Chapter 5
The surviving portion of the C text – Part II

The C booklets are not a masterpiece of calligraphy. Some of the scribes involved write rather badly; none of them seem to be trying to write very carefully. In different circumstances, most of them could probably have done better work than this; but here they had no reason to make any special effort. These booklets, as I understand it, were not expected to be kept for any length of time. Fairly soon, they would be superseded by the D text; once their usefulness had been exhausted, they would all be thrown away.[1] The scribes had no idea that their work would be seen by outsiders, still less by future critics. Their instructions were, I suppose, to write as rapidly as they could, provided only that what they wrote was legible. Judged by that standard, they seem to have performed well enough. They got the job done, and there is scarcely ever any difficulty in reading what they wrote.

Changes of hand are very frequent in C – much more so than they are in the surviving D booklets (below, p. 134), by a factor of about 15. A large number of scribes contributed, and their contributions are woven together in a way which has more than once been called bewildering. Analysis is certainly laborious, but I do not know that bewilderment need last for long. On the whole, these scribes are experienced workers, with well-developed individual manners. Each of them writes in his own way; they do not appear to be making any attempt to imitate one another. The changes of hand are generally obvious, often glaringly so. By scanning repeatedly through the manuscript (or, as I have done, through a microfilm copy), jumping forwards and backwards from stint to stint, one soon begins to notice the characteristics which distinguish a particular hand. With enough perseverance, one reaches the point where almost every stint can be assigned to a recognized scribe.

An article by Finn (1959) was the first attempt to identify the scribes individually. As far as it went, Finn's analysis seems to me largely correct, but there are no illustrations, and it is sometimes hard to understand what he meant because the references to the manuscript are not sufficiently precise. Finn thought he could distinguish a dozen different scribes – but he lost heart, at around the time when he started coming across the work of a tenth scribe,[2] and failed to complete the analysis. It seems clear enough why he stopped. He did not expect anyone to believe that a dozen or more scribes had worked on this manuscript; he was not even sure that he could believe it himself. But in fact it is certainly true. Ker (1977) said little about the script beyond commenting that there are 'many rather poor hands of Norman type' (1977, p. 807).[3] In a footnote, however, he analyzed one sample booklet (above, p. 42), distinguishing eight different scribes in the stretch of text relating to Devon (376r–9v), where Finn would have seen only five. In the whole manuscript, Webber (1989) recognized at least fifteen scribes; I see twenty or more.

My own results are tabulated in an appendix to this chapter (below, pp. 56–9). As a matter of policy, I worked out the analysis for myself, in a provisional way, before looking in detail at the conclusions reached previously by others; then I checked through the evidence again, wherever some difference of opinion seemed to arise.[4] A fair number of corrections and improvements followed from that, but no large alterations. Table 12 shows how my identifications match up (or seem to match up) with those of some other investigators; the last column refers back to the list of published reproductions given in chapter 4. Despite its prolixity, the analysis is far from exhaustive: it ignores many short insertions by other hands, as well as all marginal additions.[5] But there is a limit on how much can usefully be done by any

[1] I choose my words carefully here: it was not the intention that the C booklets should be discarded as soon as the D booklets had been finished (below, p. 55).

[2] The scribe in question is lambda, whose existence Finn doubted simply because he did not seem to have written enough. It was 'not very likely', he thought, that a scribe 'would deal with only some twenty manors' (Finn 1959, p. 367).

[3] Ker's attention was caught by a point which is, for present purposes, of only incidental interest. One of the scribes represented in the geld accounts for Wiltshire (my sigma) is a scribe whom Ker knew from elsewhere: the same man was also employed, with many others, writing books for Salisbury Cathedral (or, as I would think more likely, for bishop Osmund of Salisbury). Webber (1989, 1992) agreed with the identification made by Ker (1976, 1977); she also suggested that two or three other scribes who worked on Exeter 3500 could be recognized as having worked at Salisbury too. But this evidence does not tend to prove that the Exeter manuscript originated in Salisbury (i.e. in Old Sarum): it does not even raise the possibility. None of the three major scribes is Salisbury-connected; if a few of the minor scribes are, that is scarcely surprising. If I had been given the job of recruiting scribes for the survey, bishop Osmund is one of the first people to whom I would have turned for advice.

[4] I am greatly obliged to Dr Teresa Webber, who checked a version of this listing against her notes and discovered a number of errors. She allows me to say that my identifications, by and large, agree very closely with hers. A few points of disagreement are mentioned in the footnotes below.

[5] The text has been more or less heavily corrected throughout. On the whole, the corrections seem to have been made by the same scribe who wrote the original text, or by one of the scribes who is known to have been working with him; but some alterations and marginal notes are certainly by alien hands. This evidence needs to be looked at very closely, but I have not made any serious effort to deal with it.

