

This document has been created by the History Data Service and is based on information supplied by the depositor

SN:5694 - Electronic Edition of Domesday Book: Translation, Databases and Scholarly Commentary, 1086

*Note HDS: this is the 2nd edition of this study, the main change in comparison with the 2007 edition is the addition of the new file **identifying_domesday_landowners.rtf**, a short introduction into this file can be found at its pages 1-3, a bibliography at its pages 563-573.*

Project Summary

The text of Domesday Book is notoriously ambiguous, its array of social and economic statistics hitherto inaccessible, and the majority of individuals and many places unidentified. This electronic edition aims to make Domesday Book both more accessible and more intelligible by presenting its contents in a variety of forms: a translation, databases of names, places and statistics, and a detailed scholarly commentary on all matters of interest or obscurity in the text. All forms of the data are cross-referenced, and all can be used in standard applications such as Microsoft Office.

Resource Abstract

The Domesday Book (1086) contains the most comprehensive array of social and economic data for the pre-industrial world from anywhere in Europe, possibly from the planet. It is a major source for the disciplines of archaeology, geography, genealogy, law, linguistics, onomastics, palaeography, philology, prosopography, and topography; for several of these disciplines, it is the major source. The history of majority of towns and villages begins with Domesday Book, which includes a vast amount of data on names, places, individuals, taxation, land use, population groups, estate values, legal matters, and a wide variety of economic and agricultural resources: mills, meadow, woodland, pasture, salt-pans, fisheries, etc. Only a minute amount of such data has survived from the first six centuries of English history and little became available for another two centuries, and even then never as a comprehensive national survey.

Sources

The basis of the translation of Domesday Book and the scholarly notes are the printed edition of Domesday Book by Phillimore and Co Ltd (39 volumes, 1975-92), as supplemented or amended by *Domesday Explorer* (2000), also published by Phillimore (www.phillimore.co.uk).

Details of Digitisation

The translation of Great Domesday was transcribed from the Phillimore edition (above) into an electronic format by typists working on a government employment scheme during the early 1980s, then enhanced by the addition of extensive coding under an ESRC-funded research project later in the decade. The comparable transcription and coding of Little Domesday was undertaken by Dr Natasha Hodgson for this project, while the Phillimore notes were scanned, edited, enlarged and enhanced by Dr and Mrs. Thorn, also for this project. The databases of names and places were transcribed into electronic format from the original printed Phillimore indexes, then published as national indexes by Phillimore (1992). The statistics database is original to this project, though compiled over a longer period.

Related Digital Resources

This project developed from the translation of Great Domesday Book and the related indexes published by Phillimore in *Domesday Explorer* (2000), the first electronic edition of Great Domesday. *Domesday*

Explorer is the only version of the data which makes use of the functionality of the coding built into the translated text, and adds other powerful features (e.g., mapping).

Geographical coverage

England, from Yorkshire southwards, 34 counties often referred to as the 'old' or 'traditional' counties, those which existed prior to the major reorganisation of 1974, though there were boundary changes, particularly around London, before that. The traditional counties included are: Bedfordshire, Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Cambridgeshire, Cheshire, Cornwall, Derbyshire, Devon, Dorset, Essex, Gloucestershire, Hampshire, Herefordshire, Hertfordshire, Huntingdonshire, Kent, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Middlesex, Norfolk, Northamptonshire, Nottinghamshire, Oxfordshire, Rutland, Shropshire, Somerset, Staffordshire, Suffolk, Surrey, Sussex, Warwickshire, Wiltshire, Worcestershire and Yorkshire.

Temporal coverage

1066 to 1086 although as explained above the paucity of comparable data during the period 400-1200 means that Domesday Book is often employed for research into that period, notably in relation to the English and Viking invasions and settlement of 400-600 and the ninth century respectively. Its data has also been quarried for certain aspects of Roman and pre-historic periods

THE ANNOTATION

The notes are essentially a revision and amplification of the annotation provided by various editors for the Phillimore printed edition published between 1975 and 1986:

<p>John Morris</p> <p>Middlesex (1975) Huntingdonshire (1975) Surrey (1975) Hertfordshire (1976) Sussex (1976) Warwickshire (1976) Staffordshire (1976) Bedfordshire (1976) Nottinghamshire (1977) Oxfordshire (1978) Buckinghamshire (1978)</p>	<p>Frank and Caroline Thorn</p> <p>Cornwall (1979) Wiltshire (1979) Northamptonshire (1979) Rutland (1980) Somerset (1980) Worcestershire (1982) Herefordshire (1983) Dorset (1983) Devon (1985) Shropshire (1986)</p> <p>With John Moore Gloucestershire (1982)</p> <p>With Philip Morgan Lincolnshire (1986)</p>	<p>Philip Morgan</p> <p>Derbyshire (1978) Cheshire (1978) Berkshire (1979) Leicestershire (1979) Kent (1983)</p> <p>With Caroline Thorn Lincolnshire (1986)</p> <p>Alex Rumble</p> <p>Cambridgeshire (1981) Essex (1983) Suffolk (1986)</p>	<p>Julian Munby</p> <p>Hampshire (1982)</p> <p>Philippa Brown</p> <p>Norfolk (1984)</p> <p>Margaret Faull and Marie Stinson</p> <p>Yorkshire (1986)*</p>
---	---	--	---

* Copyright problems have prevented the use of the translation and notes for Yorkshire, but cross-references in the notes of the current project are at present still to the notes in the printed Phillimore edition.

It was the policy of John Morris, the originator of the series and its editor, to provide minimal notes. This was largely because he had set himself a schedule which involved publishing county volumes 'at about twelve each year between 1975 and 1979'. Many of Dr Morris' notes were drawn from the text itself, or were comments on Farley's text, or were taken from a very small number of published sources: the bibliography to the Huntingdonshire volume (which, with Middlesex, was the first to be published) contained 4 items. The ratios of pages of text and translation to notes in the volumes edited by John Morris illustrate this well:
1975 Huntingdonshire (64:3); Middlesex (54:3); Surrey (98:4)
1976 Hertfordshire (161:11); Sussex (184:17); Warwickshire (134:8); Staffordshire (93:4); Bedfordshire (149:10)
1977 Nottinghamshire (138:4)
1978 Oxfordshire (128:6); Buckinghamshire (153:4).

These last two volumes were published after his premature death in 1977. Among the 'county editors' who were appointed by John Morris during his final illness, Philip Morgan remained faithful to his ideal editing Derbyshire and Cheshire in 1978, Berkshire and Leicestershire in 1979 and Kent in 1983 with virtually the same ratio of pages of notes to text and translation (18:1). The annotation provided by other county editors was fuller from the outset and in some cases grew with successive volumes. Among the final volumes to be published were Devon (1985) and Shropshire (1986) both edited by Caroline and Frank Thorn in which the ratios of pages of text and translation to notes are respectively 390:299 and 156:143.

THE PROCESS OF REVISION

Since the beginning of this AHRC-funded project in October 2004 all the notes have been scanned, turned into Microsoft Word documents, imperfections and misreadings in the scanning have been rectified and all have been revised with the exception of Yorkshire where copyright has prevented the use of either the translation or the notes. This revision has principally involved:

Corrections

The correction of obvious errors (factual and typographical) in the notes.

Bibliography

All abbreviations, apart from *VCH* (Victoria County History), have been removed. Books and articles are now cited by short titles, and full details can be accessed in the bibliography. Each book or article should now be cited in the same way throughout.

Translation

A number of translations have been improved or corrected. John Morris' principle that an individual Latin word has a single (and unique) English translation has been more rigorously applied. A number of commonly recurring terms such as 'residences' and 'woodland pasture' have been re-considered (now 'messuages' and 'pasturable woodland') but a number of terms which surprised the scholarly community in 1975 ('villagers', 'smallholders', 'slaves', 'jurisdiction') have been retained. John Morris' professed aim was a translation in 'what the compiler would have written if his language had been modern English'. To this end, a number of translations such as 'wherein' and 'thither' that give the text an unwarranted antique grandeur have been replaced.

Hundreds and Wapentakes

The form of the names of hundreds and wapentakes has been standardized so as to distinguish between those names that are taken from places still extant, those whose location is known, but which are no longer on modern maps, and those which only occur in Domesday or documents directly related to it.

Place-Names

Changes have been made to some place-names as a result of new identifications or to bring them into line with the forms found on current Ordnance Survey maps; see {Name Policy}.

Personal Name-Forms

A considerable number of the forms of personal names have been changed as part of a continuing process to bring more consistency to the entire name stock of Domesday Book; see {Name Policy}.

Identification of Individuals

Some people have been further identified. When the identification comes from the person's occurrence in other documents or in other Domesday counties, this is shown in the translation between asterisks within square brackets. Where, for example, a fief holder is given a byname or title in the Landholders' List at the beginning of a county but not in his fief, or where the text has 'He also holds', referring to a person named in a previous entry, this further identification is indicated by ^ ^. Where there is no documentary evidence for the identity of an individual, but it seems likely that a number of persons with the same first name are one and the same, this has been indicated in the translation by putting the name of one of the estates held by that person between chevrons <>. See {Name Policy}.

Other Changes

Certain changes have been necessary in the conversion of the notes to a searchable electronic version, such as to the wording of lead words for the notes, to that of cross-references and to punctuation.

Additional Notes

A number of additional notes have been written on a variety of subjects, but mainly to explain changes or corrections made in the course of re-editing.

Cross-References

The cross-referencing within and between counties has been considerably increased. Each reference to a note now has a word attached to it (for example: see LEC 3,1 woodland note) to allow for rapid and exact electronic pinpointing.

Introductions and Appendices

For the counties that have not been fully revised an Introduction has been produced from various parts of the notes to the Phillimore printed edition to provide as far as possible a brief account similar to that found in fuller version in the re-edited counties. New sections on the county boundary, the names of hundreds and wapentakes and an Editorial have been included. The layout of any Appendices has been adjusted in some cases and some have been repositioned in the introductions.

