EXETER DOMESDAY BOOK

INTRODUCTION TO THE TRANSLATION

FRANK THORN

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE

Beyond lists and menus and technical manuals translation is not yet machine-led. A translator must bring his knowledge, reading and human experience to bear though those alone are not enough: it is necessary to enter the author's creative process, to produce something which, though rendered into modern language, is appropriate to its age and that period's world view. There can never be an objective performance of a Beethoven symphony but a rendition can be nearer the truth by being on instruments of the time and historically informed. Likewise, *mutatis mutandis*, with translations. Moreover words and grammatical structures are slippery but one can be diligent rather than cavalier in seeking the elusive true meaning within them without ever fully finding it.

From the very first sentence of Exeter Domesday one is confronted by a series of questions which require answering decisions.: how to deal with personal and place-names; how far to choose an easy read over 'pedantic' accuracy; who are the envisaged audience; how much supplementary information should be added to the translation in explanation; how should giving a clear recital of the 'facts' take precedence over attention to *variatio*, style and literary pretensions; how far to respect traditional translations so as to give continuity even though these may have accumulated casually, lazily and ignorantly.

For a pedestrian art translation can be surprisingly, even hotly, controversial. Individual scholars may have grown up with 'their' translation of a word which to them will always be right and the best: the birth of the Phillimore translation of Great Domesday was marked by angry exchanges. What follows is a personal attempt to reconcile the sometimes conflicting priorities. I have listened to advice and criticism but this is not the consensus view of the Project team, not a 'translation by committee', but the choices, errors and responsibility are all mine.

INTRODUCTION

> *Traduire, c'est trahir* ('to translate is to betray')
> *Traduttore: traditore* ('translator: betrayer')
> 'If you want to read Homer, learn Ancient Greek' (William Golding)

This the first time that Exon (or Exeter) Domesday (EDB) has been translated in its entirety or consistently, but a translation can never be as good as the original, since a translator must always be an interpreter and a reconciler of conflicting priorities, striving to catch the meaning, the sense, the connotations, the resonances, the

rapidity and the degree of modernity and level of style of the text, but without ugliness, excessive weight or pedantry, unless these too are fitting. Fidelity to the original in all its aspects is the ideal but some compromises have to be made with readability. With an administrative document there is usually no need to replace one 'flower of rhetoric' with another; rather the accuracy, economy and swiftness should match the original. All words should be translated, without judging arbitrarily whether they are necessary or not. Above all a translation must not mislead nor use words which carelessly evoke images of a modern, anachronistic reality. Rather than putting Shakespeare into modern dress or playing Bach with a full symphony orchestra appropriate to a rendition of Wagner, a translation of a text from long ago should transport the reader back in time to that 'other country' which is the past, a process which the French call *l'alienation* or *le dépaysment*.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

This translation aims to be clear, consistent and fluent and in a rapid and plain style using ordinary language, without archaism, which is appropriate to the register of the original and as literal as possible but in good English style without clunking and barbarism. Above all it aims to be accurate and faithful to the original in letter and in spirit. It is not literal but it does not stray far from the text. It does not indulge in grandiose fudges nor gloss over passages that at first seem incomprehensible. However, so much in translation is a matter of experience and judgement . Everyone will view the text differently and make different compromises with and accommodations to their own conflicting priorities.

To the present editor (a linguist) the Latin is economical and straightforward though with a natural elegance and it generally avoids grandeur and archaism, except for a few flourishes. it is Caesarian prose rather than Ciceronian. Of the corresponding translations of Great and Little Domesday Books (GDB, LDB) the Alecto translation, and even, in places, the Phillimore, are influenced by the weighty and the,to some extent, archaic style of the early VCH translations. It could be argued that that style was never appropriate, but even if it was, the passage of time makes it appear pompous and old-fashioned, and, by its renderings of particular terms, something of a secret garden reserved for the initiated. Despite the extreme iconoclasm of the Phillimore translation, John Morris permitted 'he could go wheresoever he would' and 'hitherto', 'therein' and 'thereof' are not infrequent. These no longer represent the level of the Latin and there are better and plainer modern equivalents. To some extent it seems that Domesday as a national monument, was felt to need a marmoreal translation, just as the King James version of the bible has greatly elevated the style of its sources. There is also a tendency to make Domesday more of a legal document than it is: 'as they state' (*ut dicunt*), when used of the observations of the men of the hundred, is more appropriately 'so they say', probably with some hint of disbelief.

The aim throughout has been to use the same English word for the same Latin word, as far as is possible and reasonable, and to dedicate that English word solely to the translation of a single Latin word. Thus within the broad notion of 'belonging to'

pertineo is always 'belong', and other words have their own translations: so *adiungo* is 'link', *iungere* is 'join' For *iacet* (with *ad* or the dative) the rendering is 'is an adjunct of', while *iacet in* is 'lies in' or lies in [the lands of]'., whereas *adiacet* (with *in* or the dative) becomes 'is attached to' and *adiacenti*a are 'attachments'. Although a matrix for the drafting of a typical entry has clearly been set before the scribes, there are many individual departures from it in terms of vocabulary and structure, not all of them happy. Even an administrative document can have literary qualities and this text has a degree of vivacity and individuality. The Geld Accounts could be simply in the form of accounts, but they are written out as reports in prose and in a slightly breathless but individualised style.

The danger with a translation produced by historians for historians is that it will be old-fashioned, bland and suffer from a sort of reductionism: 'old-fashioned' because of the nature of choices made long ago for the translation of key words and repeated in the books and articles related to the mediaeval word; and 'reduced' because it is inconvenient that the same thing may be described in Latin by different words. So a *castrum* and a *castellum* are both a 'castle' and a *mansio* and a *manerium* are both 'manors'. This makes the compilation of statistics much easier, but it ignores individuality. It sees style and content as separate, the former being discountable, whereas they are a single whole, where facts are less than facts because of the degree of rhetoric and the rhetoric has to compromise with hard factual obstacles. And reductionism inevitably leads to a dry, bland and unnecessarily repetitive greyness where different Latin words, some rarer or more colourful than others, are treated as having the same meaning and are thus able to be rendered by a single common translation. Not far away is a Domesday Book in a vocabulary of 150 words.

As this translation is being made in parallel with one of GDB and LDB, the policy of reserving a word in one language for the rendering of a single word in the other has needed to take account of the different words (often, it is thought, for the same thing) used in all three texts. Thus *albus*, *candidus* and *blancus* are all applied to coinage (the latter two not being found in EDB) and they are translated differently, as are *presbiteri*, *sacerdotes* and *clerici*, though they are all probably simply different ways of referring to 'priests', though *sacerdos* is a rather fine Classical Latin (CL)word (containing *sacer*: 'holy', untouchable') transferred from pagan use.

   Similarly *cotarii* ('cottars') are distinguished from 'cottagers' represented by another word that appears in various forms, some more French-influenced than others: *coscet*, *cosce*z, *cocetus* and *cotseta*, all of which stand for Old English *cot-seta*. This distinction is made in the tables of H.C. Darby's *Domesday England*. It may be that all these are simply 'inhabitants of a *cot*', a population group difficult to define, but and inferior to 'villans' while similar to 'bordars, but if they are carefully rendered into English by different words, it leaves the way open for questioning and researching.

   There ought to be a difference between *castrum* and *castellum*, though both are usually translated as 'castle'. In dictionaries they have distinct but also overlapping meanings. After all, *castellum* is in form, if not necessarily in meaning, a diminutive. Either way the Latin words available are unable to take account of the modern view of a continuum of structures from a castle as a place of retreat and sallying forth in

hostile territory to seigneurial residence. In this translation the choice of 'fortress' for *castrum* and 'castle' for *castellum*, though it may displease archaeologists, alerts the reader to a possible distinction on the ground or at least to a particular scribal choice.