	Finn (1959)	Williams (1968)	Ker (1977)	Webber (1989)	Reproductions (cf. Table 9)
beta	A	C	1–2	A1	108r, 117r, 438r
alpha	G	A	3	A2	103r, 117r, 438r
mu			6	A3	8r
eta	J	B		D2	114v
omicron					—
ksi	= F	D			1v, 47r
epsilon	T		4		313r
gamma	S		5		313r
delta	F		7		313r
kappa					—
zeta	C			C	245r
theta	H			= D1	—
iota	D				—
lambda	?				—
rho					8r
sigma				E	8r, 9r, 14r
tau				D1	8r, 9r, 14r

Table 12. Published identifications of the scribes represented in Exeter Cathedral Library 3500. (Scribe sigma is the 'Salisbury scribe' identified by Ker (1976).)

one person, and I think that I have reached it. Several people will need to have looked at the evidence before a fair measure of consensus can emerge. That is why I publish my results in full, despite the amount of space which they take up. I would rather risk wasting space than risk wasting the time of anyone else who may wish to check this analysis, and (if it passes the test) to build upon it.

Three scribes stand out from the crowd, because they contributed to several county texts, not just one or two. Of these three major scribes, two are especially conspicuous, alpha and beta. They each have a highly individual hand; they each wrote a large proportion of the text, much larger than any of the minor scribes who from time to time worked alongside them. Though neither of them wrote the sole surviving Wiltshire entry, it would not seem rash to assume that they wrote large parts of the lost C-WiDo booklets, as they certainly did of the surviving (Do-only) booklets. It was Finn's (1959, pp. 367–8) suggestion that alpha – his clerk G – had some supervisory role; I am inclined to agree.[6] The third scribe, mu, wrote very much less than alpha or beta, but I treat him as one of the major scribes because he worked on every county text. In fact, if we allow ourselves to look beyond C for a moment, mu is the only scribe who can be said for certain to have worked on the record for all five counties covered by the Exeter booklets.[7] Though alpha and beta did most of the actual work, I suspect that mu may have been the man in command.[8]

The minor scribes, by and large, worked on only one county text each.[9] A few small exceptions to this rule would not be disconcerting;[10] but some apparent anomalies turn out, when looked at more closely, not to be exceptions after all. (1) One entry occupying a leaf by itself (398r1–7), supposedly part of C-Dn, was written by scribe omicron, whose other stints are confined to C-Do. There is, however, some reason to think that this entry became displaced, in D and therefore in DB, and that it was indeed originally part of omicron's contribution to C-Do (above, p. 44). (2) One entry in C-Dn (98r15–22) was written by two scribes who otherwise do not occur outside Co. Scribe zeta wrote the first two lines; the rest was written by a very poor scribe whose only other appearance is a seven-page stint of C-Co (259rl–62r9). The placement of this entry allows us to think that

[6] The best evidence for the pecking order will come, I expect, from a study of the corrections, about which I cannot speak with any assurance.

[7] Scribe mu made important additions to the second version of the Wiltshire geld account; as was said above (pp. 41–2), he also wrote the statistical summary (527v–8r) covering the lands of Glastonbury abbey in Wi, Do, Dn and So. Some additions he made in the margin of 8r are the only published sample of his work (Table 9): here he is writing small, but in his most formal manner. The fancy & is his signature, when it occurs; sometimes he used the 7-shaped sign instead.

[8] To speak plainly, I suspect that mu was the treasurer – in which case his name was Henric (DB-Ha-49ra). But this suggestion is hardly worth making until it has been agreed that Exeter 3500 originated in Winchester.

[9] Finn (1959) seems to have approached this conclusion but then backed away from it. Trying to keep the number of scribes as small as he possibly could, he convinced himself that he could recognize contributions by clerk S in Co as well as Dn, by clerk J in Co as well as Do and So, and (more tentatively) by clerk F in Do as well as Dn. None of these identifications seem justified to me.

[10] One such anomaly is the final paragraph in Capp-Dn (506v1–5), written by scribe iota, who is otherwise only represented in C-So. Presumably this paragraph was added as an afterthought.

it may have been an addition, and that is almost certainly what it was – an entry inserted here later, in a convenient space, while work was in progress on C-Co.[11] (3) The sole surviving entry for Wi (47r1–11) was written by scribe ksi, who also contributed to C-Do.[12] That is odd; but the mere fact that this entry survives marks it as a special case, and one cannot think of arguing anything from it.[13]

There is, as far as I can judge, only one minor scribe who wrote more than one entry in more than one county text. The scribe whom I call eta wrote a good share of the entries in C-Do; he also wrote a good share of the entries in C-So. Here I am gratified to discover a large measure of agreement between my results and those of both Finn (1959) and Webber (1989): my eta is roughly the same as Finn's clerk J, almost exactly the same as Webber's scribe D2.[14] It is not to be thought that there was any prohibition against a minor scribe participating twice, but this seems to me to be the only discoverable instance of a minor scribe actually doing so. For that reason I have looked at the evidence with special care, and (to put the result in a suitably negative form) have failed to find any significant consistent difference between the scribe who worked on C-Do and the scribe who worked on C-So. I am satisfied that they are the same man.

Table 13 gives a summary of the results listed in the appendix, for the C booklets alone (including Capp).[15] Ignoring C-Wi, we do not have to look very hard to see some pattern here. As might be expected, the pattern is most distinct in the two counties – Devon and Somerset – for which the evidence is fullest; but it is discernible elsewhere too, to some extent. Two major scribes, alpha and beta, are jointly represented in all four county texts. In each they are assisted by a different squad of minor scribes, of whom normally there seem to have been three.