FULLY RE-EDITED COUNTIES

In addition to the conversion to electronic format and partial re-editing described above, a number of counties have been fully re-edited. This is part of a process that is intended to continue after the end of the current project. The future work of Dr and Mrs Thorn may be separately published, but will be available for incorporation in the deposited electronic version of the current project, if appropriate arrangements can be made.

Very little is self-explanatory in Domesday and the aim of a full re-edition (as far as the editors can do so) is to supply a sure guide to the interpretation of every aspect of the document and to provide for a wide range of possible users a comprehensive commentary on each Domesday county, compiled from a detailed scrutiny of the manuscript, a minute study of the organization of the county text and its relationship to Domesday Book as a whole and employing a wide range of medieval and modern sources.

THE INTRODUCTIONS

Each fully-revised county has an introduction which normally includes essays on:

- The history of the county
- Its hidation or carucation
- The county boundary (in 1086 and noticing later changes)
- The administration of the shire
- The hundreds or wapentakes (including sections on the names of the hundreds; their identification and reconstruction; their boundaries; their courts; their moot-sites; the relationship of the hundred or wapentake to a particular manor; the lordship of the hundred or wapentake and changes in their organization subsequent to Domesday)
- Manorial organization
- Ecclesiastical organization
- The Domesday format (including sections on the circuit and ruling pattern; the layout and content; the writing and correction; places entered in the wrong Domesday county; the standard order of hundreds and of vills; duplicate entries).
- Special features (including, as appropriate, references to boroughs, castles and forest and other unusual features)
- Related or 'satellite' texts
- An editorial section including a note on the identification of places and on the state of revision of the county notes.

THE APPENDICES

The appendices on the related and 'satellite' texts in the Phillimore printed edition have been revised and expanded and new ones produced.

THE NOTES

Related and 'Satellite' Texts

Relevant material from these is incorporated in the translation or in the notes. In the case of the *Liber Exoniensis* (Exon) every item that adds to or disagrees with the text of Great Domesday is included.

The Manuscript

Mention is made of all significant scribal additions and corrections by the main scribe of Great Domesday as well as of his errors and confusions. Gaps, erasures and overwriting are indicated and anything written outside the ruled framework of the page. Rubrication and later additions are studied. The work of scribe B is discussed, as are the additions by a handful of other contemporary scribes. Insertions made by later scholars and keepers, such as Arthur Agarde, are mentioned, as are the numerous marginal signs and checking marks. In places where the poor state of the manuscript has rendered a place-name or assessment figure illegible, the two main thirteenth-century abbreviations (the *Abbreviatio* and the Breviate) have been checked, as they have also been when the intention of the main scribe is unclear. The manuscript of Great Domesday has been consulted on numerous occasions for all this.

Facsimiles

Cases where the Ordnance Survey and Alecto facsimiles are unclear or appear to differ from the manuscript itself are indicated.

Farley

Errors in Farley's magnificent 1783 printed version are noted, as are the significant errors in Ellis' 1816 printed edition of the *Liber Exoniensis*.

Latinity

The Latin is read closely to see if the published translation is technically correct and also conveys the right sense. This involves close examination of the cases of nouns and the tenses, voices and moods of verbs, as well as the syntax of phrases and clauses. Other possible expansions of the highly abbreviated Latin are discussed. The *VCH* and Alecto translations are quoted where they seem to be wrong or offer a plausible alternative.

Content and Layout

There is discussion of the method and forms in which the main scribe of Great Domesday recorded material in each county - his choice of terms, inclusion of unusual details, their position in the entry etc. - and how these agreed or disagreed with his procedure in other counties in the circuit and in Great Domesday as a whole. His punctuation is also discussed when it throws light on the interpretation of the content. His practice in all this is compared with that found in his sources, such as the *Liber Exoniensis*, and in other texts closely related to the Domesday Survey.

The Fief

There is a brief biography of the fief-holder if he or she is an individual or a brief history of the institution if the holder is a church. In the latter case the lead note identifies the heads of the church, if known, during the period from 1066 to 1086.

The structure of the fief as given in Domesday is examined: whether it is organized by hundred (or wapentake), or whether lordship land is entered first and then sub-infeudations, and whether the latter are organized by hundred (or wapentake) or by subtenant. This arrangement is compared with that of any satellite texts. Added or misplaced entries are noted. The resulting order is compared with a possible county template to see if the hundreds or wapentakes are in essentially the same order in several fiefs.

Hundred or Wapentake Headings

Erroneous heads in the text are discussed and reasons given for the insertion of missing heads.

Place-Names

It is noted if the Domesday name-form is anomalous among the forms gathered by place-name scholars for the place. Any element in the name that might have a bearing on Domesday is discussed (for example, Shrewton (WIL): 'sheriff's *tun*'). It is stated whether the proposed identification passes the tests of (1) plausible derivation from the Domesday form; (2) its location in the hundred or wapentake that Domesday states, or which has been proposed as a correction to or an insertion in the text; (3) the later descent of the estate within a family or barony/ honour/ fief, or among the lands of a church; (4) the likelihoods that the resources given by Domesday could have existed at the proposed location.

Identification thus involves the reconstruction of the hundredal structure of a fief, and use of satellite and other documents, including, for the five south-western counties, the Tax Returns (Geld Rolls).

Where a place-name is lost or has been overtaken by reservoir construction, quarrying, mining or urban growth, its location, if known, is given by a six-figure grid reference.

Any elements in the modern place-name (especially affixes) that are related to Domesday are noted.

The whole Estate

It is stated whether the estate is or becomes a chapelry, hamlet, township or Ancient Parish. Any known earlier history (especially from charters and chronicles) is given. Similarly included is the immediate post-1086 history if it helps to understand the Domesday entry. A fuller later history is given where necessary to establish the identity of the place.

Since a single Domesday name may stand for a considerable area of land and silently include a number of settlements then existing, the extent of the estate and the names of its constituents are given where possible. This involves a consideration of the boundaries of the estate in relation to other administrative units.

Where a subdivision of an estate is implied or expressly mentioned ('Of this manor, Walter holds 5 hides ...') its identity (and its grid reference) is given if it can be discovered.

Its Domesday status (manor, outlier, jurisdiction, 'land') is explored and its relation to other Domesday estates in that fief or in others, is examined, especially where there is no stated link.

The possible origin of the estate as the fragment of some larger unit is explored in the hope that this will throw light on the earlier 'manorial organization' of the county, perhaps as a series of large multiple (royal) estates.

Any suggestion of illegal tenure or of the dismemberment or combining of manors is noted and cross-referenced to Fleming, *Domesday Book and the Law*, with commentary on her interpretation or translation where necessary.

If the estate appears to be duplicated in part or as a whole elsewhere in Domesday, this is noted.

People

For 1086 tenants-in-chief and their subtenants as well as for 1066 holders, the often strange name-form and byname-form is connected with its Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian, Breton, Norman or French equivalent; von Feilitzen, *Pre-Conquest Personal Names of Domesday Book*; Forssner, *Continental-Germanic Personal Names in England*; Tengvik, *Old English Bynames*; Fellows Jensen, *Scandinavian Personal Names in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire*; Reaney, *Dictionary of*

British Surnames; and Dauzat, *Dictionnaire des Noms et Prénoms de France*, are routinely cited. Notes on the names represented by every Domesday name-form and how these compare to the names in the Phillimore printed edition and in the Alecto edition, have been provided for over half of the fully re-edited counties.

If the individual came from what is now France, the supposed place of origin is given by commune, canton, arrondissement and département.

Where an individual can be identified as an office holder (earl, sheriff etc.) or from his occupation (baker, hunter etc) or by his byname, with reasonable certainty from elsewhere in Domesday, from satellite texts or from other documents, especially charters, this information is given. Where the balance of probability is also in favour of an identification, this has been included. Reference has been made to Williams, *The English and the Norman Conquest*, Clarke, *English Nobility*, Sanders, *English Baronies*; Loyd, *Some Anglo-Norman Families*; Keats-Rohan, *Domesday People*, and other books and articles where relevant.

Salient biographical details are given.

Where it seems that individuals with the same single name (Alwin, Bernard etc) can be distinguished, but their bynames (if any) are unknown, they are allocated a toponymic reference in chevrons (<>), taken from one of the estates held by them in 1066 or, as a subtenant, in 1086 (occasionally a hundred is used where the location of a holding is not recorded). Where it can be deduced, their status is indicated.

Hideage or Carucage, Ploughs, Ploughlands

Major differences between figures are noted as is any evidence that might bear on the extent of the hide, the size of the plough-team and the antiquity of the assessment in ploughlands.

Where part of a plough or its equivalent in oxen is mentioned, the complementary parts or beasts are located in Domesday if they can be. There is discussion of different types of hide and of carucate.

Population

Categories of population including unusual ones (for example 'riders', 'cottage-men', 'ox-men') are defined in relation to each other and by their status, possessions (land and ploughs) and services. The cases where scribes convert one category to another in the various documents related to the Domesday Enquiry are noted.

Resources

The commoner terms are defined and the resources described. The location of salt-pans mills and fisheries is given when known, and any evidence that resources (such as pasture and woodland) were remote from the manor are given. The renders from mills (monetary and in eels) are discussed and where part of a mill is recorded, the other portions are located if possible. Evidence is gathered to define the various terms used for woodland and the ways in which it is assessed.

Churches

The superior status of a church (minster, mother church) is given where possible using evidence from within or outside Domesday. Churches known from other sources to have existed in the late eleventh century are mentioned.

Value

Significant changes or discrepancies in value are noted, as is evidence that a manor was 'farmed'. A brief account of 'waste' is given.

Disputes

Where all or part of an estate is subject to a dispute, the nature of the dispute is outlined and the land identified in another fief where possible. Where a county contains separate schedules of disputed land (*Clamores*, 'Declarations of the Jurors' or, in the *Liber Exoniensis*, the *Terrae Occupatae*,) these are linked where possible to the relevant entries in the main text and commentary provided.

Cities and Boroughs

A brief earlier history of each is given and a detailed commentary provided on the particular customs, payments and laws of each.

Forest

Where 'forest' is mentioned in the text, an attempt is made to relate it to the later known forests and chases of medieval England.

Boroughs database

The *Boroughs* database was compiled by myself for this project.