Likewise there ought to be a difference between *mansio* and *manerium*. The former is a Classical Latin (CL) word which over time developed a range of meanings. In CL it is 'an act of staying', 'lodgings', 'hotel for travelling officials' and in Medieval Latin (ML) it acquires further meanings including 'hide', 'tenement', 'messuage' so that a typical entry beginning *Serlo habet mansionem…* might at first sight mean that Serlo has a messuage or tenement or a hide of land. *manerium* on the other hand was a Norman import. Though it has the same root as *mansio* (from *manere* ' to stay, dwell, be permanent'), it has a single translation 'manor' which seems to have had a single tight definition though its exact nature is still controversial. It may be that *mansio* was at first pressed into service and would anyway be the choice of any scribe with a sense of *Latinitas*, since it has an antique dignity which *manerium* (a neologism and defying the normal rules of Latin word formation: Latin *manere* (infinitive) > Old French *maneir* (infinitive then noun) > reLatinized as *manerium*). However, it is difficult to find *mansio* in any thing like the sense of 'manor' in pre-Conquest documents: the so-called equivalent Old English *heafod botl* is rare and most charters simply grant a number of hides or *terra* ('land'). It looks as if 'manor' as a concept has greater importance to the Normans as part of their administratively more hierarchical view of the landscape. In Exon *manerium* (23 occurrences) is rare. Further some of these are found in entries where something else is described as a *mansio*, in relation to a *manerium regis* (a 'royal manor'). In GDB *manerium* seems to have been imposed as the word of choice, although a few evaded the conversion process. To alert the reader and to provoke further research, it has seemed worth maintaining a distinction between *mansio* ('estate') and *manerium* ('manor').

Some 1086 tenants constructed *parci* on their lands. These allowed them to rear or to protect the growth of wild animals contained there, before hunting them on a smaller scale than they would in a 'chase' or in a 'forest', the latter anyway being reserved for the king. It is unfortunate that 'game-park' or 'game-reserve' have the aroma of tourism with a scent of zoo. These *parci* may well have contained deer, but other species as well (one occurs elsewhere in the Domesday corpus as a *parcus bestiarum silvaticarum* ('a park for wild animals') and the translation should not be restricted to 'deer-park'. 'Game-park' is used here, though reluctantly. The overseer, (*parcarius*) who often held by serjeanty is sometimes translated as 'park-keeper', but that conjures up images of those floral green spaces, possibly with a bandstand, beloved of nineteenth-century urban planners. The traditional 'parker' (the name of the serjeanty) has been retained here, with 'warden of the park' for *custos parci*.

Among verbs the little word *eo, ire* ('to go') is commonly used in the clause 'he could go to any lord he wanted', meaning that he was not tied to a particular lord or institution, that is he did not have the status of a man 'who could not be separated from his lord/ the church'. Twice, in adjacent entries (349a1-2), the verb *pergo* is used in place of *eo*. It is certainly a word of 'going' but it is larger and weightier. As a derivative of *rego* ('I rule', whose original sense was 'straighten out': see English 'ruler' as in an instrument for measuring, and the word 'direct'). it means to 'go

straight to somewhere,' 'to carry on/ win through despite obstacles'. As least its difference from *eo* should be marked, as it is here, perhaps feebly, by 'make his way'.

Similarly in the so-called value clause, which usually ends an entry and which gives the current (1086) value and the value when the 1086 holder gained control of the land, two verbs (*accepit* and *receipt*) are used. It is common to translate both as 'received' ('When he received it, it was worth …') but there should be a distinction, especially as some examples of *accepit* are corrected to *recepit*. What that distinction is remains unclear, but the difference is faithfully marked in the translation by 'acquired' for *accepit* and 'received' for *recepit*.'

Thus the aim here is three-fold: to impose a much-needed discipline on the translation of the Domesday corpus; to bring anyone reading the translation without referring to the Latin text face to face with the some of the important variations of the latter (often the result of scribal choice); and to allow for further work which might argue that these words define a different reality, rather than being a mere choice of language. However, in all cases the need for natural and fluent modern English is a priority.

On the other hand, the policy has not been carried to excess. Latin *molinus* and *molendinum* are both used for 'mill' but there is no mechanical distinction, both being water-mills, and there is no alternative term for 'mill' in English which is not far-fetched.

The rules for Latin word-formation mean that it is easy to move between nouns, adjectives and verbs. Faced with the need for a noun for a 'fish-thing', or 'fish-place', the scribes of EDB come up with *piscaria, piscatia, piscatio, piscatoria, piscatura* and *piscuaria* to which the scribe of GDB subsequently adds *piscina*. There is no reason to think that these words refer to different locations (riverine, maritime, manorial ponds) or devices (nets, traps, weirs) and it would be impossible to find enough different words in English, let alone ones in mainstream modern use, to make distinctions if they were needed.

In the case of *uirga/ uirgata*, although it appears that both are simply a 'virgate' (a quarter of a hide), the first is the norm in EDB and the second usual in GDB. It could be useful to have different English translations, but appropriate ones are lacking. One of them could be 'yardland' but this is now obsolete, while 'rods' or 'poles' (which is the original meaning of *uirga*) are a linear measure and very short of the length of one side of a virgate. Even if that were not the case 'a square rod' or 'square pole' is difficult visually and seems to be straining too much after etymology at the expense of meaning.

Variants in terms of accidence of the same Latin word are ignored, thus *siluester* and *siluestris*, used of mares, are both translated by 'wild', though the other term *indomitus* which probably amounts to the same thing is 'unbroken'. *salvagius*, a re-Latinisation of *salvage* an Old French word (CL *silua* 'wood'> ML *siluaticus* > OFr *salvage*> Mod Fr *sauvage*), is used once (in 393b1) of a Walter and glossed as or replaced by *siluestris*. *salvagius*, is here rendered as 'untamed' even though the reason for the replacement is probably a stylistic one, substituting for a word become vulgar through its deformation by French one from the educated stratum of Latin. *siluaticus* itself (355a2) is treated as a variant derivation from *silua* and translated as 'wild'.

However Domesday Book does have a technical vocabulary, which it is reasonable to expect novices to master. The biggest weakness of the Phillimore translation is in compressing the centuries, obscuring the differences and introducing misleading associations so that a vill becomes a village (evoking a nucleated settlement with pub, church, village green and cricket match) and a bordar becomes a smallholder (suggesting that the man was free and his main occupation was rearing small numbers of pigs and chickens and growing cabbages, beetroot and potatos). In fact a vill is a township, the secular equivalent of an ecclesiastical parish (with which it was often co-extensive), while whatever the exact definition was of a bordar, he was a member of the manor's unfree peasantry and of lesser status than a villan. Where a word is clearly a technical term with a particular 'Domesday definition' (although that itself may contain obscurities and uncertainties), it has been Anglicised, but retained. Thus terms such 'vill', 'colibert' and 'cottar' are simply representatives of their Latin originals (*uilla*, *colibertus*, *cotarius*) and this allows the terms to be explored in a glossary or notes, without the translation conjuring up anachronistic images. On the other hand some terms which are not actually technical have acquired a traditional translation which is unnecessarily obscure for a modern reader (thus 'plea' for *placitum* when 'court-case' will serve and 'food-rent' or 'fixed sum' or 'revenue' (depending on the context) in place of the traditional 'farm' for each of the two different Latin words *firma*.

There is a tendency among translators to render a Latin word by its English derivative or on the basis of some simple one-for-one wordlist used at school. For the present translation many terms have been re-thought and their use throughout the Domesday volumes examined before what, it is hoped, is a more satisfactory rendering has been decided. Thus Latin *hortus* is usually rendered as 'orchard', an English word whose first element derives from it, but it is more probably 'a smallholding'. 'Orchard' has been reserved for *uirgultum*. No distinction is sometimes made in previous translations between *wastus* and *vastatus*, both being rendered as 'waste' but there should be a difference between something that is 'waste' and something that 'has been wasted'. Even so, both notions need exploring. Latin *vastus* or, in its common ML spelling *wastus*, means 'big and empty', often used of landscapes but sometimes of houses. It describes a state ('empty', 'abandoned', 'unoccupied', 'deserted', 'derelict') in Domesday, whereas *vastatus* refers to something that has been 'emptied' or 'ruined', 'harried' or indeed, 'wasted'. The cause of the emptying is rarely given: it might be population shrinkage, with marginal land abandoned, or houses demolished to allow the construction of a castle in a borough, or, it has been argued, the progress of William's army through Northamptonshire or the result (though 20 years on) of the 'harrying of the North', but *wastus* itself is not necessarily a strong word and *vastatus* could merely be saying that emptiness has been created. Essentially in Domesday these words refer to the reason for a lack of value because of the absence of people, and they are rarely found outside the 'value clause' that ends an entry. *wastus* is here rendered by 'derelict' and *vastatus* by 'ruined' Translations of these two words also need to be distinguished from more powerful words: *devastatus* ('utterly ruined', 'devastated') and *depredatus* (36b3) 'sacked'.