The details are as follows. For C-Do, only a fragment of the text survives, but there is no reason why the fragment, in this respect, should not be representative. The minor scribes occurring here are three: eta, omicron, ksi.[16] For C-Dn, the pattern is very clear, and was recognized well enough by Finn. The minor scribes here are three again: epsilon, gamma, delta. For C-Co, the quantity of text is relatively small, and alpha and beta wrote a larger share of it than usual. There is only one minor scribe who occurs here often enough to be given a name, and that is zeta; but two other scribes write one large stint apiece (259rl–62r9, 263rl–4r20).[17] For C-So, again, the same sort of pattern exists, though the number of minor scribes occurring here is (as Finn suspected) four rather than three: theta, iota, eta, lambda.[18] However, there is only one booklet (fos. 456–67) in which the last two scribes appear together – lambda wrote an early stint (463r5–v15), eta wrote two later ones (464r18–22, 465r2–v7) – so it seems quite possible that lambda left the squad, for one reason or another, and that eta (the same scribe who had worked on C-Do previously) was brought in to take his place. On that view, the number of minor scribes at work simultaneously would not have exceeded three.

I am not proposing to press this point very far. I do not suggest that there was any rigid rule that a squad should consist of exactly three scribes, and always exactly the same three. Some flexibility would obviously be desirable, and was no doubt permitted. But it does seem clear, generally speaking, that the minor scribes were organized into three-man squads – that three, by and large, was thought to be a suitable number, and that scribes who were accustomed to working together were, by and large, allowed to continue doing so. Again, I am not suggesting that there was a different squad of three scribes for every single county text. On the contrary, I take it that each squad would have been employed successively on several texts, in whatever sequence was dictated by the flow of the work. In the surviving booklets, we see four of these squads each writing itself out of a job by completing the county text which formed its final assignment.[19]

How many squads there were, and how many scribes alto-

[11] The entry relates to Werrington. As Finberg (1944) pointed out, it is clear that this manor was initially surveyed as part of Cornwall but then recorded under Devon. In C we can watch that change taking effect: two of the scribes working on C-Co add this entry to C-Dn, rather than including it in their own text.

[12] He also wrote most of the first Wi geld account (1r–3r), to be discussed in chapter 6.

[13] What happened, I would guess, is that this entry had to be recopied for some reason (perhaps because it had been included in an omnibus booklet at first), after work had started on C-Do.

[14] Webber (1989, p. 13) gives a list of the stints she assigns to scribe D2. Not counting two marginal additions (which I do not include, though I agree that they are eta's work), there are only two small discrepancies between her listing and mine (36v19–20, 374v14–15). The same hand was identified by Webber (1992, pp. 12–13) in several manuscripts from Salisbury.

[15] It is plain to see that the same teams of scribes who worked on the county texts in C-DnCoSo worked on the corresponding sections of Capp-DnCoSo too.

[16] Two stints in C-Do which I have left unattributed (37v3–8r7, 51r17–v6) were attributed by Webber (1989, p. 12) to a scribe who worked on the Wiltshire geld accounts, the scribe whom I call tau. I do not feel confident that the hand is the same, though it is certainly very similar. The disagreement extends further than that, because the scribe whom I call theta (represented only in C-So) is, in Webber's judgment, the same as scribe tau, not somebody else. For the moment I leave these questions unresolved, intending to come back to them later when I deal with the geld accounts. ((Some further comments will be found in chapter 6 (below, p. 66).))

[17] These stints are the ones attributed by Finn to clerk S and clerk J respectively (above, note 9). (For the latter attribution see Finn 1959, pp. 382–3.) Webber (1989, p. 12) assigned the second stint to her scribe C, who is otherwise the same as my zeta (Finn's clerk C). The hand looks different to me.

[18] The three scribes who worked on C-So alone are not represented in any published reproduction. Perhaps it may save somebody some time if I note that there is just one page (286v) on which all three hands occur together.

[19] A third reservation: I am not suggesting that these squads worked only at headquarters and only on C. I am more than willing to believe that each squad may have spent some of its time working with the commissioners in the field, putting together the B text. ((The role that they would have played is discussed in chapter 10.))