The *Boroughs* database contains records of the separate sections of Great Domesday devoted to Boroughs and County Customs, plus Colchester (ESS B1-7) and Norwich (NFK 1,61;66) from Little Domesday; the structure of these sections is inconsistent with that of the bulk of the rural entries recorded in the *DomesdayStatistics* database. Those boroughs which are recorded among the rural holdings are not included here but in the main *DomesdayStatistics* database.

There is little statistical information in the Boroughs or Customs sections and little standardisation in the data. Those Boroughs or Customs records with the characteristics of rural manors (e.g., BUK B1-2 and YKS C22-35) and those with significant statistical data are recorded both here and in the main *DomesdayStatistics* database in order to offer a separate database for the boroughs without unduly complicating totalling the figures in the *DomesdayStatistics* database.

The data structure is simple. The Boroughs table contains the text of each Phillimore entry (apart from Yorkshire where copyright constraints preclude this) while the dependent tables contain one record for each place, landowner or holding named in the entry.

Few assumptions are made about the data. It is probable, for instance, that houses or other holdings attributed to post-Conquest landowners existed before 1066; but they are only recorded as such if this is specifically stated. Similarly, only post-Conquest data is recorded under the name of the Boroughs. The king (or earl) is included as lord of the Boroughs even if unnamed. Data is disaggregated by equal division where necessary: if two houses are jointly attributed to two landowners, each is recorded as holding one.

The *Boroughs* database consists of five tables, linked to each other and to the *DomesdayStatistics* database, indexes and the *DomesdayTextbase*.

The **Entries** table contains four fields and 489 records:

StructIdx	Numerical equivalent of County/Phillimore for linkage & sorting
County	Standard 3-letter abbreviation for the Domesday county
Phillimore	Phillimore entry reference
TextType	Type of entry: Boroughs (U), Customs (C), Rural (E), or Welsh (W).

The **Boroughs** table contains six fields and 489 records:

StructIdx	Numerical equivalent of County/Phillimore for linkage & sorting
BoroughID	Unique reference identifying record
County	Standard 3-letter abbreviation for the Domesday county
Phillimore	Phillimore entry reference
Text	Domesday text of entry
Notes	Notes on matters of interest.

The **BoroughPlaces** table contains eight fields and 812 records:

PlaceID	Unique reference identifying record
StructIdx	Numerical equivalent of County/Phillimore for linkage & sorting
County	Standard 3-letter abbreviation for the Domesday county
Phillimore	Phillimore entry reference
BoroughPlace	Boroughs or other recorded place-name
Holding	Number of units
Units	Units in which holding is given
Value	Value in £s sterling.

The **BoroughTRELords** table contains eight fields and 989 records:

LordID	Unique reference identifying record
StructIdx	Numerical equivalent of County/Phillimore for linkage & sorting
County	Standard 3-letter abbreviation for the Domesday county
Phillimore	Phillimore entry reference
BoroughTRELord	Pre-Conquest lord
Holding	Number of units
Units	Units in which holding is given
Value	Value in £s sterling.

The **BoroughTRWlords** table contains eight fields 1717 records:

LordID	Unique reference identifying record
StructIdx	Numerical equivalent of County/Phillimore for linkage & sorting
County	Standard 3-letter abbreviation for the Domesday county
Phillimore	Phillimore entry reference
BoroughTRWlord	Post-Conquest lord
Holding	Number of units
Units	Units in which holding is given
Value	Value in £s sterling.

Claims database

The *Claims* database was compiled by myself for this project.

The *Claims* database contains records of the separate sections of Domesday Book devoted to claims, whose structure is largely incompatible with that of other Domesday entries. Claims sections are included for Huntingdonshire, Lincolnshire and Yorkshire in Great Domesday. The three counties of Little Domesday Book also contain separate sections on claims, recorded as 'Annexations'; but since the bulk of these conform to the structure of normal rural manors they are not recorded here but have been included in the main *DomesdayStatistics* database. They are recorded at the end of each county and are easily extracted by their fief numbers. Claims recorded incidentally elsewhere in Domesday Book are not included here.

There is little statistical information in the Claims sections, and what there is almost always duplicates information given in the entries to which the claims refer. Hence there is virtually no loss of statistical information in separating these records from the main statistical database. As data from the *Claims* database is unsuitable for aggregation, normal database conventions on disaggregating data have not been adhered to.

The *Claims* database contains two tables and is linked to the *DomesdayStatistics* database, indexes and the *DomesdayTextbase*. The Claims table is also included in the *DomesdayStatistics* database but is supplied here separately with the Entries table for the convenience of users.

The **Entries** table contains four fields and 289 records:

StructIdx	Numerical equivalent of County/Phillimore for linkage & sorting
County	Standard 3-letter abbreviation for the Domesday county
Phillimore	Phillimore entry reference
TextType	Type of entry: Boroughs (U), Customs (C), Rural (E), or Welsh (W).

The **Claims** table contains sixteen fields and 289 records:

ClaimsID	Unique record ID for table
StructIdx	Numerical equivalent of County/Phillimore for linkage & sorting
County	Standard abbreviation for the Domesday county
Phillimore	Phillimore entry reference
Vill	Domesday manor(s) or vill(s) to which the dispute refers
Holding	Nature and scale of holding in dispute
TenInChief	Tenant-in-chief of the manor, holding directly to the Crown
Lord86	The immediate lord of the peasantry, either the tenant-in-chief himself or a tenant to whom he had granted the estate
Overlord66	Overlord of the manor before 1066; overlord of the 'man' holding the manor <i>TRE</i>
Lord66	Lord of the manor before 1066: the landholder in receipt of the profits of the estate <i>TRE</i>
Claimant	Claimant or claimants in the dispute
Defendant	Defendant or defendants in the dispute

Jurors	The 'sworn men' of the county, Riding or Hundred
Xref	Phillimore entries to which claim refers
Notes	Comments on entry
Text	Text of the Phillimore entry.

The DomesdayStatistics database

The *DomesdayStatistics* database was compiled by Dr Natasha Hodgson and myself for this project, based upon data accumulated in a variety of earlier projects.

Conventions: Problems with the data at the county level are explained in the *StatisticsNotes* for individual counties, and at the level of the Phillimore entry in the notes to the records in the Manors table.

Two general conventions apply throughout: null or missing data in text fields is indicated by a dash, and in the numeric fields by a blank. There is one qualification to this last convention: missing numeric data is entered as zero where the absence of a value is the scribe's normal convention for zero, as for instance in the data for population groups and ploughteams. We have not done this for data on the geld, ploughlands, valuations, or information recorded irregularly. Inevitably there are borderline cases, such as mills, where we have taken a conservative view and left the field blank.

The database tables

The *DomesdayStatistics* database consists of ten tables, linked to each other and to the *Names* and *Places* databases and to the *DomesdayTextbase*.

The **Entries** table contains four fields and 21106 records, one for each separate entry or rubric in the database; all other tables are linked or linkable to this table:

StructIdx	Numerical equivalent of County/Phillimore for linkage & sorting
County	Standard 3-letter abbreviation for the Domesday county
Phillimore	Phillimore entry reference
TextType	Type of entry: Boroughs (U), Customs (C), Rural (E), or Welsh (W).

The **Counties** table contains three fields and 35 records, one record for each county in the database:

County	standard 3-letter abbreviation for the Domesday county
Circuit	Domesday circuit in which the county is believed to be included
County name	full name of county

The **Manors** table contains fifty-six fields and 19970 records, one for each separate entry, as defined by the Phillimore numbering system. This is the main table, containing all the statistical data, aggregated where necessary for the entry as a whole:

StructIdx	numerical equivalent of County/Phillimore for linkage & sorting
County	standard 3-letter abbreviation for the Domesday county
Phillimore	Phillimore entry reference
HeadOfManor	name of the manorial centre of groups of holdings; used for aggregating data
Geld	units liable for taxation and other public services in 1066 and 1086
gCode	code for variations in formulae in recording tax units: see Coding below
VillTax	Payment by vill when geld on the Hundred is 20 shillings (in old pence); Little Domesday only
Taxed on	assessment units on which tax is actually paid
Lords Geld	tax units on the lord's demesne: 'lordship hides'
New Land	additional, unassessed carucates or hides, often described as 'inland' or as carucates in non-carucated areas
Ploughlands	'Land for' so many ploughs, often interpreted as the area of arable land, sometimes as a new tax assessment
pCode	code for variations in formulae in recording ploughland data: see Coding below
LordsPloughs	number of ploughteams attributed to the lord of the manor, the teams each assumed to comprise 8 oxen
MensPloughs	number of ploughteams attributed to the men on the manor, the teams each assumed to comprise 8 oxen
TotalPloughs	total number of ploughteams attributed to the holding
LordsPloughsPossible	additional number of lord's ploughteams needed to bring the estate to full working capacity
MensPloughsPossible	additional number of men's ploughteams needed to bring the estate to full working capacity
TotalPloughsPossible	total number of additional ploughteams needed to bring the estate to full working capacity
villagers	number of villagers (villeins) on the holding
smallholders	number of smallholders (bordars) on the holding
slaves	number of male slaves on the holding
female slaves	number of female slaves on the holding
Freemen	number of Freemen (sokemen) on the holding
free men	number of free men (<i>liberi homines</i>) on the holding
priests	number of priests on the holding
cottagers	number of cottagers on the holding [cottagers with small 'c' in Phillimore]
OtherPop	number of any major population group confined to a few counties (eg, pigmen in Devon)
MiscPop	miscellaneous population not recorded among groups with separate data fields
MiscPopCategories	categories of miscellaneous population recorded in MiscPop field
Burgesses	number of burgesses among the urban or rural population