There are some difficulties with the appropriate translation for the status of some individuals. A Gerard a tenant of Roger de Courseulles on one estate and of Glastonbury Abbey on two is described both as a *fossor* (427a1) and as a *fossarius* (164b2, 165a1). Elsewhere in DB the word *fossator* is used. The root of these is Latin *fodio* ('I dig'). Gerard is usually translated as a 'ditcher', which suggests a lowly occupation that of the 'hedger and ditcher' who used to maintain the enclosed fields and clean out the ditches. Since Gerard is a tenant of Glastonbury, with holdings near the Somerset Levels, and since the Abbey is credited with major work that contributed to the draining of the levels and the incorporation of islands into continuous dry land, Gerard may well have been a man who made ditches or watercourses, a 'dyke-maker' or 'rhyne-bulder' (to use a local Somerset word), even a 'hydraulic engineer' 'Dyke' is not the word used for such drainage ditches in the south-west and anyway tends to refer not to the digging of the 'channel' but to the resulting spoil disposed as an embankment. The very fact that he is named and is a sub-tenant suggests a free man of some status. He is here rendered as 'drainage-man'.

Similarly, there are a group of men holding from the king by serjeanty who are described as *balistarii* or *arbalistarii* and commonly treated as 'crossbowmen' or 'arblasters'. Again the rarity of their mention and the fact that many are tenants-in-chief suggest that these are men of status who command others, not some nameless 'gunners'. They are likely to be 'siege-engineers' or at least 'artillery-men'

Likewise the word *piscator* (usually rendered by 'fisherman' is rare: there are only four occurrences in EDB. No doubt many men with other occupations 'went fishing' to furnish this staple part of the medieval diet, but. It is more likely that these *piscatores* are actally professionals: fish-farmers or pisciculturists.

The translation also aims to convey the meaning of the Latin in a way that is comprehensible, thus avoiding renderings which correctly give one of the possible meanings for individual words, but which are, in conjunction with others translated in isolation, obscure. 'The exception proves the rule' (that is, 'an exception tests a rule') and 'nature abhors a vacuum' ('mother nature shudders at the idea of an empty space') are non-DB examples.

SOME DETAILED APPLICATIONS
All Latin words are translated, with trifling exceptions; for example *sed ... tamen* is rendered by 'yet', and no distinction is made between *ea die qua rex Eduuardus fuit uiuus et mortuus* and the plainer *die qua rex Eduuardus fuit uiuus et mortuus*. The use of *ea* might be more emphatic ('on that day ...') but can also simply be the definite article ('the') which would need to be supplied in translation even in the absence of *ea*. This phrase also illustrates the tension between literalness ('on that day on which King Edward was alive and dead') and something smoother but not misleading ('on the day that King Edward was alive and dead'). It is even tempting to omit the 'that'.

Avoidance of Clutter

Editorial insertions (enclosed in square brackets) are kept to the minimum. However in some cases words that are traditionally inserted in rendering Latin into English are not placed in brackets:

(a) For the translation of pronouns such as *hic*, *ille*, *iste* and *idem* which show gender in Latin, the necessary 'man' or 'woman' etc. are not bracketed: thus 'this woman' not 'this [woman]'.

(b) Similarly when adjectives are used on their own: thus in 144b3 *inter se et suos* is rendered by 'between him and his men' without the 'men' appearing in brackets.

(c) Latin rarely uses any indefinite or definite articles but 'a' or 'the' are routinely include in the present translation without being put in brackets as is the norm in translations from Latin. It would be a repetitive and ugly series of interventions in the text to draw attention to these thus, merely so that the few occurrences of *quidam* ('a' often unnecessarily treated as 'a certain') and of *is* ('the') could be distinguished from them.

(d) It is normal in Latin to write *quando recepit* with the direct objet understood, and traditional to make a silent insertion of 'it' or 'them'. Thus in the rendering 'when he received it' the 'it' is not bracketed.

For further details, see and Conventions: Square Brackets (below).

Clarifying the Meaning

Although the rule here is minimal insertion, it is sometimes necessary to insert a word or two to help the translation as when a 'he' needs to be defined as [William] to distinguish from another 'he' nearby. Sometimes the insertion of a word or phrase into the Latin text is essential, and this is reflected in the translation.

Thus in 295b4 where the opening reads *Bauduinus habet .i. quae uocatur Cloenesberga*, the noun *mansionem* must be supplied in the text as otherwise the *quae* would lack an antecedent. In translation this becomes: 'Baldwin [the sheriff] has 1 ⟨manor⟩ which is called ....'. A more complex example is 276a3 where a translation of the text would read 'Drew holds this from the count and he has 1 hide and 1 plough in demesne and 5 villans, who have 2 hides and 2 ploughs, and 8 bordars and 2 slaves and 7 beasts and 11 pigs. Here what the villans actually hold is confined to 2 hides and 2 ploughs, the rest belongs to Drew. Although this distinction is indicated in the translation by punctuation, it is too important for a humble comma to bear its weight alone: thus a ⟨there Drew has⟩ needs to be inserted before the '8 bordars' corresponding to an insertion in the Latin text. A further instance is in 342a2 where 'insertion of 'Roger has' is needed. Where scribes notice this ambiguity, they make a similar (interlined) insertion.

On the other hand additions to the text and the translation are not made when the Latin, though laconic is not enigmatic and does not mislead. Latin is frequently elliptical and a verb may have to be understood more than once in a long sentence. However only smallest additions are used, where they are essential to make sentences comprehensible. Thus in 243b1 in the case of 'Osfrith has 1 virgate of it and half a plough in demesne and the villans the other land and 2 ploughs, some translators would supply 'have', often silently, after 'the villans' but 'have' can easily be understood out of the earlier 'has' and an inserted 'have' hinders reproducing the rapidity and economy of the text. Omission is common in the 'value-clause of an entry as in 229b3: '... and it is worth 30 shillings a year and, when the count received

it, 4 pounds. Strictly one should end with '... and, when the count received it, [it was worth] 4 pounds, especially as previous 'it is worth' (*ualet*) refers to the present time and the second value to the past. The Latin verb would be *ualebat*. However the sense is clear without 'it was worth'.

Most estates consist of demesne land and land tenanted by 'villans' A typical entry will contain a sentence such as in 161b2: 'Of these Roger has 3 hides and half a virgate and 2 ploughs in demesne and the villans have 1 hide less half a virgate and 1 plough and a half'. A contrast is provided by 230a3:'Osfrith holds this from the count and he has three-fifths of it and half a plough and the villans have two-fifths and half a plough'. Here 'in demesne' is not present, though in many such cases it probably should be. However it has not been inserted, even if it is judged to be missing, demesne being a complicated notion, where a note would be better. In the first case Roger [of Courseulles] holds from the abbot of Glastonbury and has demesne, while Osfrith, holding from the Count of Mortain, while he has land, may not have the privileges and exemptions associated with demesne.

Woodland, Meadow, Pasture
These are often assessed in areal measures, usually acres, and the Latin if translated literally, gives a satisfactory English: '6 acres of meadow' etc. However, sometimes these resources are measured in length by width. Here a literal rendering 'two leagues of woodland in length and one furlong in width' is ugly. In such cases the genitive has been eliminated: 'woodland 'two leagues in length and one furlong in width'

Saints
These are regarded throughout the Middle Ages as real people. Many grants and charters have clauses beginning 'I give to God and Saint Peter...', although it is common to translate 'to God and St Peter's as if the church were meant. In fact saints are rarely used in ellipsis for their church. Thus *haec terra pertinet Sanctae Mariae* means 'this land belongs to Saint Mary', not 'to Saint Mary's '.Entry 266a3 begins: 'The count [of Mortain] has 1 manor, which is called Crowcombe, which Saint Swithun held ....' The word 'saint' is only abbreviated (to St) in place-names.