	Wi	Do	Dn	Co	So	Total
beta		17	93	7	67	184
alpha		12	83	9	70	174
mu		1	6	2	2	11
eta		15			16	31
omicron		9				9
ksi	1	7				8
epsilon			73			73
gamma			71			71
delta			36			36
kappa			3			3
zeta			1	4		5
theta					54	54
iota			1		24	25
lambda					10	10
unattributed		5	5	3	6	19
Total	1	66	372	25	249	713

Table 13. Numbers of stints performed by each scribe in each section of the C text, summed from the listing given in the appendix. (Stint 398r1–7 is counted under Do.)

gether, is hard to decide.[20] Four squads are represented in the surviving portions of C, a fifth perhaps in the batch 4 geld accounts, i.e. the accounts for Wiltshire.[21] There are, besides, several stints in C which I have left unattributed. In some cases, the script resembles that of an identified scribe, and might perhaps be attributed to him if we were willing to stretch the definition slightly.[22] Still, there are several stints of which I think it can be said with confidence that they were not written by any of the major or minor scribes mentioned above. There are, so to speak, some occasional scribes who make sporadic appearances in C; and possibly these are members of other squads, lending a hand here when they have no work of their own to keep them busy. At the very least, four occasional scribes occur. One of them writes three short stints in C-Dn, just enough to deserve a name (this is the scribe whom I call kappa); two others write one stint each in C-Co (see above); and the fourth – with a small and rather elegant hand – writes one sizable stint in C-So (430v2–1v9).[23] In total, therefore, I think I can recognize twenty different hands: three major scribes, thirteen minor scribes (including the three who occur in the batch 4 geld accounts), and four others (including kappa).

There is no order for the C booklets which is absolutely right. On the contrary, one advantage of dividing the text into self-contained units of this kind was to make it possible to sort and shuffle the booklets into different arrangements, depending on the task in hand. The scribes assigned to write D-Dn, for instance, would separate out the booklets that they did not need, and impose some appropriate order on the ones that they did; the scribes assigned to write D-Co would resort the booklets and make their own arrangement of the ones which interested them. Given some definite task, one can start deciding which order would be best. Without knowing what the task is, one cannot.

When Ellis set about rearranging the text,[24] he seems to have assumed that the preexisting sequence made no sense at all. He changed it without recording it. Nobody working from the printed text could tell how much of the arrangement originated with the editor. If the leaves had not been numbered previously, there would be no way to undo what Ellis did; because they had, we can – virtually – put the quires back into the sequence which existed before 1816. If we do that, as Whale (1905) did, we discover that the

[20] If I had been in charge, perhaps I might have thought of employing eight squads and assigning four counties to each. To make up these squads, therefore, I should have had to recruit a total of 24 scribes. Some strategy not very different from that lies behind the division of labour observable in the surviving booklets.

[21] Not counting mu, three scribes worked on the second version of the Wiltshire account (7r–9v), two of whom also wrote the third version (13r–16r). It is clear, by the way, that the third version is a fair copy of the second version. The order in which the batch 4 booklets were arranged by Ellis (1816) is the right order; Darlington (1955) misread the evidence. ((Anyone who doubts this will find the proof at the end of chapter 6.))

[22] In doubtful cases like this, I have preferred to err on the side of caution. For example, one unattributed stint (373r3–v12) is very similar to iota's work, and is indeed cited as a specimen of it by Finn (1959, p. 367). It does not look quite right to me; but perhaps the differences might be explained away. (The light was bad, the scribe was using a borrowed pen – some ad hoc conjecture of that sort might be enough.)

[23] As far as this fourth scribe is concerned, Dr Webber allows me to say that she too thought that this was his only stint.

[24] Some of the work seems to have been done by Barnes (above, p. 39), but he was just doing what Ellis wanted done.

arrangement was far from being senseless: the booklets had been put into a task-specific order. This order was not meant to be permanent – it only became permanent when the manuscript was bound – and Ellis was, arguably, entitled to impose a new arrangement which would be generally more convenient. By choosing to do this, however, and then by failing to explain what he had done, he made a significant aspect of the evidence entirely invisible in the printed edition. Once Barnes had imposed the same arrangement on the original manuscript, the same aspect became invisible there as well.[25]

The task-specific order was, as I have said, rediscovered by Whale (1905). He did not, as far as I can see, have any idea what it meant; but he did realize that there was a pattern in the evidence, obliterated by Ellis's rearrangement, which could be recovered with the help of the old foliation. The pattern is not perfect – but it is perfectly obvious (Table 14. Some time before they were bound, the C booklets had been sorted into four stacks, as follows:

the C-WiDo quires relating to Wi (including those which also related to Do) were put into stack 1;

the C-DnCoSo quires relating to So (including those which also related to Dn or Co or both) were put into stack 2;

the C-WiDo quires not in stack 1 were put into stack 3;

the C-DnCoSo quires not in stack 2 were put into stack 4.

Stack 1 does not survive (in due course I propose to ask why); stacks 2–4 do survive, and in that order, sooner or later, they were bound.

The plan is clear, even though its execution was not altogether perfect.[26] A few mistakes were tolerable, so it seems. If one or two unwanted leaves were included in stack 2, say, that would cause no trouble. If a few quires which ought to have been included were overlooked, that did not matter greatly: their absence would be detected, once the task for which this stack was intended was under way, and any missing quire could be found at that stage, just by flipping through stack 4. Similarly, it does not seem to have been thought important for the quires to be kept in the right order: on reaching the end of one quire, it would be easy enough to find the next, just by flipping through the rest of the stack.