Mills	number of mills on the holding
MillValue	value of mills on the holding
Meadow	amount of meadow
MeadowUnits	units in which meadow is recorded
Pasture	amount of pasture
PastureUnits	units in which pasture is recorded
Woodland	amount of woodland
WoodlandUnits	units in which woodland is recorded
Fisheries	number of fisheries, fishponds
Salthouses	number of salt-houses
Payments	total of payments other than mills for 1086 not included in the valuation
PaymentsUnits	categories of miscellaneous payments
Churches	number of churches on the holding
ChurchLand	land attached to church or priest
Value86	value of the holding to its lord in 1086
Value66	value of the holding to its lord in 1066
ValueQR	value of the holding to its lord, circa 1070
Values	standardised form of the formulae used to record values: see Coding below
Render	payment over and above the stated value of the holding
Waste	coded form of the formulae used to record waste
Waste66	code for recorded waste for 1066: see Coding below
WasteQR	code for recorded waste, circa 1070: see Coding below
Waste86	code for recorded waste for 1066: see Coding below
Duplicates	code for entry duplicated in whole or in part elsewhere
Subholdings	Subholdings whose data is aggregated with manorial totals (Y)
Notes	notes on problems with the data

The **ByPlace** table contains thirteen fields and 22966 records, one for each vill to which any statistics are attached:

PlaceID	unique record number
StructIdx	numerical equivalent of County/Phillimore for linkage & sorting
SubIdx	numbering within Phillimore entry
County	standard 3-letter abbreviation for the Domesday county
Phillimore	Phillimore entry reference
Area	administrative area between the county and Hundred or Wapentake
Hundred	Domesday Hundred/Wapentake in which manor is described or to which it belongs
Vill	Domesday manor/vill name
Grid	4-figures OS coordinates of Domesday vill
Holding	hides, carucates, or other data indicating size or assessment of holding
Units	nature of units recorded for holding: see Coding below
Waste86	recorded waste for each place in 1086.
PlacesIdx	link to the <i>Places</i> index.

The **TREowners** table contains sixteen fields and 24104 records, one for each pre-Conquest landholder to whom any statistics are attached:

TreID	unique record number
StructIdx	numerical equivalent of County/Phillimore for linkage & sorting
SubIdx	numbering within Phillimore entry
County	standard 3-letter abbreviation for the Domesday county
Phillimore	Phillimore entry reference
Overlord66	overlord of the 1066 estate; overlord of the 'man' in possession in 1066
Lord66	lord of the estate in 1066, in receipt of the profits of the holding
Holding	hides, carucates, or other data indicating size or assessment of holding
Units	nature of units recorded for holding: see Coding below
Value66	valuation of the holding in 1066, averaged where shared
Value66/QR/86	as for Value66 but QR and 1086 valuations are supplied where no 1066 valuations are recorded, the purpose being to facilitate estimates of the estates of pre-Conquest lords which would otherwise require complex querying: see Coding below.
V66Code	code for significant characteristics of the valuation: see Coding below
IdxOverlord66	link to Names table
IdxLord66	link to Names table
Waste66	recorded waste in 1066
OverlordCode	Code to record overlords with a jurisdictional, not a personal relationship.

The **TRWowners** table contains thirteen fields and 22634 records, one for each 1086 landholder to whom any statistics are attached:

TrwID	unique record number
StructIdx	numerical equivalent of County/Phillimore for linkage & sorting
SubIdx	numbering within Phillimore entry
County	standard 3-letter abbreviation for the Domesday county
Phillimore	Phillimore entry reference
TenInChief	tenant-in-chief of the estate, holding directly of the Crown
Lord86	the immediate lord of the peasantry, either the tenant-in-chief himself or a tenant to whom he had granted the estate
Demesne86	whether held by the tenant-in-chief, subinfeudated, escheated, or farmed royal manor (Y/N/E/F)
Holding	hides, carucates, or other data indicating size or assessment of holding
Units	nature of units recorded for holding: see Coding below
Value86	valuation of the holding in 1086, averaged where shared

V86Code code for significant characteristics of the valuation: see Coding below
Waste86 recorded waste in 1086: see Coding below.

The **YSstatistics** table contains twelve fields and 2176 records and is described in *Yorkshire Summary database 1b.rtf*.

The **Claims** table contains sixteen fields and 289 records and is described in *Claims database 1b.rtf*.

The **BruceFief** table contains thirteen fields and 99 records, one for each separate entry, as defined by the Phillimore numbering system. The Bruce fief was a late addition to the Domesday manuscript, inserted in the 1120s:

BruceID	unique record number
StructIdx	numerical equivalent of County/Phillimore for linkage & sorting
SubIdx	numbering within Phillimore entry
County	standard 3-letter abbreviation for the Domesday county
Phillimore	Phillimore entry reference
TenantInChief	tenant-in-chief of the manor holding directly of the Crown
Area	Yorkshire Riding
Hundred	Domesday Hundred/Wapentake in which manor is described or to which it belongs
Vill	Domesday manor/vill name
Geld	units liable for taxation and other public services in 1066 and 1086
gCode	code for variations in formulae in recording tax units
Notes	notes on problems with the data
PlacesIdx	link to the <i>Places</i> index.

The **Livestock** table contains twenty-three fields and 3230 records, one for each Phillimore entry for which livestock is recorded, that is the counties of circuits 2 (in the Exeter Domesday) and 7 (Little Domesday):

StructIdx	numerical equivalent of County/Phillimore for linkage & sorting
County	standard 3-letter abbreviation for the Domesday county
Phillimore	Phillimore entry reference
cobs 1086	number of cobs in 1086
cobs 1066	number of cobs in 1066
cattle 1086	number of cattle in 1086
cattle 1066	number of cattle in 1066
cows 1086	number of cows in 1086
cows 1066	number of cows in 1066
pigs 1086	number of pigs in 1086
pigs 1066	number of pigs in 1066
sheep 1086	number of sheep in 1086

sheep 1066	number of sheep in 1066
goats 1086	number of goats in 1086
goats 1066	number of goats in 1066
beehives 1086	number of beehives in 1086
beehives 1066	number of beehives in 1066
wild mares 1086	number of wild mares in 1086
wild mares 1066	number of wild mares in 1066
other 1086	number of other livestock in 1086
other code 1086	code for other livestock in 1086
other 1066	number of other livestock in 1066
other code 1066	code for other livestock in 1066

Coding employed in tables

gCode: codes used in recording tax units

adjusted	hidage adjusted for detached areas
ambiguous	carucates of ambiguous character
carucates	carucates in hidated county
converted carucates	hides converted into carucates
exemption	total or partial exemption from tax
geld	standard assessment unit for county
missing hides	blank in manuscript
never assessed	never hidated for taxation
never paid tax	units on which tax not paid
no units	no tax, ploughland or ploughteam data
recorded elsewhere	recorded in another record
satellite statistic	additional statistics from satellite
tax hides	units on which tax paid
unchanged	1086 geld not given; assumed unchanged

pCode: standardised formulae used in recording ploughlands

can plough	number of ploughteams needed to plough land
land for	standard ploughland formulae
land for [x]	two formulae used; standard formulae recorded
missing ploughlands	ploughlands blank in manuscript
no ploughlands	no ploughlands; possibly recorded elsewhere
ploughs possible	number of ploughteams there 'could be'
recorded elsewhere	ploughlands recorded in another record
tre	number of ploughteams before 1066
were there	number of ploughteams previously

Waste: standardised formulae used in recording waste; formulae are often combined

always waste	recorded waste for all dates
in Forest	taken into the Forest; waste assumed (1086)
none	no recorded waste
now waste	recorded waste (1086 specified)
now waste except	recorded waste (1086 specified) with exceptions
qr waste	recorded waste circa 1070
tre waste	recorded waste (1066 specified)
was waste	recorded waste (unspecified date before 1086)
was waste except	recorded waste (before 1086) with exceptions
waste	recorded waste (1086 presumed)
waste except	recorded waste (1086 presumed) with exceptions
waste implied	implied waste normally by absence of resources (1086 presumed)

Waste66/QR/86: code for waste at different dates

I	waste implied, normally by absence of resources
N	no waste
P	partial waste
X	ambiguous: possibly waste
Y	waste

Values: standardised formulae used in recording valuations; formulae are often combined

always	value stated to be forever unchanged, assumed to refer to 3 dates
assessed elsewhere	value recorded in another record or manor
customary	customary payment (assumed all dates)
night's revenue	customary payment on some royal manors
no data	valuation omitted or not required
nothing	estate has no value
now	value for 1086
[now]	value for unspecified date (presumed 1086)
qr	value for intermediate date
tre	value for 1066
tribute	payment in kind
was	value for unspecified date before 1086

V66Code: where no valuation for 1066 is supplied, later valuations are recorded in the Value66/QR/86 field

QR value	in counties where the earliest value is the intermediate one (e.g., circuit 2), that value is recorded in Value66/QR/86 and coded thus.
1086 value	where only the 1086 valuation is supplied, that value is recorded in Value66/QR/86 and coded thus.

Units: units in which holding is recorded or described.

adjusted	hidage adjusted for detached areas
ambiguous	units of ambiguous character
carucates	carucates in hidated county
equal	aggregated data, divided equally between owners or places
geld	standard assessment unit for county

no units	no tax, ploughland or ploughteam data
ploughlands	ploughlands recorded in the absence of tax units
ploughs	ploughteams recorded in the absence of tax units or ploughlands
proportional	aggregated data, divided in proportion to another statistic
recorded elsewhere	recorded in another record
villages	some Welsh villages are the unit of ownership

V66/86

20d to the ora	20d paid for every 16d due: 20% depreciation
assessed elsewhere	recorded in another record
at face value	value given in coins at face value; by number
equal	aggregated data, divided equally between owners
farm of one night	render on royal manors, often valued £105
not separately valued	probably included in another valuation in entry
proportional	aggregated data, divided in proportion to another statistic
unvalued	no recorded valuation
weighed	value given as bullion

Duplicates

E	entry duplicated elsewhere
X	duplicate versions of E entries
G	geld, or part of geld, duplicated elsewhere (recorded in notes)
P	other statistics duplicated elsewhere (recorded in notes)

DomesdayTextbase

(version 1b)

The *DomesdayTextbase* is based upon the translation of Domesday Book published by Phillimore and Co. in 39 volumes between 1975 and 1986, as amended for the electronic edition published by Phillimore in 2000 as *Domesday Explorer*, created by myself, Matthew Palmer and George Slater. For the present project, the translation has been revised by Dr Frank and Mrs Caroline Thorn in accordance with a more rigorous application of the principles laid down by the original editor, John Morris (see further *Annotation.rtf*).

