by the king in 1088 remained his for very long. Within twenty or thirty years at the most, it had all been granted out again. It is clear enough who the new men were who profited from the fall of the bishop of Bayeux – Goisfrid Talebot, Willelm Pevrel, Willelm de Albigni, Walter Tirel – but little is known about the circumstances in which they came into their reward.[66] If one reads this document closely, however, one can see, from the way in which the paragraphs are grouped, that the author already had some idea how the loot was going to be shared out; if it is right that a copy of this text was in archbishop Lanfranc's hands by May 1089, it will seem likely that Goisfrid Talebot and his friends were not kept waiting long.[67] In all this there are many points which need to be argued out in detail, and I hope to have a chance to do that in the future; but the conclusion seems solid enough that I am willing to anticipate it here. After but probably very soon after May 1088, somebody tried to work out what consequences followed from the forfeiture of the bishop of Bayeux; and the source-text to which he turned for that purpose was DB-Ke.[68] In my

---

[64] The phrase at the heart of the colophon – *facta est ista descriptio* – cannot be made to mean anything more than what Round took it to mean: 'This survey was carried out'. It gives a date for the B text; it does not give a date for the D text.

[65] ((The idea that the date of DB is given away by a slip of the pen in DB-Sx is too silly to be worth discussing; I am reluctant even to mention it. The obvious explanation – as Thorn and Thorn (2001, p. 71) point out – is that the scribe momentarily forgot which chapter he was in.))

[66] One by-product of these changes is a writ of Willelm II (Davis 1913, p. 133) responding to a complaint from the abbot of Saint Augustine's; it dates from 1088×93. Unfortunately only one of the culprits is mentioned by name, Anskitil (de Ros), and he was not a newcomer.

[67] The English chronicler takes it for granted that confiscation was followed by immediate redistribution. After the rebellion had collapsed, 'many French men relinquished their lands and travelled across the sea; and the king gave their lands to the men who were loyal to him' (Swanton 1996, p. 225).

[68] Unlike this epitome, DB-Ke itself has no anachronistic features. Having read it closely, many times, I detect not the slightest hint that the DB scribe

judgment it is safe to say that DB was in existence by the summer of 1088.[69]

For most of the people who have occasion to look at DB, the date when it was written does not signify. What they want to know is precisely what the DB scribe was trying to tell them: how things stood at the time of the survey, in early 1086. They read it, in short, as the best available substitute for B. In the end, however determined we are to try to look on the bright side, we cannot quite resist the thought that Maitland was justified in feeling disappointed. What we have got is not what we would have chosen. If we had been told that only one version of the survey text was going to survive and that we could choose which one, there is no doubt what decision we would have made. Without hesitation, we should have chosen the B text. Given B, we could, if we wished, construct our own feodalized version of the survey to take the place of D. Because we have improved technology, and because we are not in a hurry, our version of D would actually be better than the version produced by the D scribes. Given our own version of D, we could, if we wished, construct not just one but any number of shortened versions, each designed for some particular purpose. We could decide for ourselves what information should or should not be included, and what format will best suit our purpose, rather than being forced to accept the decisions made by the DB scribe. But these are all dreams. We have not got the B text. Instead we have got small parts of C and D, which are fairly good substitutes for B, plus a large part of DB, which is not. Nor can we comfort ourselves, as Maitland did, by imagining that it may become feasible, at some future date, for B to be reconstituted. That will never happen. What was done cannot be undone, and we have to make the best of it. But if the time and effort invested in the making of D and DB had rather been spent making multiple copies of B, if those copies had been distributed among the bishops and abbots who, as far as was humanly possible, could guarantee their safety, if even one complete contemporary copy of B had managed to survive till now, how much happier should we not be?

was in possession of any knowledge which he could not have possessed in 1086–7.

[69] The evidence from Kent thus seems to me to bear out a knot-cutting comment made by Stenton: 'On general grounds, there is an overwhelming probability that the [two] volumes [DB as well as D-ExNkSk] were written before the information which they contain was seriously out of date; that is, before, at latest, the confiscations after the revolt of 1088' (1943, p. 647 = 1971, p. 655).