Word-Order
Latin and English have different norms for word order even if Medieval Latin is closer to that of English than Classical Latin, where the verb is routinely at the end of the sentence and the subject sometimes not at the beginning. Where possible an English translation should follow English norms, so as to give the reader a fluid, non-lumpy ride. However there are exceptions:

Inde
In EDB, this is usually placed as the first word in a sentence. In 133b1 (one of countless examples) the neatest translation would be to bury the *inde*: 'Drew has 1 ferding of it and 2 ploughs in demesne...' However, *inde* like *ibi* appears to act as a way-mark or signpost, so it should rightly be at the front: 'Of it Drew has 1 ferding and 2 ploughs in demesne ...'

Ibi

The same applies. For example in 167a1 a comfortable rendering would be: 'The abbot has 5 villans there and 9 bordars and 3 cottars...', though 'There the abbot has 5 villans and 9 bordars and 3 cottars ...' better reflects the emphasis of the Latin. In the translation, neither *ibi* nor *inde* is promoted to head position, if they are already buried in the sentence in the Latin as in 165a1: 'Gerard has this in demesne and he has 1 bordar there and 1 cob and 5 beasts.'

In dominio

In 167a1 the Latin word order is correctly reflected by 'Of it the abbot has 4 hides and 1 virgate and 2 ploughs in demesne and the villans ....' However, 'in demesne' can be found in two other positions: 'Of it the abbot has in demesne 4 hides and 1 virgate and 2 ploughs and the villans ....' or 'Of it the abbot has 4 hides and 1 virgate in demesne and 2 ploughs and the villans ....' The first order has a natural flow whereas in the other two that flow is interrupted. The first also has the advantage of marking off the demesne land and ploughs most clearly from what the villans hold. This first formula has been used as the standard here.

Hanc or *Has*

('This', 'These') also often have prime position, but here the resulting translation sounds like a crib: 'This 6 ploughs can plough. (167a1), rather than '6 ploughs can plough this' A more drastic solution (sometimes adopted, but not here) would be to use the passive: 'These can be ploughed by 6 ploughs'.

Qui

Sometimes a *qui* is not adjacent to its antecedent, but is in effect resumptive: these are rendered by 'and he' etc: For example in 50b3: 'Roger has 1 manor, which is called Powerstock, which Almær held on the day that King Edward was alive and dead **and it** paid geld for 6 hides'. Here the 'and it' is *quae* in Latin (feminine nominative singular referring a long way back to 'the manor' (*mansionem*), not to the nearer Powerstock.

Numerals

Roman figures are rendered as arabic. Numbers are used for numbers and words for words; thus '5 ploughs ...' (*.v. carruce* ...) is the norm even where a figure begins a sentence, but where a word (*duo* etc.) stands for a number it is translated as a word ('two' etc.).

In the MS the majority of Roman numerals are written in a traditional way, thus *.xviii.* for 18, *.lxxxiii.* for 83, *.ccdlx.* for 260. However some scribes divide these numbers into more manageable groups, thus *.x. & .viii.*, *.lxxx. & .iii.* and *.cc. & .d. & .lx.* Further, for some large numbers, a multiplication sum is given, thus *.iiii. .xx.* (4 x 20 = 80, still used as *quatre-vingt* for 80 in French) and *.vi. .xx.* (6 x 20 = 120). However, in the translation it is the final sum of the addition or multiplication that is given. The exception to this is where an addition to the number involving the use of 'and' has been interlined, since such an alteration shows the scribes at work and may be significant in balancing some larger total in the entry.

By contrast where subtraction is involved, the sum has simply been translated. Thus *.xx. hidas .i. uirga et dimidia minus* is rendered literally as '20 hides less 1 virgate and a half' Were the subtraction sum to be done, the translation of this ('19 hides and 2 virgates and 2 ferdings') would introduce 'ferdings' which are not in the text.

Interlined numbers are enclosed thus in brackets: {16}, but where a number is changed by interlineation (*.xxii.* with a superscribed *.ii.*), the interlineation is not shown and only the intended number (24) is translated.

Coinage
Many manorial values are given in terms of pounds, shillings and pence. There were 12 pennies to a shilling and 240 to the pound. The silver penny was the only coin in regular use whereas the shilling and pound and occasionally the mark and Danish ounce (*ora*) were units of accounting. Halfpennies and farthings were produced by cutting pennies in half or into quarters. A pound of pence was a pile of pennies weighing a pound. These differences, plus the fact that values and payments were quite different in 1086 and based on different criteria, mean that it is better to say 10 pounds, 7 shillings and 6 pence rather than £5. 7s. 6d. Adopting the latter course would cause difficulties in examples such as 286b5 'and it pays 4 pounds and a half a year'. Here one would be reluctant to have £4. 10s.

Sometimes such clauses as 'the geld-gatherers have received the pence' are found. Here 'the pence' are *denarios*, and it is tempting to translate 'the geld-gatherers have received the money'. On the other hand 'the pence' underlines the fact that a sack of coins is involved; moreover 'money' has been saved for the solitary appearance of *pecunia* in this sense in 18a1. In DB as a whole it normally means cattle, but in CL it is 'wealth as represented by cattle' (from *pecus* a 'flock' or 'herd'), then 'wealth' then 'money').

In some places *nummus* ('a coin') is used in place of *denarius* ('a penny') for example in 38a2: *& .i. molendinum qui reddit .v. solidos. & .v. nummos*. Here these are clearly *denarii* (there are no other coins), and it seems pedantic to say 'five shillings and 5 coins'. As a compromise 'pennies' are used for *nummi* (which only occur in the plural) and 'pence' for *denarii*.

Translating the present participle
Where appropriate a present participle is rendered as a relative clause as in 528a4: 31 hides and a half and 2 carucates of land which does not pay geld. Here 'land which does not pay geld' represents *terrae non gheldantis*, literally 'land not paying geld'.

The Continuous Present Tense
Latin sometimes uses the present tense in narrative where a past tense might be expected. This is true of the phenomenon called *repraesentatio*, where at the climactic moment of some past battle the narrator moves dramatically into the present tense for vividness. . It is also the case that Latin can use a present tense for an event in the past whose effects are still continuing. Usually a translator simply treats the tense as if it were a past one, but there is an argument for marking it in some way. The commonest use is of *aufert* where *abstulit* would be expected. Entry 507b10 refers to the estate of Trenhaile which formerly paid 6 sheep and 8 pence a year as a customary due to Saint Petroc. The entry continues: 'Now Brian holds it from the count [of Mortain] and is taking away this customary due from the church.' *aufert* is present tense but the sense is that Brian has removed these dues from the saint at some time in the past and continues to deprive him of them. The solution

adopted here is to introduce the idea of continuity and also modify the meaning of the verb: 'Now Brian holds it from the count [of Mortain] and continues to keep this customary due from the church.

CONVENTIONS USED IN THE TRANSLATION.
References
　Folio References
Folio numbers indicate recto (r) or verso (v) There are usually three different sequences of numbers applied at different times to the head of the page in the manuscript (see Concordance). The numbers here used are those written in the centre at the head of each folio in preparation of the edition of Ralph Barnes and Sir Henry Ellis published by the Record Commission in 1816. In the MS itself the letters r and v are not used and there are no numbers written on the versos. Blank folios are numbered and included in text and translation.
　References to individual entries
References such as 156a1, 334b3 indicate the folio, the recto (a) or the verso (b) numbered from the top to the bottom in a straight numerical sequence. Headings are allotted separate numbers in this sequence. Separate entries are generally indicated by scribes with a paraph ('gallows-sign').In this translation any paraph-sign is given a number, whether or not there is text following it, and even if the material, where it is present, really belongs to a previous entry.