As its name implies, the *DomesdayTextbase* is not simply an electronic transcription of the translated text of Domesday Book. Considerable value has been added, principally in the form of half-a-million codes to enhance retrieval and analysis. Until a new edition of *Domesday Explorer* is published, however, there is no software capable of exploiting this functionality so much of the coding has been stripped from the version deposited here. I have, however, left in place the coding which may be useful in normal text searches, indicated by the use of brackets. Simple square brackets are inserts made by the editors of the original printed volumes; the additions here are:

—	missing personal or place-name
[***]	space in manuscript left by scribe
? ?	marginalia

[=	=]	Landholders inserted into each entry based upon the fief heading
[*	*]	Individuals accorded a known byname; the basis of my identifications is explained in the file <i>IDs.rtf</i> .
<	>	Individual accorded an estate name in the absence of a known byname; the basis of my identifications is explained in the file <i>IDs.rtf</i> .
^[]^	Information inferred from another part of the text.
[!1!	!1!]	Not in Domesday Book, from satellite text (Exon.)
[!2!	!2!]	Not in Domesday Book, from satellite text (Domesday Monachorum)
[!3!	!3!]	Not in Domesday Book, from satellite text (St Augustines)
[!4!	!4!]	Not in Domesday Book, from satellite text (ICC)
[!5!	!5!]	Not in Domesday Book, from satellite text (Ely Inquisition)
[!6!	!6!]	Not in Domesday Book, from satellite text (Feudal Book of Bury)

Individual entries are identified by their Phillimore reference numbers and the abbreviated county names - slightly modified - used in the published Phillimore indexes for names, paces and subjects (1992).

Folio numbers are recorded between chevrons: <12a>

For copyright reasons, we have not been able to include the text for Yorkshire; a new translation is being prepared.

Word processors can be painfully slow in searching plain text; a text editor such as TextPad (www.textpad.com) is more suitable.

NAME POLICY

1. PLACE-NAMES

A Domesday place-name describes an estate, sometimes a manor, and corresponds to part or all of a vill. Depending on its size and status it may form part or all of a later ancient ecclesiastical parish (which is in origin the territory served by the church of an estate, manor or vill), or encompass more than one. The 1086 estate may well contain a number of settlements that had separate names, rarely given in Domesday. These Domesday estates are above all units of survey and of taxation. Some were neither independent nor self-supporting; earlier and later evidence can sometimes show that some were fragments temporarily alienated from another estate, or the dependencies of one. The probable extent of many Domesday estates is explained in the notes.

A Domesday name can only be regarded as satisfactorily identified if: (a) it can be connected philologically with the proposed modern equivalent; (b) it can be localized to a particular hundred or wapentake and distinguished within that administrative unit from other places of the same basic name; (c) the resources of the Domesday estate can be matched with those of its supposed modern representative; (d) the descent of the Domesday estate can be traced in medieval records.

There are many identifications of Domesday places that do not satisfy these tests. Where necessary, doubts are expressed in the notes.

The place-name given in the translation is the modern representative of the Domesday name as taken from recent Ordnance Survey Maps; it should be noted that the place-name form can vary from edition to edition. In most cases the modern place-name chosen will be the linear descendant of the 1086 name-form, except where (a) one name that describes the same estate, vill or manor has directly and entirely replaced another, for example, Reigate (SUR 1,7) for 'Churchfield', and Christchurch (HAM 1,28. 17,1) for 'Twynham'; (b) a topographical name, especially that of a river has been replaced by a more localized name, for example, Martinstown (DOR 55,1) for 'Winterbourne'; (c) the later name of the estate derives from the Domesday holder's name, or title, for example Dodington (SOM 47,12) for 'Stowey'; Bishopstone (HEF 2,46) for 'Mansell'. Where a Domesday name has subsequently been replaced by that of an adjacent settlement that probably lay within the Domesday estate in 1086 the latter name has not been used in the translation, but is given in the notes. Thus, Domesday *Beddintone* (STS 4,10) survived as 'Bedintone' to the twelfth century, but was displaced by the adjacent Pillaton. The translation reads 'Bedintone'. Other information (for example, concerning manorial names not derived from the Domesday name forms) is given in the notes.

Where the Domesday name is now represented only by a house, farm or particularized settlement (for example, Warnford Barton, Perry Farm, Forton End), the affixes are omitted and the places appear simply as Warnford, Perry and Forton. Similarly, where modern maps provide a range of names (for example, Hartford Manor, Hartford Green, Hartford Farm, Hartford Mill), the simple name Hartford will be chosen. However, where separate estates with the same name in Domesday can be identified with separate later settlements (Upper and Lower, East and West, Bishop's and Earl's etc.), these identifications are included in the translation. In the case of major settlements, those that often form separate parishes, the use of 'or' (Upper or Lower Cheddon) indicates that there is uncertainty about the precise identification; the use of 'and' (Great and Little Standon) implies that both places were part of the particular Domesday estate.

Four-figure Grid References refer to the surviving representative of the name where there is only one, or to what seems to be the original or most important settlement where there are several or a hierarchy. A settlement site is always preferred to a wood or hill name where there is a choice. The church or the so-called 'manor' is not used as a reference point, when there is a settlement nearby to serve as such, since both church and manor are often post-1086 and built on the periphery of the settlement, or sometimes, in the latter case, in deliberate isolation from it. In a hamlet, village or suburb, the point chosen for the reference is usually a central crossroads. Where the settlement has been swallowed by urban growth, early nineteenth-century maps have been used to determine what appears to be the historic centre. In all cases, the point chosen on the map is not necessarily the centre of the eleventh century estate, though any known major changes, caused for example by imparking, or abandonment and subsequent resettlement in another place are included in the notes. It should be borne in mind that Domesday says nothing about the form of the settlement, whether nucleated or dispersed. Moreover, settlement forms can change and centres can shift.

Unidentified Places

Where a place has not been identified, the Domesday form is printed in the translation in italics. Some of these places may have disappeared soon after 1086, by being abandoned or absorbed into other holdings. Some of these names may yet be found as the listing of minor names (for example, field names) in each county continues. In other cases, the name-form may be so distorted by the process that produced Domesday Book, that it has not yet been possible to connect it to a name evidenced later.

Lost Places

Single inverted commas enclose the following categories of name:

1. A place name that is evidenced after 1086 but disappeared later.
2. The modern equivalent of the Domesday name if it is not now a habitation name (it may, for example, be the name of a hill, wood, field, street or road).
3. Places lost to the sea or covered by the water of a reservoir.

In such cases, the name-form chosen is the latest found or (if that is unrepresentative), the most normal. Where the location is known, a Grid Reference is given and a note explains.

HUNDRED AND WAPENTAKE NAMES

Hundreds and wapentakes continued to exist, though for increasingly minor purposes, into the twentieth century. The form chosen for use in the translation and notes is the most recent representative of the 1086 name. This will either be (a) a place (not necessarily a settlement) still named on modern maps, or (b) a place no longer in existence but which is evidenced after 1086 (such names are included in single inverted commas), or (c) a name that is last evidenced in Domesday (the Domesday form or a representative of several forms is given in italics). Where one hundred-name was replaced by another, this latter has not been used, as the extents of the hundreds often changed as well. This departs from the policy of the Phillimore printed edition. Information to connect the 1086 and later administrative units is given in the Introduction to each county.

COUNTY NAMES

The counties referred to are those that existed before the major reorganization of 1974. Probably because of a lack of county headings in certain circuit volumes, a number of Domesday places are included in the wrong county in 1086. Further, a number of Domesday places have been transferred to another county between 1086 and 1974. These matters are addressed in individual notes and in the Introduction to each county.

2. PERSONAL NAMES

Apart from a few names taken from the Romans, from the Bible and from Celtic languages (Welsh, Irish, Cornish, Breton) most personal names in Domesday Book are in origin Germanic, that is, they derive from, or are developments of, a name-stock that was common to the members of a branch of the Indo-European speakers. Germanic includes English, Dutch, German, Frankish and the Scandinavian Languages (Icelandic, Danish, Norse, Swedish).

Some of this Germanic name-stock will have arrived with the Germanic peoples settled by the Romans in Britain in the late third and early fourth centuries, and with the migration of

those peoples (with the separate identities of Angles, Saxons and Jutes) that followed the Roman withdrawal from Britain and the collapse of imperial rule in the west (fourth century). Some names (not infrequently the same ones in origin, but subject to various forms of evolution) came with the Danish invaders who attacked, marauded and settled from the ninth century. This branch of these names is especially found in the later Danelaw counties: Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire and Yorkshire. Many of these names were thoroughly implanted and developed specifically Anglo-Scandinavian forms. Further names and duplicates of existing ones arrived with the 'Vikings' (Norwegians) who settled in Yorkshire in the early tenth century and more with the renewed Danish settlement, especially under King Cnut at the beginning of the eleventh century. Finally, Germanic names came with the Normans, Picardians, French and Flemings who arrived in England in and after 1066. The Normans themselves were Scandinavian in origin, but many adopted Old German names or Old German versions of their own that had been current in France since the Frankish invasions of the fifth century, and many of which had Old French variants. On arrival in England some of these names developed distinct Anglo-Norman variants. It should be noted that Edward the Confessor (1042-1066) welcomed a small number of Normans who settled in England.

The implication of this is that a single name of Germanic origin may have entered England on four different occasions, in a form that was the same, similar or differentiated by separate development in isolation and by the passage of time. Other names, especially ones compounded from more than one element, arose after the peoples had separated, but some, though arising independently, were look-alikes because of the comparatively small number of basic elements.

An ideal text, however idiosyncratic its spellings of individual names, would nonetheless distinguish one from another. This is not the so with the texts of Domesday Book, for a number of factors make it inevitable that some names will be impossible to identify and in the case of others there will be uncertainty or more than one possibility.