One result of the sorting was that some of the larger booklets became split between two stacks.[27] The booklet for the bishop of Coutances, cited previously (above, p. 38) as an example of the disruption which Lyttelton tried to undo, can be cited again here. It consists of six quires. Quires 3–6 contain portions of the C-So text, so they belong in stack 2, even though quire 3 (fos. 135–40 in the old foliation) starts with the broken-off end of the C-Dn text. Quires 1–2 relate to Dn alone, so they belong in stack 4.[28]

Up to a point, it is clear what the stacking means. Some operation was being performed on each county text in turn, and the C booklets were being sorted into stacks for that purpose. As far as these five counties are concerned, the division into stacks suggests that the intended sequence was this: Wi, then So, then Do, then either Dn or Co. There is one weak link here: we cannot feel sure that So was intended to be dealt with sooner than Do. (We could only be sure of that if we had some guarantee that the order of the stacks remained unaltered until it was permanently fixed when the booklets were bound.) It is certain, however, from the way in which the C-WiDo booklets were divided between stacks 1 and 3, that Wi was intended to be dealt with sooner than Do, and equally certain, from the way in which the C-DnCoSo booklets were divided between stacks 2 and 4, that So was intended to be dealt with sooner than Dn and Co.

Suppose that the operation – whatever it was – had continued running smoothly. The sequel would have been this. When work on Wi was finished, the booklets from stack 1 would have been resorted: those which included some section of C-Do would have been added to stack 3 and the rest (relating to Wi alone) discarded (as all the preceding C booklets already had been). When the moment arrived for work to start on Do, stack 3 would now be ready. Similarly, when work on So was finished, the booklets from stack 2 would have been resorted: those which included some section of C-Dn or C-Co would have been added to stack 4 and the rest (relating to So alone) discarded. Eventually it would have had to be decided whether Dn or Co was to be dealt with first, and a fifth stack would then have been formed accordingly – a stack which, when first created, would consist of the booklets relating to Co alone, if Dn was to be dealt with first, or of the booklets relating to Dn alone, in the opposite case. But that decision had not yet been made, or, if it had, had not yet issued in action.

[25] There are two issues here. (Q1) Was Ellis justified in rearranging the text? (Q2) Was Barnes justified in rearranging the original? Briefly put, my answers would be as follows. (A1) Certainly he was; in fact he ought to have rearranged it much more thoroughly than he did. (A2) Probably not.

[26] Anomalies are few, and perhaps we might think of explaining them away as accidental displacements, occurring while the booklets remained unbound. But that seems facile to me. I think we had better accept that the sorting was not very carefully done in the first place.

[27] The same sort of split has affected Capp-DnCoSo. This booklet consists of four quires. Quires 2–4 relate to So, so they belong in stack 2, even though quire 2 contains the broken-off end of Capp-Dn and the whole of Capp-Co, as well as the beginning of Capp-So. Quire 1 relates to Dn alone, so it belongs in stack 4. Once again, this booklet proves to have had the same history as the other C booklets. (It also turns out that we do not need to think of any special explanation for the disappearance of Capp-WiDo. That booklet would have been put into stack 1; if we can think of some reason for the loss of this stack, that reason will cover the loss of Capp-WiDo too.)

[28] This split explains only some of the disruption. In addition, quires 4–5 have got themselves transposed with quire 3, and quire 6 has wandered off by itself.

Stack 2			Stack 3			Stack 4		
ix–xii	So	437–40	247–50	Do	25–8	307–10	Dn	117–20
1–7	So	430–6	251–7	Do	29–35	318–21	Dn	121–4
8	So	375	258–60	Do	36–8	322–9	Dn	125–32
9–12	DnSo	371–4	261–8	Do	39–46	∗ 330–7	DnSo	161–8
∗ 13	?	398	∗ 269–71	WiDo	47–9	338	Dn	184
14–16	DnSo	196–8	272–5	Do	50–3	339–40	Dn	194–5
17–24	DnSo	456–63	280–3	Do	54–7	341–5	DnCo	177–81
25	So	154	284–7	Do	58–61	346–7	Dn	182–3
26	So	116				348–55	Dn	210–17
27	So	193				356–65	Co	224–33
28–34	DnSo	468–74				366–73	Co	234–41
35–6	DnSo	286–7				374–7	Dn	220–3
37–40	So	282–5				378–9	Dn	218–19
41–2	So	191–2				380–7	Co	247–54
43–8	DnSo	376–81				388–92	Co	242–6
49–51	So	185–7				393	Co	199
52–4	So	151–3				394–401	Dn	288–95
55-60	DnSo	382–7				402–9	Dn	296–303
61–5	DnSo	366-70				410–17	Dn	304–11
66–85	CoSo	255–74				∗ 418–21	DnSo	312–15
86–91, 93	So	275–81				422–7	Dn	93–8
94–101	So	422–9				428–9	Co	200–1
102–5	So	[176], 188-90				430–7	Co	202–9
106–12	So	169–75				438–42	DnCo	108–12
113–20	DnSo	83–90				443–50	Dn	495–502
121–2	So	91–2				451–8	Dn	316–23
123–30	So	139–46				459–61	DnCo	332–4
131–4	So	147–50				462–9	Dn	324–31
135–40	DnSo	133–8				470–8	Dn	335–6, 408, 337–42
141–8	CoSo	99-106				∗ 479–80	DnSo	343–4
149–56	DnCoSo	503–10				481–4	Dn	388–91
157–64	So	511–18				485	Dn	392
165–71	So	519–25				486–9	DnCo	394–7
172–6	So	441–5				490–1	Dn	420–1
177–80	So	446–9				492	Dn	419
181–2	So	450–1				493–4	Dn	409–10
183	So	107				495–8	Dn	399–402
184–6	So	353–5				499	Dn	393
187–9	So	113–15				500–1	Dn	481, 488
190–5	DnSo	475–80				502	Dn	407
196–203	DnSo	356–63				503–6	Dn	411–14
∗ 204	Do	62				507–12	Dn	482–7
207–12	DnSo	490, 489, 491–4				513–16	Dn	415–18
213–16	So	452–5				517–20	Dn	403–6
217–18	So	364–5						
219–26	DnSo	345–52						
227–30	So	464–7						
231–6	So	155–60						