Numbers are also applied to complete entries without paraphs, whether in the body of the text or in the margin, and to whole erased entries. The scribes themselves are inconsistent: sometimes a separate entry lacks a paraph, while they hesitate as to whether to mark additional information about a manor added in the margin with a paraph or not. Where a marginal jotting or *aide-mémoire* is, or could be thought to be, in a contemporary hand, it is numbered but additions which are certainly later (such as those identifying the estates of the Bishopric of Exeter with their then place-name forms) are ignored.
　Cross References
Individual estates are linked to their corresponding entry in GDB, also to any occurrence elsewhere in EDB (for example a duplicate entry or to the entry in another fief referring to the same dispute; also to any mentions of any irregularity concerning it listed in the *Terrae Occupatae* (TO). A complex example is 139b2 where the cross-references are [= GDB SOM 5,10. See EDB172b2 = GDB SOM 8,38 (part); also EDB (TO) 516a3, 524a2]. This is the estate of Hutton held by the Bishop of Coutances, abbreviated into GDB as SOM 5,10. However the land was clamed by the bishopric of Wells according to EDB172b2 to which part of GDB SOM 8,38 corresponds. The dispute is also recorded twice in the *Terrae Occupatae* (516a3, 524a2).

The numerical references to GDB are to the 'chapter' and section of the Phillimore edition.

Marginalia

As in the extended Latin text these are backlit in blue and their beginnings are marked by the interlined word Margin.

As explained in the Introduction to the Extended Latin Text, most instances of marginalia and of interlineation (the latter marked by curly brackets {…}, see below) there is a degree of overlap as an interlineation can spill over into the margin and the scribe of what seems to intended as a marginalium can begin in a space left when the last line of an entry ends early. In a few instances scholars will not agree on the categorisation. Nonetheless only two classes (interlineations and marginalia) are recognised here, any complexities being discussed in the Notes

One particular group of marginalia consists in the Latin of a repetitive *d. m.* These are confined to the Wiltshire Geld Accounts and are mostly found in Version B. There are two instances (7b8, 9a7) where the *d. m.* is interlined rather than being marginal. These are *aides-mémoires* indicating some irregularity in a payment (usually money paid late or still owing) recorded in that line. Being mostly marginal they do not indicate the exact item being queried, of which there are usually several in a line. The exact identity of these is discussed in the Notes.

Brackets

Chevrons, < >, enclose folio numbers.

Curly Brackets {…} enclose an interlineation consisting of one or more whole words or figures. However, alterations within existing names, numbers or ordinary words are not shown. These can be seen in the extended Latin text. Also see Numerals (above).

As mentioned above (under Marginalia), while most instances are clearly either an interlineation or a marginalium, there are cases where classification is less certain, when, for instance, an interlineation runs over into the margin and a marginal addition begins on an existing line. This is discussed more fully in the Introduction to the Extended Latin Text.

Angle Brackets ⟨…⟩ enclose the translation of whole words that have been omitted by the scribes but are necessary for the understanding of the text and have been inserted (also in angle-brackets) in that text.

In the accompanying Latin text these brackets are also used to indicate where, in a word, necessary letters have been added, when there is no sign in the text indicating abbreviation. These instances where letters have to be restored to a word in the Latin are ignored in the translation: thus *R*⟨odbertus⟩ becomes 'Robert', *c*⟨omes⟩ becomes 'count' and ⟨re⟩ddidit (where the manuscript is damaged) is simply translated as 'paid'

Square Brackets […] enclose an editorial addition. For example, these supply the modern affix to a place known by a simpler name in 1086: thus Curry [Rivel]; also, in the Geld Accounts, the byname, if any, which occurs in the corresponding entry in the main (feudal) text of EDB (and vice versa): so, Humphrey [de Lille]; see Identifications below. Also included is the name of the bishopric, where the text only has 'Bishop' or 'Bishop Giso' or 'Bishop Walkelin': thus 'the bishop [of Wells]', 'the bishop of Winchester' or Bishop Giso [of Wells], Bishop Walkelin [of Winchester]. This is partly to aid locating in the text and indexing.

For the same reason the rare occurrences of 'the Bishop of St. Lô' are given a following [*alias*, of Coutances]; Walter of Douai is [*alias* Walscin] and *vice versa*,

Walscin being the pet-form of the name Walter. However, within an entry, such additions to the name are only made to its first occurrence.

There is a delicate balance here: the text should not be cluttered with extraneous material nor filled with identifications of people or places that are supposition or assertion, but a minimum of carefully chosen additions can greatly assist the reader and save him or her from endlessly turning to Notes or Indices. Thus help is also sometimes given with understanding the grammar or structure of a sentence.

The intention is only to include material that is certain and uncontroversial, uncertainties being discussed in the notes. There seems no point in not indicating that 'The abbot' in a particular context is demonstrably 'The Abbot [of Glastonbury]', but casual musings without a sound evidential base, for example about the possible identity of an unnamed holding, have been ignored. Recently there has been a tendency to assume that if a man called William of X holds from a tenant-in-chief called Robert, then all undifferentiated Williams in Robert's fief are in fact William of X. However, rigour demands that the case be made for each individual entry (for example from gifts to religious houses where the full byname is given, or from the later history of the manor and the later descent of the individual's holdings), and material to do so is currently scattered and scanty.

Such bracketed additions of by-names are especially frequent in the translations of the Geld Accounts. In the case of Wiltshire the existence of three different stages of the same account means that a byname often occurs in one account but not in another but these are easily transferable from Account to Account. In the case of all counties the Geld accounts have been analysed and the nameless holdings identified in most cases with named manors in GDB, where the byname of the holder (often that of a tenant-in-chief) is commonly present.

Incomplete Sentences.
Where the text cannot be read or restored (in angle brackets ⟨...⟩) from the corresponding entry in GDB, or where a sentence breaks off or material such as the figure for a particular resource is missing this is indicated by **....** However **Gaps in the Latin Text**, which do not affect its sense are not shown. They can be seen in the images of the manuscript and the reasons (defect in the parchment, space possibly left for something not obviously missing, erasure, etc.) are given in the notes.

Erasures
---- denote the erasures of whole entries, with or without a 'gallows-sign'. Such whole entries are allotted a reference number.

Deletions
A single strike through (~~bishop~~) indicates a deletion marked by the scribe, as in 256a3 'when the count acquired it, it was worth ~~the same amount~~ 60 shillings'.

Underlining indicates something which, in the editor's judgement, the scribe should have marked for deletion. These often represent the scribe's writing of one name such as Robert, which is then followed by the correct Walter, sometimes interlined, though the scribe has failed to mark the 'Robert' for deletion. The translation will have '<u>Robert</u> {Walter} holds it ...'

Similarly accidental repetitions of words are recorded but the second occurrence is marked as needing deletion; thus '... and <u>and</u> ...'(248a2) and '... on the day that King Edward <u>that King Edward</u> was alive and dead.' (239a1)

The intention here is to bring the Latinless reader closer to this important but hastily written and little revised text.

Sometimes a sentence which began *Ibi habet* ... ('There he has ...') has had the 'He' specified by interlineation; thus *Ibi habet {episcopus}* ... ('There {the bishop} has ...'). In such cases the original 'he' has been displaced by the 'bishop' In the Latin the personal termination –t would remain on the verb either way. The translation thus has to record this two-stage process by an underlining: There <u>he</u> {the bishop) has ...'

Corrections.

If there appears to be something wrong with the text, this is discussed in a note rather than corrected in the translation. However corrections are occasionally made where the scribe has made a simple error which left uncorrected would confuse; thus in 416b1: 'Half a ferding [*recte* plough] can plough this'.

Punctuation

Writers of Latin, who would have been familiar with the elements of rhetoric, usually constructed their sentences so as to need minimal punctuation, generally only a full stop. Reading and composing aloud were common, and even material composed in writing seems to have been mouthed or phrased ('performed in the head') as if it were being or were to be spoken. Thus phrases are often terminated by natural breath pauses and not by written punctuation. In the case of EDB however the actual punctuation of the text is inconsistent and even chaotic; see Latin Text: Punctuation.