Firstly, in 1066 England was mainly populated by Anglo-Saxons, Anglo-Scandinavians and Old Welsh (Cornish, Welsh), speaking Old English, various Scandinavian dialects and varieties of Old Welsh. The new arrivals were Norman, French, Breton, Picardian and Flemish, speaking several different languages. The English scribes had their own insular manuscript hands, but were no doubt conversant with Carolingian minuscule; the continental scribes had probably only been trained in the latter. As a result of this involvement of different peoples and tongues in the course of the Domesday Survey, there will have been mispronunciations, mishearings, misreadings and miscopyings.

Secondly, the scribes involved, working under pressure of time, will have made simple errors of their own: a vowel miswritten here, a termination left off there. Both English and continental scribes were used in the compilation of the *Liber Exoniensis* and it is probable that this was true of every circuit volume. To some extent each will have tried to express alien sounds in terms of the sounds allotted to the letters of his own alphabet. When a Saxon worked on the schedule compiled by a Norman scribe (or *vice versa*) there will have been further confusion. Some, but not all, of the names are as it were 'encoded', hidden under letters that conceal phonetic modifications made by clerks dealing with names that were outside their language.

Thirdly, it is unlikely that the names themselves were ever written in a 'pure' form (as understood by a personal name scholar) in any of the documents that preceded Great Domesday. In particular, if tenants-in-chief supplied the names of their tenants and of their 1066 predecessors, and jurors (French or English) pronounced on them, another layer of confusion, apart from scribal, will have been introduced.

Fourthly, if the stages by which Great Domesday was produced have been correctly understood, each name will have been 'processed' four or five times. The differences between the *Liber Exoniensis* and Great Domesday Book are not simply of misunderstanding, but show the application of different conventions (for example, the handling of initial *W-* and initial *St-*, the addition of Latin terminations), which were partially unscrambled for the final product. The removal of a supposedly Latin termination can take away a vowel that is in fact Scandinavian or English and which makes the difference between two names. The reduction of an element such as *Aethel-* to *Ail-* in a circuit volume, then its subsequent partial restoration in Great Domesday similarly confuses a series of different names and makes the Domesday occurrences of any of them suspect. The same is true of the reduction of both *-ketel* and *-kell* to *-chil*.

Fifthly, for the eleventh century, it is Domesday Book that provides more name-forms than any other document. The lack of a larger quantity of comparative material makes it difficult to determine if some Domesday forms are aberrant, Normanized or are, as it were, a new spelling, representing more accurately the pronunciation of the time. The nature of much of the comparative material (Anglo-Saxon charters, perhaps traditional and backward-looking in terms of name-forms, and chronicles, often compiled later and with spellings perhaps updated) makes a true assessment difficult.

The result of all this is that it is sometimes difficult to perceive through the Domesday form a name that is adequately attested elsewhere. Sometimes the Domesday spelling may suggest the existence of a name not otherwise found, but in such cases caution is needed, as error may have produced the new form (as *Pirot* perhaps for *Picot*). On the other hand with such a comparatively large number of names, Domesday could reasonably be expected to contain names otherwise unknown, especially if they are compounded from known elements in traditional ways of name-forming.

However, there is no question that a number of name-forms in Domesday are erroneous or misleading. It can be shown that the same man is represented by forms that are in fact those of different names. Conversely, the same name-form can represent different names, especially if the nationality and the date of arrival in England of the individuals can be established; thus a single Domesday form, such as *Adelelm*, *Alstan*, *Algar*, can conceal several distinct English or Germanic names.

Where a Domesday name-form can be confidently identified with a particular English, Danish, Norwegian, French or Breton (etc.) name, there is the added problem of which form to choose for that name. The priority for students of personal names is to find enough examples of the name to be able to determine its etymology, elements and earliest form. However, these early spellings and the pronunciations that they imply may well have fallen out of use by the mid-eleventh century. It is not certain that Old English *-gifu* or *Beorht-* were still in use or pronounced as spelt then since their common representations are *-eva* and *Brikt-*. Scandinavian personal names in particular are often given in the standard works of name scholarship in their more primitive Old Norse or Old Icelandic forms, together occasionally with the use of letters not found in the English alphabet. Such forms were never in use in England (though the names were) and they seem out-of-place when inserted into a Domesday translation.

The first serious attempt to handle all the Domesday names in a uniform translation was made by John Morris for the Phillimore edition (1975-86). He used the scholarly tools then available to identify the Domesday form with an English, Scandinavian, Norman, French, Breton or Flemish counterpart, but as a moderniser he simplified some name-elements and brought them more into

line with the regular spellings in Domesday which in his opinion more exactly recorded the eleventh-century pronunciation.

John Morris died suddenly and before his time in 1977 with only a dozen counties published and leaving untouched many Domesday names which he had not been able to standardize, especially in Lincolnshire, Yorkshire and the three counties of Little Domesday. Had he been able to work on every name some of his earlier conclusions would no doubt have been modified. The completion of the project was overseen by John Dodgson who was himself a names expert. He contributed a series of valuable notes to individual counties but it was impossible for him to identify or approve each name. Inevitably, individual county editors had preferences of their own and those who had a background in name-studies tended to choose philologically purer forms. The scale of the discrepancies became clear when that cumulative index of personal names was being prepared (*Phillimore Domesday Book: Index, part 2: Persons*, 1992). John Dodgson tried valiantly to assist the reader in finding the way through the myriad names and forms by indicating real or possible equivalents and connecting them with the forms normally preferred by personal-name scholars by a series of entries (for example Carl: see also Karl, Karli; Fredregis: see also Fredegis, Fredis). As John Dodgson explained in his Introduction to that cumulative index: 'Because of the vicissitudes which befell the preparation of the Phillimore Domesday Book, not least of them the untimely death of Dr. John Morris its General Editor, there was no opportunity to complete the standardisation of personal-names and descriptions which he appears to have intended in the modern English translation and the annotations. The county volume editors and the Index volume editors have had to do the best they could in difficult circumstances for lack of a fully articulated scheme.'

In view of this and of the fact that some of John Morris' chosen forms were improbable, unwise or idiosyncratic, it has been felt necessary to review all the forms of Domesday personal names found in the Phillimore printed edition. Nonetheless, John Morris was essentially right in refusing to use name-forms which, though they might represent the original or etymologically pure form of the name, were obsolete by the time of Domesday Book. He and others since (see, for example Lewis, 'Joining the Dots') have stressed that names evolve, and divide. Behind the confusions and partially understood codes of the Domesday scribes are real people with the names they actually used. A modern Harry is not a *Harald* or even a Harold, even though the names have the same origin, a Piers is not a Peter or a *Petrus* nor should a present-day Edmund be forced to re-spell himself *Eadmund*.

It is important to realize that, although the identification and classification of names relies heavily on the work of philologists, there are cases where the philological deduction about the nature of the name is at variance with historical record, or with the identification of an individual on the basis of the proximity of his holdings or the geographical spread of his lands. These problems are addressed in the notes.

The aims of the revision are:

1. As far as the Domesday forms allow, to distinguish one name from another.
2. To eliminate variant forms of the same name; that is, for each separate name, to choose a single standard form that is in scholarly use, except that certain elements have been modernized in accordance with John Morris' guiding principles (not followed slavishly or uncritically) and the usage of Domesday Book itself.
3. To provide notes on all name-forms.

In detail this means that:

1. Where a Domesday form cannot be identified with a name attested elsewhere or where it could represent two or more distinct names, it has been left in the Domesday form, less any Latin termination, in italics.
2. With a few exceptions given below (3-6) and unless an error can be shown, the head-words provided by von Feilitzen, *Personal Names of Domesday Book*, have been used for 1066 holders. Old Danish forms have been preferred to those of other Scandinavian languages. They were adopted by John Morris on the grounds that in 1086 they were the most likely Scandinavian names to be found in England and were closer to English methods of spelling. This means that Anglo-Scandinavian names in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire, where the Old Norse or Old Icelandic forms were used in the printed edition of those counties, as occasionally in others, have been changed: thus Atsurr is replaced by Azur; Saksulfr by Saxulf. The different editorial choices exercised in the translation and commentary of these two counties have hitherto made them appear to contain a unique population group.
3. There is no reference work comparable to von Feilitzen, *Personal Names of Domesday Book*, for 1086 names, so the name-forms that are those of English, 'French' and Anglo-Scandinavian holders have been regularized as far as possible using the principles of von Feilitzen, *Personal Names of Domesday Book*, and after consulting Tengvik, *Old English Bynames*; Forstemann, *Personennamen*; Forssner, *Continental-Germanic Personal Names*; and Dauzat, *Dictionnaire des Noms de Famille et Prénoms*.
4. A number of other works of reference have been consulted, including Fellows-Jensen, *Scandinavian Personal Names*. All the forms adopted have been compared with those provided by Ann Williams for the Alecto edition and discrepancies noted.
5. Certain elements that are in use by personal name scholars, but whose spelling was probably obsolete in the mid-eleventh century, have been simplified and brought more into line with Domesday spelling. These are either those adopted by John Morris himself, or, as far as can be, in accordance with his principles:

<p>First elements; Aethel- only for MS forms <i>Ade(l)</i>, <i>Agi(l)</i>, <i>Ede(l)</i>, <i>Ege(l)</i> for OE <i>Æthel-</i> Aelf- for women, Alf- for men, for OE <i>Ælf-</i> Ald- (MS and translation form) for OE <i>Eald-</i> Al(f)- (MS <i>Alu-</i>) for OE <i>Ælf-</i> Bald- (MS and translation form) for OG <i>Bald-</i> Bern- (MS and translation form) for OE <i>Beorn-</i> and OG <i>Bern-</i> Brict- (MS <i>Brict-</i>, <i>Brist-</i>, <i>Brics-</i>, <i>Briht-</i> etc.) for OE <i>Beorht-</i> Ceol- (MS <i>Cel-</i>) for OE <i>Ceol-</i> Ed- (MS and translation form) for OE <i>Ead-</i> Ern- (MS and translation form) for OE <i>Earn-</i> Lam- (MS <i>Lan-</i>) Leof- (MS <i>Lef-</i>, <i>Leu(e)-</i>, <i>Lep-</i>etc.) for OE <i>Leof-</i></p>