Table 14. The quires of C restored to the sequence recorded by the foliation of circa 1500. (The old foliation is given on the left, the new foliation on the right; the counties represented are listed in the middle. Anomalies are marked with a star.)

Of the things which would have started happening as soon as Wi had been dealt with, none actually happened. Hence it is clear that the operation was interrupted, and that the interruption occurred while work was in progress on Wi.[29] The four counties last in the queue were left untouched. We can be sure of that; we can also be sure that no other operation ensued which required a rearrangement of the C booklets. The untouched stacks remained untouched, and this task-specific arrangement – expected to be temporary, and not very carefully worked out – became permanent by default (till Ellis decided to change it).

The C booklets existed, in the first instance, so that the text could be copied from them into the D booklets. But that was not the operation for which these stacks were set up. If the writing of D had been interrupted as this operation was, D-Wi would have been the last D booklet to be written; and in that case DB-Do, DB-So and DB-DnCo would not exist. Since they do exist, the operation in question has to be different from the writing of D – different from and subsequent to it. Thus it is clear that the C booklets were not discarded as soon as they had served their primary purpose. They needed to be kept, at least a little longer, because they were going to be used again, for some secondary purpose; and the division into stacks was made with this purpose in view. There are two possibilities, not mutually exclusive. The C booklets may have been kept because they were going to be used when D was checked; alternatively or in addition to that, they may have been kept because they were going to be used when DB was checked.[30] We cannot hope to decide between these possibilities until we have developed some theory as to how the checking process might have worked.

Before the interruption, stack 1 had been removed – taken from the shelf (so to speak) and carried off to some other part of the office, wherever the work was being done for which these booklets were needed. After the interruption, stack 1 was not returned; sooner or later, all these booklets dropped out of existence. Stacks 2–4, still on the shelf, had a marginally better chance of survival, and did indeed survive – long enough for someone to rescue them and carry them away, on a journey which ended, sooner or later, in Exeter. Once there, they became part of a library: they entered an environment in which it was taken for granted that loose quires should be bound and that books should be kept for ever. The collection of booklets became a book, with the same chance of long-term survival as any other book in the Exeter cathedral library.

I do not know that we shall ever be able to say who the man was who retrieved these booklets from the Treasury shelves and found a safe home for them elsewhere. If we want to try guessing, there is something to be said for preferring the earliest possibility. The sooner we can extract these booklets from a milieu where their chances of survival are almost nil, the sooner we can insert them into a milieu where their chances are fairly good, the less utterly unlikely it will seem that they still exist. In that abstract sense, an early date for the transfer is more probable than a late one. For what it is worth, my own guess would be that the mystery might cease to be a mystery if we knew just a little more about the early career of Willelm de Warelwast, the king's clerk rewarded for his services by being made bishop of Exeter in 1107.

Appendix
Booklets and scribal stints in Exeter Cathedral 3500

If it is read alongside Ker's (1977) description, the list which follows ought to be self-explanatory; but it may be helpful to clarify a few points first. (i) In numbering the lines, I have followed the ruling: in other words, I have counted blank and erased lines, not just written lines. (ii) I have ignored some of the headings, wherever I am not certain that the heading was written by the same hand that wrote the following entry. (iii) I have ignored all insertions made into the text, into spaces or over erasures, as well as all marginal additions and annotations.

The attributions made here all seem secure to me. There are no question marks. Wherever I feel any doubt, I have chosen to err on the side of caution by leaving the stint unattributed.

[29] I risk speaking loosely here. To describe it more carefully, the situation is this. The last sort which did happen was the sort which had to be done before work on Wi could start. Because Wi was the first county in the next collection of C booklets to be dealt with, the sort could have been done some time in advance (in the same way that stack 2 has already been separated from stack 4). The first sort which did not happen was the sort which would have had to be done before work on Do could start. The operation was interrupted before that moment arrived. (It is possible, however, that the work did not cease altogether: it may have been continued on some simplified plan – if such a plan is conceivable – which meant that it was no longer necessary for the C booklets to be consulted.)

[30] Perhaps we should not neglect a third possibility: that they were going to be used for checking the geld accounts. ((It seems to me now that this is the likeliest explanation (below, pp.131–2).))