The translation aims to reproduce, or (in cases where the *genii* of the languages differ) to create, as natural a flow as possible. In EDB many sentences are prolonged by the repetition of 'and' (rendering commas redundant), as they join together material, though it is often of disparate nature and diverse importance. It is common to embrace the manorial resources and the valuation of the manor in a single sentence, which though long, is nonetheless rhythmic, balanced and clear. Because of this, minimal punctuation is used in the translation, though relative (*qui*) and temporal and other clauses are marked off where necessary, by commas, and the 'value-clause', which is a summation of much that has gone before and which is often given a separate line in GDB, is preceded by a semi-colon: thus (in 152a1) 'There Ralph has 1 villan and 5 bordars and 2 cottars and 2 slaves and 2 pigs and 56 sheep and 1 mill, which pays 3 shillings, and 5 acres of woodland and 3 acres of meadow; and it is worth 30 shillings and, when he received it, 20 shillings'.

The Latin text does not systematically mark the beginning of a 'sentence' with a capital, although many common nouns, occurring within sentences, are, by contrast, capitalised there. This poses a problem for the handling of the connective 'and'. This is represented in the Latin by *et* or *Et* or by the ampersand (*&*) or by the Tironian *nota* (*7*). There is no distinction between them or between the use of capital *Et* and small *et* in terms of force, hierarchy or use. Most are simply (as in the last example) used for continuity, but others manifestly introduce different material or even a new sentence or paragraph. The editor has used his judgement in each case as to

whether to continue with an 'and' sometimes preceding it with a semi-colon, or to begin a new sentence or paragraph with an 'And' preceded by a full stop.

The translation presented hereis not over punctuated. On the one hand in the long lists of resources that most estates have, the payments from mills, fishermen, salt-houses and swineherds are meticulously marked off so that the swineherds, for example, are not accidentally credited with other dues or renders in what follows. On the other hand, it has been thought over-fussy to punctuate 'Oda, son of Eadred, held this…' in place of a simpler but still comprehensible 'Oda son of Eadred held this …'.

Paragraphing

In the Latin text an entry can seem like a single dense slab of prose, despite containing diverse material, while it would be possible to paragraph the text in terms of its answers to each of the questions listed in the preface to the *Inquisitio Eliensis* (IE). The compromise position adopted here is to allot separate paragraphs firstly to those sub-infeudations which, from the way they are presented in the text, are evidently separate units within a manor and secondly to any additional information in an entry which follows the value clause. This is usually an answer to the IE question: 'How much has been added or taken away?' Further, information given at the end of one entry, but which relates to two or more previous ones, is separated off by a blank line.

Paragraphing has also been applied to the Geld Accounts. Essentially these are financial accounts but rendered in continuous prose. They tend to have a standard pattern, though the order differs between shires: (a) the name and hidage of the hundred; (b) details of the king's and barons' exempt demesne; (c) the amount of money received for a given number of hides; (d) information on what is still owed and what has been paid late. These elements have all been allotted separate lines or paragraphs in the translation.

NAMES

In the present absence of Notes on the text and translation, much relevant information can be found in the Phillimore volumes for the 5 south western counties, now updated and available on-line via the Domesday Explorer website, and in the 'Hundreds and Wapentakes' article in the relevant volumes of the Alecto edition.

Personal Names
Given or Forenames

Anglo-Saxon personal names are given in standardised form following the conventions used for the *Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England* (*PASE* http://domesday.pase.ac.uk/).Dr Christopher Lewis, a key member of the PASE Domesday project and a member of the present Project team has undertaken the immense labour of checking the forms in which the Anglo-Saxon names are here represented and adding standardised forms for those which are not yet in the above databases. He has also suggested appropriate forms for names that were recent arrivals from the continent.

These Anglo-Saxon personal names were handled during the DB process by a variety of Francophones. They brought their own conventions to the representation of particular sounds and were forced to do their best with sounds that do not exist in the French and Anglo-Norman of the time. In particular they had to contend with the different sound-system and representation in letters that was Cornish. It is manifest that many or most scribes pronounce these unfamiliar names in their heads and represented the resulting sounds as best they could. Further, in the process of trying to regularise these names, the main scribe of GDB introduced further confusions. The result is notoriously complex and Dr Lewis has made the best attempt yet to identify the correct Anglo-Saxon names embedded in their sometimes bizarre representations.

However a small number of names which in the above databases are represented by their traditional forms have been given their regularised Anglo-Saxon forms; thus Eadweard for (King) Edward and Eadgyth for (Queen) Edith

In the Latin text many personal names, when repeated in a fief or an individual entry, are reduced to a single letter; thus *Balduuinus* becomes B. In the semi-diplomatic text the extension is indicated by italic letters: B*alduuinus*. However, in the translation all such reductions are silently extended; thus B. in the right context appears as Baldwin, without an indication that it has been extended. As always the authority is the semi-diplomatic Latin text and above that stands the manuscript itself.

Bynames
It is difficult to demonstrate the regular existence of inherited 'surnames' for 1086 either in England or in France. As a result, the default position in the translation is to take them as referring to the individual and to render them as such. In the rare cases where there is evidence to the contrary, for example in the case of the names Giffard and Crispin (in origin meaning 'chubby cheeks' and 'curly-haired' respectively) where the name was also held by predecessors of the Domesday holders, they are treated as family names. For example, Berengar *gifart, gifard, gifardus* of EDB and the Walter *gifard* (etc.) of GDB and LDB are from a family which was already named *gifart* in Normandy. They may all have had large jowls, but the balance is in favour of Berengar Giffard rather than Berengar Fat-face.

Most names fall into the categories of (a) physical or moral defects or characteristics, (b) occupational, (c) toponymical:
(a) Personal Characteristics
These are quite commonly used to distinguish people with the same name (the stock of forenames being small), and even individuals where the basic name is rare. Many of these become inherited surnames held by families in England or in France or in both. They are often informal nicknames and even when held by people of high rank are notably absent from formal documents such as charters. Despite the later history of the name on English or French soil, it is likely, in the absence of other evidence, that these names are applied (often affectionately, however rude they may seem), to an individual. Thus William *belet*, though he sired the Billett family was probably William 'the rather handsome' or William the Pretty, *belet* being a diminutive 'pathetic little... ' gorgeous little...' of the OFr *bel* (from popular Latin *bellus*), modern

French *beau*. There is perhaps a hint of effeminacy. Geoffrey *maloret* is probably ancestor of a family called Mallory, but he had perhaps been overwhelmed by a particular or general misfortune: Geoffrey the Ill-Fated, Geoffrey the Unfortunate, Geoffrey the Ill-Starred from OFr **maloret* (< OFr *maleuré* itself from Latin *malus* + **agurium* < CL *augurium* 'bad augury'). Gunfrid *maledoctus* was probably the originator of the Mauduit family in France and the Mawditts in England, but he personally was most likely badly educated or terribly brought up, so 'Geoffrey No School' or 'No Manners' or 'Geoffrey the Dunce'. Robert *grenon* is probably connected with Grenons in France and the Garnon/ Gernon/ Garnham and Grennan family or families in England. However the 1086 holder probably had a moustache which dominated his face or wore one when they were otherwise out of fashion. Ralph *tortae manus/ tortes mans* (in the Latin and French forms) named a family (the *Tortesmeynes*) which was active in Somerset in the Middle Ages, but probably himself had bent, crooked or twisted hands, a birth defect or the result of an accident. Here translation needs to avoid giving rise to unwarranted deductions: the Latin and French forms suggest a purely physical handicap, whereas both 'bent' and 'crooked' (less so 'twisted') nowadays can suggest criminality. Likewise Robert *bastardus* (his chapter is missing from the extant EDB, but he is present in the Devonshire Geld Accounts) is better Robert the Illegitimate than Robert the Bastard.

It would be easier and safer for a translator to leave such words in the Latin or French. On the other hand they bring the reader briefly much closer to human beings in a text that is otherwise quite dry and austere. But a translator is forced to take risks: William *capra* is strictly William the She-Goat, but the guess is that he was a fusser, an ever-clucking hen, a Nanny-Goat.