Ord- (MS and translation form) for OE *Ord*-
Os- (MS and translation form) for OE *Os*-
Sae- (MS *Sa*-) for OE *Sæ*-
Si- (MS and translation form) for OE *Sige*-
Theo- (MS *Ted*-, *Tet*-) for OG *Theo*-
Thor- (MS *Tur*-, *Tor*-) for ON /ODan *Thor*-
Ulf- (MS and translation form) for ON/ODan *Ulf*-
Wulf- (MS *Ulf*-, *Ul*-, *Wl(f)*) for OE *Wulf*-

Also (apparently):

Had- (MS and translation form) for OE *Heathu*-
Hard- (MS and translation form) for OE *Heard*-

Final elements: -bald (MS *-bald*, *-bold*) for OG *-bald* and OE *-beald*

-bert (MS *-bert*, *-ber*, *-bric*, *-brict*) for OG *-bert* and OE *-beorht*

-bern (MS *-ber*, *bern*) for OG *-bern*
-eva (MS *-geva*, *-giva*, *-eva*, *-iva* etc.) for OE *-gifu*
-got (MS *-got*, *-cot*, *-god*) for OG and ODan *-got*, *-gut*
-gar (MS *-gar*, *-ger*, *-car*) for OE *-gar*
-geat (MS *-get*, *-giet*, *-iet*, *-ied*, *-et*, *-ed* etc.) for OE *-geat*
-ger (MS *-ger*, *-gar*) for OG *-ger*
-gyth (MS *-ith*, *-it*, *-iet*, *-id*, *-gid*, *-ged*, *-ed*, *-ad* etc.) for OE

-gyth

-hard (MS *-ard*) for OG *-(h)ard*
-heah (MS *-ac*-, *-ag*, *-ec*, *-eg*) for OE *-heah*
-here (MS *-er*, *-ere*) for OE *-here*
-lac (MS and translation form) for OE *-lac*
-mer (MS *-mer*, *-mar*) for OE *-mær*
-mund (MS and translation form) for OG *-mund*
-noth (MS *-nod*, *-not*, *-noth*) for OE *-noth*
-old (MS *-ald*, *-olt*) for OG *-ald*, *-old*
-red (MS *red*, *-ret*, *-rad*, *-erd*, *-ert*) for OE *-ræd*
-ric (MS *-ric*, *-rich*) for OG *-ric* and ON *-rikr*
-si (MS *-si*, *-sy*, *-sic*, *-sid*) for OE *-sige*
-sten (MS *-sten*, *-stan*, *-stin*, *-steinn* etc.) for ON *-steinn*
-w- or -fw- (MS *-uu-*)
-ward (MS *-uuard*, *-uard*, *-uuart*, *-uart*, *-uord*) for OE -

weard and OG

-ward

OG *-win*

-win (MS *-uuin*, *-uuine*, *-uin*, *-uine*, *-uui*) for OE *-wine* and

-weald

-wold (MS *-uuald*, *-uuold*, *-uuolt*, *-uuol*, *-uold* etc.) for OE

OG *-wig*

-wulf (MS *-ul*, *-ulf*, *-olf*) for OE *-wulf* and OG *-wulf*
-wy (MS *-uui*, *-uuic*, *-ui*, *-uit*, *-uid*, *-uui*) for OE *-wig* and

-wynn (MS *-en*, *-ene*) for OE *-wynn*

Also (apparently) -frith (MS <i>-frid</i> , <i>-fert</i> , <i>-ferd</i> , <i>-uert</i> , <i>-uerd</i> , <i>-fort</i> , <i>-ford</i>) for OE <i>-frith</i> , to be distinguished from OG <i>-frid</i>

6. In the particular case where the manuscript form can represent either Old English *Ælf*-, *Æthel*-, *Ealh*-, *Eald*-, the base-form (*Al*-) has been used, as suggested by John Dodgson, and as appears in von Feilitzen, *Personal Names of Domesday Book* (see p. 142), though John Morris' final elements to have been retained. Thus: Aleva, Alfled, Alfrith, Algar, Algard, Algeat, Almer, Almund, Alnoth, Alred, Alric, Alsi, Alstan, Alswith, Althryth, Alward, Alware, Alwin, Alwold, Alwy, Alwynn). Where the individual can be identified, this is placed in square brackets: Alric [Aelfric] son of Goding .

7. Where a document such as the *Liber Exoniensis*, the *Inquisitio Eliensis*, the *Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensis*, or *Domesday Monachorum*, which are closely related to Domesday, provides a different name-form for the same individual, it is the standardization of the form given in Domesday itself that is included in the translation. The discrepant form, even if it is fuller or more likely, is given in brackets or in the notes. Thus *Aluuoldus* in DEV 16,174 appears as *Adeluuoldus* in the corresponding entry in the *Liber Exoniensis*. He appears as Alwold [Aethelwold] in the translation, with an appropriate note. The same applies when any individual can be identified from another source which shows that the Domesday form is mangled or erroneous. Where the person is well-known, the commonly used form of his name is placed in square brackets after it: for example, Bishop Almer [Aethelmer] of Thetford.

8. The traditional spelling of important people, mostly kings and queens, earls and countesses, abbots and bishops (for example, Alfred, Edgar, Edith, Edmund, Edward, Edwin, Godiva, Harold, Morcar, Oswald, Siward, Stigand, Swein, Tosti, Waltheof etc.) has been retained.

9. In the case of Norman and Breton names which are predominantly those of 1086 holders, the modern English forms which descend from them, where they exist, are preferred: thus Aubrey, Brian, Gilbert, Geoffrey, Godfrey, Harding, Henry, Ralph, Richard, Robert, Roger, William.

10. Careful attention has been given to the context in which individual names occur in the text and this has been used where possible to decide between alternative forms of the names. Thus if a name of a *T.R.E.* holder, which has both an Old English and a Scandinavian form, occurs in a list of several holders who bear Scandinavian names, the Scandinavian option is preferred. Similarly with a 1086 tenant holding from or coupled with a Norman, the Old German or Old French form of the name is preferred to the Old English. The reasoning behind these choices is explored in the Notes.

Thus the overall principle is consistency: to leave in the Domesday spelling in italics forms that are obscure, and to regularize all others, noting, where possible, evidence that suggests that the Domesday form is in error, or that two apparently different names refer to one individual.

Identifying Individuals

The principal ways in which individuals might be identified are:

1. If they have a byname either in Domesday or in another document that can be securely connected with the presumed individual's occurrence in Domesday.
2. By the fact that the lands held in 1066 by a person or persons having the same name reappear in more than one county in the fief of a particular tenant-in-chief or generally pass to the same 1086 subtenant. The rarer the name of the 1066 holder, the more likely that one individual is involved. Similarly, if a particular name appears as a subtenant more than once in the fief of a single tenant-in-chief.
3. By the geographical distribution of estates, that is if a particular name (the rarer the better) appears more than once in a particular locality or, if the person can be shown to be important, in several clusters.
4. If pairs or groups of the same names appear in more than one place, suggesting that the holders are kin-related.
5. If the assessed size of an estate is small or it is not valued at much it is less likely to have been held by an important thane or Norman.

None of these methods is entirely convincing. It is uncertain what significance should be given to the distance between estates held by men of the same name. There is no reason to think that it was important to own or be a tenant of estates that were within a day's travel: the owner or tenant might in fact live on none of his estates, but merely enjoy their revenues, and in such a case the geographical spread (which might be the result of marriage or inheritance over more than one generation) is of no importance. Spots on the map can produce spectres in the mist or imaginary ley lines unless there is some factual underpinning. The evidence of the wills of quite modest people or of their deeds of gift to churches might show that dispersed estates in the hands of one individual were not rare. The problem is that with a hundred undifferentiated men called Leofwin, any number of individuals (from one to a hundred) can be produced on the basis of unexamined and unproved or unprovable assumptions. Further, the smallness of an estate is no guarantee that the individual was of no importance, since even great thanes held estates of widely differing sizes, as did their mighty Norman successors. The bynames become problematic when they are not used, as in cases where a Harold might be Earl Harold or a Tosti the earl of that name, or where they are quite common, such as *cild*. The others are subject to decreasing probability, especially since even in the case of the predecessors of 1086 tenants-in-chief and particularly of the latter's subtenants, more than one individual of the same name may be involved.

Even with very rare names there would sometimes seem to have been more than one person: there are only four mentions of the name Buggi in Domesday, three in Nottinghamshire, where two holdings of apparently separate individuals called Buggi appear in one entry (NTT 14,2). Moreover, the policy of the main scribe of Great Domesday led him to omit the names of a great many people, calling them merely 'thanes' or 'men of [the 1086 tenant-in-chief]', as shown by a comparison between the returns in the *Liber Exoniensis* and the counties in circuit II of Great Domesday. Therefore the 'rarity' of a name in fact cannot be proven; indeed, rarity is a difficult concept, bearing in mind that the individuals named in Domesday represent only a tiny percentage of those living in England in either 1066 or 1086. Finally, the Domesday forms of names, where *Algarus* can represent Old English *Ælfgar*, *Æthelgar* or *Ealdgar* or even Old Norse *Alfgeirr*, makes it even harder to link individuals, let alone identify them.

Nonetheless, these groups - the predecessors and the 1086 subtenants - call out to be systematically studied, and the aim of the present revision is to facilitate this. Possible individualizations, where there are bynames available, are given in the translation between asterisks within square brackets. In other cases it has been thought helpful to identify an

individual by naming him from one of his estates or, where his holding is not given a location, from the hundred or wapentake in which it lay. These toponyms, placed within chevrons, are markers or identifiers, but they are not used of the person concerned in Domesday or in any other source.

BYNAMES

Patronymics

'Son of' is used in place of 'fitz'.