C-WiDo

King

Do	25r1–10	alpha
	25r11–v19	eta
	25v20–8r20	beta
	28v1–4	eta

King (queen Mathildis)

Do	29r1–v14	beta
	29v14–16	—
	29v17–30r10	omicron
	30r10–v9	eta

King (queen's knights)

Do	31r1–6	alpha
	31r7–2r12	omicron

Countess of Boulogne

Do	33r1–16	alpha
	33r16–20	omicron

St Peter of Cerne

Do	36r1–v1	beta
	36v1–11	alpha
	36v12–18	eta
	37r1–9	alpha
	37r9–10	beta
	37r11–15	eta
	37r16–v2	beta
	37v3–8r7	—
	38r7–17	ksi
	38v1–6	alpha
	38v7–20	beta

St Peter of Abbotsbury

Do	39r1–8	eta
	39r9–40v4	beta

Abbot of Athelney

Do	41r1–9	omicron

Abbot of Tavistock

Do	42r1–8	ksi
	42r8–14	beta

St Peter of Milton

Do	43r1–v1	beta
	43v1–8	eta
	43v9–19	alpha
	43v20–4v3	beta
	44v4–5r10	omicron

Willelm de Moion

Wi	47r1–11	ksi
Do	47r12–8r3	ksi
	48r3–20	beta
	48v1–9r12	ksi
	49r13–20	beta
	49v1–16	—

Roger Arundel

Do	50r1–16	beta
	50r16–v3	ksi
	50v3–10	eta
	50v10–1r17	ksi
	51r17–v6	—
	51v6–2r8	omicron

Serlo de Burci

Do	53r1–15	omicron

Hugo son of Grip's wife

Do	54r1–18	alpha
	54r19–v7	eta
	54v8–5v20	alpha
	56r1–6	eta
	56r7–17	alpha
	56r17–7r6	eta
	57r7–15	alpha
	57r16–19	beta
	57v1–20	alpha
	58r1–9	beta
	58r10–12	eta
	58r12–18	ksi
	58r18–v3	omicron
	58v4–9r1	beta
	59r2–v17	eta
	59v17–19	beta
	60r1–v16	mu
	60v16–1v17	eta
	61v18–20	—

Walter de Clavile

Do	62r1–v17	eta

C-DnCoSo

King

Dn	83r1–7	alpha
	83r8–19	epsilon
	83v1–17	alpha
	83v18–4r4	gamma
	84r5–v4	beta
	84v5–20	epsilon
	85r1–8	beta
	85r9–15	alpha
	85r16–v1	epsilon
	85v2–14	alpha
	85v15–6v12	beta
	86v13–7r16	delta
	87v1–13	beta
	88r1–3	alpha
	88r3–10	epsilon
So	88v1–9r1	alpha
	89r3–10	theta
	89r11–90r20	alpha
	90v1–8	theta
	90v8–1v10	alpha

King

Dn	93r1–4r5	beta
	94r6–22	alpha
	94v1–7	beta
	94v8–15	epsilon
	94v16–5r20	gamma
	95v1–6r3	alpha
	96r9–17	gamma
	96r18–v2	epsilon
	96v3–7r10	beta
	97r10–v9	epsilon
	97v10–8r4	alpha
	98r4–14	epsilon
	98r15–16	zeta
	98r16–22	—
Co	99r1–102v14	alpha
So	103r1–v15	alpha
	103v16–5v6	beta
	105v7–6r4	alpha
	106r5–7v9	beta
	107v9–12	eta

King (queen Mathildis)

Dn	108r1–v5	beta
	108v6–9r12	alpha
	109r13–v9	beta
	109v10–10r4	gamma
	110r5–13	epsilon
	110r14–19	alpha
	110v1–8	epsilon
	110v10–17	gamma
	110v18	alpha
	110v18–11r7	epsilon
	111r7–15	delta
Co	111v1–12r18	alpha

King (queen Edit)

So	113r1–9	beta
	113r10–v6	alpha
	113v7	beta
	113v7–14r15	alpha
	114r15–v9	eta
	114v13–19	theta
	114v20–15r3	beta

King (Ulward Wit)

So	116r1–17	alpha
	116r18–v2	theta

Bishop of Exeter

Dn	117r2–4	beta
	117r5–v14	alpha
	117v15–18r3	beta
	118r4–11	alpha
	118r12–17	beta
	118r18–v3	alpha
	118v3–10	delta
	118v11–19r8	beta
	119r9–20r16	gamma
	120r17–v2	alpha
	120v3–10	gamma
	120v11–16	kappa
	120v17–20	beta
Co	199r1–2	alpha
	199r2–13	beta
	199r14–201r20	alpha