Sometimes the meaning of the nickname is clear, though its significance is opaque. Thus Roger *arondel/ arundellus* is clearly a 'swallow' or a 'swift' (Old Fr *arondel*, Mod Fr *hirondelle*), though whether that refers to body shape or frenetic activity is unsure. The exact species of fish or bird or tree designated by some words both in CL and in ML is uncertain. In this case he is standardised as Roger *Arondel*. The traditional Roger Arundel inevitably connects im with Arundel in Sussex, held by another Roger, Earl Roger of Shrewsbury though Arundel has a different etymology.

Finally there are nicknames where the meaning is unclear or the choice between different meanings impossible. Such names are left in the Latin or French. Thus Richard *estordit* also *estormit* , ancestor of the Sturmy family, was either 'stunned' or 'confused' or 'perplexed' or 'giddy' or 'dizzy', 'silenced' or (perhaps because of these) 'reckless', 'full of mad enterprises' This is OFr *estordit*, past participle of OFr *estordir*> ModFr *étourdi*, but as Richard *estormit*, seemingly a different word (< OFr *estormir*) applied to the same man he may have 'taken up arms', 'made a loud noise' or 'sounded the alarm'. The existence of a Ralph *turmit* and Ralph *sturm'* in LDB (NOR 31,38;41) might suggest a family name, if Ralph and Richard were related and Ralph's name has the same root in OFr *estormit*. John Morris was probably heedless in calling one of them Richard Reckless in the Phillimore Wiltshire.

William *malbanc*, is William Bad-Bench, but the context, whether a prank-inspired collapsible seat or bad carpentry (an incompetent *bricoleur*) or something else, is unknown; just as Hugo *malus transitus/ maltavers* is Hugo 'Bad Passage' or 'Poor Crossing', but whether he had got himself shipwrecked or was 'difficult to get past in battle', as Tengvik suggested, is uncertain. Such names are left in the Latin or French.

In summary, these bynames are overwhelmingly treated as describing the individual and are translated where possible; otherwise they are left in the original Latin or French. It seems to this editor that an attempt to translate these terms, though involving some uncertainties, is preferable to treating them as progenitors of English and French families. A table of equivalents is available elsewhere on the website.

(b) Occupational Names

These are heretreated as if the individual is currently doing that job or performing that office, thus 'cook' 'chamberlain', 'huntsman', 'kitchener', 'gate-keeper', in contrast to the Phillimore Ansger Cook, Alfweard Hunter etc. as if these were surnames. Some of these skills become family specialities, especially in the form of inherited serjeanties. However, in 1086 these names seem far from becoming surnames.

Toponyms

In Domesday translations and studies it has been become usual to give bynames derived from Continental places in the form adopted by the English families they later became: thus Mortimer for Mortemer, de Mandeville for de Manneville, d'Oilly or d'Oyly for d'Ouilly, Dabernon for d'Abenon, Balliol for Bailleul, of Pomeroy for de La Pommeraye, Rivers for de La Rivière, Redvers for de Reviers. Apart from the English colonisation of French that this represents, and its anachronism, it is not always certain that the English families with these names were derived from the holders listed in Domesday Book.

In Domesday these names generally refer to an individual's place or country of origin. These holders of English soil, who arrived with the Conqueror or in the twenty years between 1066 and the Domesday survey are generally first generation Normans, Bretons, Flemings Lorrainers or Picardians, some of whom were adventurers, but others still retained estates and power at the places that give them their bynames. Such names only tend to be adopted when someone moves from one country or province to another and to distinguish people with the same name among the very restricted stock of Norman names. Inherited surnames really begin with the next or succeeding generations. They are treated in the translation as toponyms and are given in their modern Continental forms. There is an argument for calling such people as for example Nigel of Gounai (translating the Latin of when all other Latin words are translated) or as Nigel from Gournai which is the underlying sense.

However here 'of' is used for English places (Ralph of Hastings) and variants of *de* (such as *de*, *d'*, *de la*, *du*, *des*) for French ones (Reynold de Torteval, Ralph de la Pommeraye, Richere des Andelys, William d'Eu etc.)

Names of uncertain identification are left in the Latin. Thus Walter *de Clauilla*, Bretel *de Sancto Claro*, In these cases there is more than one place called *Claville* as also a *Clasville*, in northern France, and several called *Saint-Clair* as well as a St Cleer in Cornwall, but, without other evidence to connect the individuals to a particular place, an arbitrary decision would be misleading, and suggestive of greater knowledge than is the case. It is a regrettable tendency of modern editors to

produce an imaginary modern form of a place only attested in Domesday (Leigh for *Lega*, for example, as if it had been confidently identified.

Bynames are sometimes represented by an adjective, thus *Moritonensis* meaning 'of Mortain'. English does not readily accept such adjectives used of people (Mancunian and Cantabrigian being exceptions), which are often seen as 'fancy'.) By contrast virtually every French commune, however small has its own adjective). The rendering 'the Moritonensian Count' would be rebarbative, so *Moritonensis* is translated as 'of Mortain', the same as the rendering of *de Moritonio*. The Mortain Count would be a violation of English usage, whereas, with churches, it is useful and acceptable to say 'Glastonbury Church' for *ecclesia Glastoniensis* (etc)., while retaining the translation 'The church of Glastonbury for *ecclesia Glastoniae*.

Place-Names

Identifiable names are given in their modern form as shown on OS maps (for England) or IGN maps (for France).

Those parts of the name given without brackets in the translation correspond to the only part of the name that is found in the Latin text. The bracketed additions are post-Domesday extensions of the name. However, some modern names contain the Domesday form and an addition within a single word: Bowcombe (220b1) for plain *Comma*, Northleigh (473a3) for simplex *Lega*. It has been thought unnecessary to write these in the forms [Bow]Combe and [North]Leigh.

Names which are attested after 1086 but are either lost or no longer the names of settlement sites are placed in single inverted commas (such as 'Dodisham', 424b1). Names, for which the latest (and often the only) evidence is in DB, are given in italics: as *Wederiga* in 222b1. No attempt has been made to give such names an extrapolated modern form (Wetheridge), since their location on the ground is unknown and the name un-evidenced after 1086. In some instances, as a result of further research, such names may turn out to be bad forms of a known, and still existing, place-name.

The identifications are largely those made or confirmed by Frank Thorn for the five south-western counties as published in the Phillimore series and re-used and occasionally re-identified for the Alecto edition. Those for Cornwall are based on the work of Oliver Padel. All were looked at afresh and in some cases slightly updated for the e-Phillimore deposited in the Essex University data archive and also accessible via the Domesday Explorer website.

The process used for identifying places is a strict one: the name is identified by its modern representative supported by a sequence of name forms running back the 1086 name; the identifications of place and the hundred in which it lay must correspond; the resources listed must have lain historically within the bounds of the manor or be plausibly connected to it; the later history of the manor should relate, where possible, the 1086 tenant or sub-tenant to the medieval holders of the estate.

Names are given in their modern form, so Woodford for *Odeforda*. The only exceptions to this rule are: (a) where a settlement, simply named from a river in Domesday, later acquires a more precise name (thus Martinstown for 'Winterborne', 'Waringstone' now Weston, named from Warin the 1086 holder of *Oteri*), and (b) where one name has entirely replaced the Domesday name: thus in 197b2 the manor called 'St Andrew' after its church is now Northover from its relation to

Ilchester. An example in Devon, though not in EDB is GDB DEV 35,27 where Domesday's *Alfelmestone*, for which later forms are found, has been displaced by Train: a document from 1561-62 speaks of *Alphemeston alias Treawyn*. Further off Domesday's *Cherchefelle* is now entirely Reigate (GDB SUR 1,7).