Toponyms

Both English and French forms are preceded by 'of'. Where the name is unidentified, it is left in Latin, in italics. Otherwise, the place-name is given its modern spelling. Identifications that are certainly erroneous but which appeared in the Phillimore printed edition have been corrected. Uncertainties or alternative identifications are referred to in the notes. An exception is, however, made for major figures who have acquired a traditional name among historians and others. These names had already appeared in the printed edition. Thus de Mandeville, of Mortimer and d'Oilly have not been replaced by 'of Manneville', 'of Mortemer', or 'of Oully'. It should, however, be emphasized that it is not always certain that the English families with these names were derived from the holders listed in Domesday Book; these Domesday holders are generally first generation Normans, Bretons, Flemings or Picardians, who still retained lands and often power at the places that give them their bynames. Inherited surnames really begin with the next or succeeding generations. These French places of origin have mostly been drawn from Tengvik, *Old English Bynames*, Loyd, *Some Anglo-Norman Families*, and Keats-Rohan, *Domesday People*. Information concerning the location of French places (département, arrondissement, canton, commune) has been taken from the *Dictionnaire National des Communes de France*, Paris (2001).

Occupational Names

The definite article, 'the', is used at all times and the occupation not capitalized; thus: Ansgar the cook, Waleran the hunter, William the usher. In many cases the detail of Domesday Book or the later history of the family or of the estate show that the holder really was a butler or steward. The alternative (that the name has, by 1086, become a surname) is scarcely ever demonstrable.

Bynames derived from attributes of physique or character

These are usually translated, but some of the more flamboyant translations of the Phillimore printed edition have been revised, and where there is doubt the form found in the MS has been retained; thus Osmund *Benz* (DBY 17,13) is preferred to Osmund Bent.

3. RELIGIOUS HOUSES

Domesday Book often uses *ecclesia* ('church') for *abbatia* ('abbey'), and sometimes uses both terms for the same place. The translation reproduces what Domesday Book says, but a note explains the type and status of the church, whether abbey, church, cathedral, secular college,

minster or other. A further note gives a brief history of the religious house in question and brief information on its abbots, abbesses, bishops and archbishops for the period from 1066 to 1086.

Names database

(version 1b)

The *Names* database originated in the indexes to the individual county volumes of the edition of Domesday Book published by Phillimore and Co. in 39 volumes between 1975 and 1986. These county indexes were subsequently revised and amalgamated into a national index by J. McN. Dodgson and myself and published by Phillimore in 1992 as *Domesday Book Index Part Two: Persons*. The introduction to that volume explains the principles upon which it was compiled. Further revisions were incorporated into the first published electronic Domesday, *Domesday Explorer*, created by myself, Matthew Palmer and George Slater and published by Phillimore in 2000. For the present project, the personal name stock has been substantially revised by Mrs Caroline Thorn (see further *Name Policy 1a.rtf*).

Many individuals named only by their Christian names have been identified in this database, with varying degrees of confidence. The basis of these identifications are explained in the *IDs.rtf file*. They are signalled in the database by the use of brackets: round brackets for a byname attested by contemporary sources, chevrons for a name derived from an estate held by the individual for whom no byname is recorded, and curly brackets for bynames recorded in the Domesday satellite texts. The process of identifying individuals is on-going though this revised edition adds substantially to the previous data-set.

The *Names* database consists of a single table, linked to the *DomesdayStatistics* database and to the *DomesdayTextbase*.

The **Names** table contains eight fields and 13956 records:

NamesIdx unique record number, for linkage and sorting.
Name personal name
County standard 3-letter abbreviation for the Domesday county
Phillimore Phillimore entry reference
NameCode code (L) for unidentified personal name-element, recorded in its Latin form
GenderCode male or female (M/F)
ChurchCode code for institutional type (see below)
Xrefs cross reference to related names or name-forms

ChurchCode coding

a English abbeys
b English archbishops and bishops
c English canons
d Other English clergy and institutions
e Foreign bishops
f Foreign monasteries

g Foreign nunneries
 h minster & other landowning churches
 n English nunneries

Places database

The *Places* database originated in the indexes to the individual county volumes of the edition of Domesday Book published by Phillimore and Co. in 39 volumes between 1975 and 1986. These county indexes were subsequently revised and amalgamated into a national index by J. McN. Dodgson and myself and published by Phillimore in 1992 as *Domesday Book Index Part One: Places*. The introduction to that volume explains the principles upon which it was compiled. Further revisions were incorporated into the first published electronic Domesday, *Domesday Explorer*, created by myself, Matthew Palmer and George Slater and published by Phillimore in 2000. For the present project, the place-names and their Ordnance Survey coordinates have been substantially revised by Dr Frank Thorn (see further *Name Policy 1a.rtf*).

The *Places* database consists of two tables, the second being required to accommodate the place-names and coordinates of those Domesday villis which represent more than one modern settlement. This structure results in considerable data redundancy (duplication) but is less likely to produce incorrect results from queries by inexperienced database users. Both tables are linked to the *DomesdayStatistics* database and to the *DomesdayTextbase*.

The **Places** table contains nine fields and 14767 records:

PlacesIdx	unique record number, for linkage and sorting.
County	standard 3-letter abbreviation for the Domesday county
Phillimore	Phillimore entry reference
Hundred	Domesday Hundred/Wapentake in which manor is described or to which it belongs
Vill	Domesday manor/vill name
Area	Lathes, Rapes, Ridings & other areas intermediate between county and Hundred/Wapentake
Xrefs	cross-references to alternative or complementary name-forms
OSrefs	4-figure OS coordinates of Domesday vill
OScodes	uncertain OS refs: approximate; speculative; lost

The **PlaceForm** table contains seven fields and 20458 records:

PlacesIdx	link to Places table
PlaceFormSub	in combination with PlacesIdx a unique identifier for each record
County	standard 3-letter abbreviation for the Domesday county
Hundred	Domesday Hundred in which manor is described or to which it belongs
Vill	Domesday manor/vill name
OSref	4-figure OS coordinates of Domesday vill
OScodes	uncertain OS refs: approximate; speculative; lost

OScodes coding

approximate	precise location not know; OS coordinates give approximate location
area	an area name; no OS coordinates supplied
speculative	uncertain location; OS coordinates speculative
unknown	location not known within sufficiently narrow compass to provide OS coordinates.

The Yorkshire Summary database

The *Yorkshire Summary* database was compiled by myself for this project.

The *Yorkshire Summary* database contains records of the section of Domesday Book devoted to the Yorkshire Summary, a quasi-index to Yorkshire (but not of other areas included in the Yorkshire folios), listing tenants-in-chief and their geld assessments on a geographical basis. As such, the bulk of its data is duplicated in the main text and needs to be queried separately; there are significant discrepancies between the two sources.

A few lacunae have been filled from entries in the main text, and some breakdowns recorded there have been added; such cases are commented in the Notes field.

The *Yorkshire Summary* database contains two tables and is linked to the *DomesdayStatistics* database, indexes and the *DomesdayTextbase*. The Statistics table is also included in the *DomesdayStatistics* database (as YSstatistics) but is supplied here separately with the Entries table for the convenience of users.

The **Entries** table contains four fields and 2176 records:

StructIdx	Numerical equivalent of County/Phillimore for linkage & sorting
County	Standard 3-letter abbreviation for the Domesday county
Phillimore	Phillimore entry reference
TextType	Type of entry: Boroughs (U), Customs (C), Rural (E), or Welsh (W).

The **Statistics** table contains twelve fields and 2176 records:

StatisticsID	Unique reference identifying each record
StructIdx	Numerical equivalent of County/Phillimore for linkage & sorting
County	Standard 3-letter abbreviation for the Domesday county
Phillimore	Phillimore entry reference
Tenant-in-chief	Tenant-in-chief holding directly of the Crown
Riding	Yorkshire Riding
Wapentake	Wapentake or Hundred
Vill	Vill
Carucates	Number of units liable for taxation
gCode	code for variations in formulae in recording tax units
Notes	Notes on problems or matters of interest
Phillimore ref	Cross-reference to the entry in the main text

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE NOTES

Initials of Contributors

This revision of the Phillimore edition of Domesday Book (1975-1986) incorporates many notes from the original series. These were by various editors listed below. They have generously allowed their annotations to be re-used. For copyright reasons the translation and notes of the Phillimore edition of Yorkshire (1986) were not available and will be replaced at a later date.

This revision has been part of a larger Domesday Book project undertaken by a team of four based on the University of Hull and they are grateful for funding from the Arts and Humanities Research Council. The revision of the notes has been the particular responsibility of Caroline Thorn and Frank Thorn and any unsigned notes are by them:

PB: Philippa Brown, who was county editor of Norfolk (1984)

NH: Natasha Hodgson who was a Research Assistant on the AHRC-funded project (2004-2006)

JM: Julian Munby, who was county editor of Hampshire (1982)

JMcND: John Dodgson, who supervised the Phillimore project following the death of John Morris in 1977

JRM: John Morris, series editor and county editor of Middlesex (1975), Huntingdonshire (1975), Surrey (1975), Hertfordshire (1976), Sussex (1976), Warwickshire (1976), Staffordshire (1976), Bedfordshire (1976), Nottinghamshire (1977), Oxfordshire (1978) and Buckinghamshire (1978). He died in 1977.

JSM: John Moore who was county editor of Gloucestershire (1982)

PM: Philip Morgan, who was county editor of Derbyshire (1978), Cheshire (1978), Berkshire (1979), Leicestershire (1979), Kent (1986) and joint county editor of Lincolnshire (1986)

JP: John Palmer, who has been leading the AHRC-funded project (2004-2007)

ARR: Alex Rumble, who was county editor of Cambridgeshire (1981), Essex (1983) and Suffolk (1986)

DR: David Roffe, who contributed some notes to Lincolnshire (1986)

CT: Caroline Thorn, who was joint county editor of Cornwall (1979), Wiltshire (1979), Northamptonshire (1979), Somerset (1980), Worcestershire (1982), Herefordshire (1983), Dorset (1983), Devon (1985), Shropshire (1986) and Lincolnshire (1986). She has been a Research Assistant on the AHRC-funded project (2004-2007).

FT: Frank Thorn, who was county editor of Rutland (1980) and joint county editor of Cornwall (1979), Wiltshire (1979), Northamptonshire (1979), Somerset (1980), Worcestershire (1982), Herefordshire (1983), Dorset (1983), Devon (1985) and Shropshire (1986). He has been a Research Assistant on the AHRC-funded project (2004-2007).