Insertion of Additional Bynames

Often a plain Richard or Robert or William can be identified as 'Richard of x', 'Robert the y'. On the other hand this information comes from a variety of sources of varying quality both medieval and modern. It is too easy to leap to the conclusion that William of Z' in a cartulary can be certainly identified with a particular Domesday William. This is properly the stuff of annotation. Here additional names [Count] Eustace [of Boulogne] are only drawn from elsewhere in the Domesday corpus and only put in the translation where the cross-reference is certain, as often it can be from the Geld Accounts to the main text. This means that even bynames for which there is good other evidence (for example Goscelm of Claville, Andrew of Vitré, Jovin the craftsmen, are not included in the text or translation, though they are mentioned in the notes.

Hundred-Names

In the majority of the counties listed in GDB the name of the administrative unit (Hundred, Wapentake, Lathe, Riding etc.) in which a place lies, are entered in the text. These heads often precede groups of places which lie in that same unit. It is rare, however, for this system to be perfectly applied and there are errors and many omissions. But in the five south-western counties although there are sporadic mentions of hundreds and their names, there is no systematic insertion of headings. In 1955 in a seminal article Peter Sawyer suggested that in the majority of English counties (he did not examine the south-west) the text had a hundredal substratum, that places were grouped by hundred and that in many cases the hundreds (and even vills) were entered in the same (or very similar) order in each fief. Identification of such patterns is a vital tool in distinguishing places and in separating those of the same name which lay in different parts of a county.

   Work by the present editor over many years has demonstrated that the only difference between the five counties of the south-west and those elsewhere in the rest of England is not the absence of a hundredal framework underpinning the text, but simply an absence of the hundred names themselves. It is felt that there is sufficient evidence from these studies to insert these headings in the text. The information is derived from analysis of the EDB Geld Accounts, from plain lists of the names of hundreds (two, here called A and B, for the counties of Somerset, Devon and Cornwall, given on folios 63r-64v, and the identification of groups of places entered together within the text of the main (feudal) part of EDB and corresponding to the constituents of separate hundreds. This has been supplemented where necessary by later evidence.

   There are some discrepancies between the names of the hundreds in the Geld Accounts and those in the plain lists of hundred names, also differences between the A list and the B list for each county. The B-Lists seem to be closely related to the structure and order of EDB itself.

For example, in the case of the holdings of Bishop Giso of Wells, the Geld Accounts head his Somerset lands as 'From 1 part of Bishop Giso's Land, which belongs to the honor of his bishopric ...' while the other evidence allows the individual hundreds in which each of his estates lay to be indentified. In this case the hundred heading in the translation is given in a format similar to [In the Land of [Bishop] Giso/ Kingsbury [Episcopi] Hundred] as in 156a4. Here the 'Land of Bishop Giso' comes from the Geld Account, while 'Kingsbury [Episcopi] Hundred' comes from the List of Hundred names

Further, in the Geld Accounts for Somerset there are hundreds of Frome, of Bruton and of Yeovil, but these are really groupings of the separate hundreds of Frome, Kilmersdon and Wellow, of Bruton, Wincanton and *Blachethorna* and of Yeovil, Houndsborough, Lyatts, *alias* Coker, Stone and Tintinhull, all of which feature in the hundred lists. Thus a heading, as in 146b1, might read: [In the Frome Hundreds: Wellow Hundred].

Where the same hundred has different names in the different sources, this is indicated by *alias*: thus in 152a1 [Milborne *alias* Horethorne Hundred].

The identification of the names of the hundreds and the form in which these are expressed are the work of the present editor and in large part derive from those published by him in the Phillimore and Alecto editions and elsewhere, but also from his continuing unpublished researches. This work would have limped without the researches of O.S. Anderson published as three volumes of *The English Hundred Names*.

In 1086, the names of the hundreds are those of the manors on which they depended or the site where the men of the hundred met. They are thus treated as place-names; so Kingsbury [Episcopi], 'Abdick', *Stana*. The first of these has a modern affix and the whole is given in the modern form found on OS maps. The site of the second is known, but the name is lost as that of a place; it is given in its last known form or in a representative one. The third place has not been identified or found after Domesday.

Where one hundred-name was later replaced by another, as *Blachethorna* by Catsash, this latter has not been used, as the extents of the hundreds often changed as well.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

from the knowledge and rare expertise of Palaeographers, Historians and of Dr. (now Professor) Peter Stokes. from the Department of Digital Humanities at KCL

Dr Christopher Lewis read the whole at an earlier stage, criticised it with characteristic clarity and trenchancy, and also provided a schedule of desirable standardised forms of the Anglo-Saxon personal and bynames, which I have gratefully adopted wholesale. On the digital front, Geoffroy Noël has been incredibly understanding, skilful and accommodating, and our two doctoral students, Lois Lane and Alex Dymond, have provided some stimulating new ideas as well as youthful encouragement. I am grateful to Professor Stephen Rippon for some detailed discussion

As a linguist specialising in Latin and French and their interface I have came to Domesday without a historian's baggage, but with a certain naïvety and insouciance. The length of this introduction will show that I have tried to breathe some new life into tired or, in my view, wrong-headed Domesday translations. Perhaps I do 'protest too much'. I have received a great deal of advice from people, apart from those already named, who are masters of this terrain, but in the end I have ploughed my own furrow and captained my own ship and can blame no one else for this translation's mis-ploughings (for which the Latin is *delirium*), mis-navigations, faults and ineptitudes, such as they be.

A QUICK GUIDE TO CONVENTIONS

Abbreviations
DB: Domesday Book, as a whole; the Domesday process and Survey, the Domesday corpus of texts specified below.
CL: Classical Latin
EDB: Exon, or Exeter Domesday Book
GDB: Great Domesday Book
LDB: Little Domesday Book
ML…..Mediaeval Latin
OFr: Old French
TO: The Exon *Terrae Occupatae*

REFERENCES
Folio References
Folio numbers indicate recto (r) or verso (v) folios of the MS as used in the 1816 edition of Sir Henry Ellis.

References to individual entries
References such as 156a1, 334b3 indicate the folio, the recto (a) or the verso (b) numbered from the top to the bottom in a straight numerical sequence.

Cross References
Individual estates are linked to their corresponding entry in GDB, also to any occurrence elsewhere in EDB

MARGINALIA
The beginning of each marginalium is marked by the superscript word MARGIN and its content is highlighted in blue.

BRACKETS
Chevrons, <...> enclose folio numbers.

Curly Brackets {...} enclose an interlineation consisting of one or more whole words or figures. Some run into the margin.

Angle Brackets ⟨...⟩ enclose the translation of whole words that have been omitted by the scribes but are necessary for the understanding of the text.

Square Brackets [...] enclose an editorial addition, for example to clarify the translation or to identify places or individuals.

GAPS
... indicate that a sentence breaks off, or normal information such as the figure for a particular resource is missing or that the text cannot be read.

ERASURES
--- denote the erasures of whole entries, with or without a 'gallows-sign'. Such whole entries are allotted a reference number.

DELETIONS
   A strike through (~~bishop~~) indicates a deletion marked by the scribe.
   Underlining indicates something which, in the editor's judgement, the scribe should have marked for deletion.

NAMES
Personal Names
Given or Forenames
With a couple of exceptions Anglo-Saxon personal names are given in standardised form following the conventions used for the *Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England* (*PASE* http://domesday.pase.ac.uk/) and the incomplete PASE 2 ('Profile of a Doomed Elite').
Bynames
Most names fall into the categories of (a) physical or moral defects or characteristics, (b) occupational, (c) toponymical. Those from physical or moral defects are translated from the Latin or Old French wherever the meaning is clear. Occupational names are treated as such ('the cook', 'the huntsman'). Except in rare instances, none of these categories are treated as surnames. Toponymical names are treated as

the names of the places from which the holders came; see place names (next). They are not treated as surnames.

PLACE-NAMES
Identifiable names are given in their modern form as shown on OS maps (for England) or IGN maps (for France).

Those parts of the name not given in brackets in the translation correspond to the only part of the name that is found in the Latin text. The bracketed are post-Domesday extensions of the name.
Names which are attested after 1086 but are either lost or no longer settlement sites are placed in single inverted commas ('Dodisham'). Names, for which the latest (and often the only) evidence is in DB, are given in italics: as *Wederiga*.