Bishop of Coutances

Dn	121r1–v10	epsilon
	121v11–2v9	alpha
	122v10–3r6	gamma
	123r6–19	—
	123r20–v11	epsilon
	123v12–15	gamma
	123v16–4r14	beta
	124r15–v12	alpha
	124v13–20	beta
	125r1–18	alpha
	125r19–8r8	beta
	128r9–10	gamma
	128r10–14	epsilon
	128r14–31r11	beta
	131r12–2r10	alpha
	132r10–20	gamma
	132v1–17	beta
	132v18–3v20	alpha
	134r2–v6	gamma
	134v7–19	alpha
	135r1–6	beta
	135r7–11	epsilon
	135r11–16	delta
	135r17–v11	epsilon
	135v12–6r8	beta
So	136v1–13	theta
	136v14–7r3	alpha
	137r4–10	beta
	137r11–19	theta
	139r1–40r19	beta
	140r20–1v2	iota
	141v2–6	theta
	141v7–11	alpha
	141v12–5v4	theta
	145v5–8r3	eta
	148r4–52r15	beta

Bishop Osmund

So	154r1–14	theta
	154r15–v2	beta

Bishop Giso

So	156r1–v6	eta
	156v6–7r5	alpha
	157r6–60r20	theta

Abbot of Glastonbury

Dn	161r1–2	epsilon
	161r2–8	delta
So	161r8–9	alpha
	161r9–19	theta
	161v1–5	eta
	161v6–12	alpha
	161v13–8v19	beta
	169r1–70r17	alpha
	170r18–v17	beta
	170v17–3r5	eta

Abbot of Tavistock

Dn	177r1–v12	alpha
	177v12–19	beta
	177v20–8v12	alpha
	178v13–9r5	beta
	179r6–v5	gamma
	179v6–12	epsilon
	179v12–16	delta
	179v17–80v3	beta

Co	180v13–1r13	zeta
	181r13–v10	alpha

Abbot of Buckfast

Dn	182r1–14	epsilon
	182r15–19	alpha
	182r20–v12	gamma
	182v13–3r5	alpha
	183r6–v15	beta

Abbot of Horton

Dn	184r1–v4	alpha

St Peter of Bath

So	185r1–7r5	eta

St Peter of Muchelney

So	188r1–7	iota
	188r8–9r12	theta
	189r13–v3	beta

St Peter of Athelney

So	191r1–9	iota
	191r10–19	theta
	191r20–v12	eta
	191v13–20	beta

Abbess of St Edward's

So	193v1–9	alpha

Saints

Dn	194r1–10	alpha
	194r11–v11	beta
	194v12–18	alpha
	194v19–5r7	beta
	195r8–12	gamma
	195r12–v6	epsilon
	195v6–6r1	delta
	196r2–3	beta
So	196r10–14	theta
	196r15–17	alpha
	196r17–v8	beta
	196v9–13	alpha
	196v13–7r3	beta
	197r4–9	theta
	197r10–v5	beta
	197v7–20	alpha
	198r1–11	theta
	198r12–19	alpha
	198v1–2	beta

fos. 199–201 should follow fo. 120

Saints

Co	202r1–8v9	alpha

Count of Mortain

Dn	210r1–9	epsilon
	210r10–12v8	beta
	212v8–12	epsilon
	212v13–13r19	beta
	213r20–v13	epsilon
	213v14–14r1	gamma
	214r2–6	alpha
	214r7–v20	gamma
	215r1–16v3	beta
	216v4–9	gamma
	216v9–14	epsilon
	216v15–17r16	delta
	217r17–v3	beta
	217v4–19r7	alpha
	219r7–v18	epsilon
	219v19–22r9	beta
	222r10–3r2	delta
Co	224r2–5v7	beta
	225v8–33v20	zeta
	234r1–43v20	beta
	244r1–5v16	zeta
	247r1–54v20	beta
	255r1–8v22	alpha
	259r1–61r20	—
	261v1–7	alpha
	261v8–2r9	—
	262r9–v15	beta
	263r1–4r20	—
	264v1–5r2	beta
So	265r8–20	alpha
	265v1–20	theta
	266r1–v7	alpha
	266v8–7v20	beta
	268r1–7	theta
	268r7–10	alpha
	268r13–19	theta
	268v1–9v7	alpha
	269v7–9	eta
	269v9–71r20	alpha
	271v1–2v19	beta
	272v20–3r6	alpha
	273r7–5v6	eta
	275v6–6v9	theta
	276v10–19	alpha
	277r1–8	iota
	277r9–18	alpha
	277r19–v15	iota
	277v16–8r20	alpha
	278v1–81r18	beta

Count Eustachius

So	282r1–v11	beta
	282v12–3r7	alpha
	283r7–12	theta
	283r13–19	alpha

Earl Hugo

Dn	286r1–13	alpha
	286r14–20	beta
So	286v1–7	lambda
	286v7–12	iota
	286v13–17	alpha
	286v18–7r3	theta

Baldwin the sheriff

Dn	288r1–90r9	beta
	290r10–1v11	gamma
	291v11–14	beta
	291v14–4v16	gamma
	294v17–7r4	epsilon
	297r5–v22	beta
	298r1–9v15	alpha
	299v16–301r9	epsilon
	301r10–v2	gamma
	301v3–8r11	epsilon
	308r11–9v4	alpha
	309v5–14	epsilon
	309v14–20	delta
	310r3–14	epsilon
	310r15–18	delta
	310r18–v4	epsilon
	310v4–11v5	delta
	311v5–12r9	epsilon
	312r10–15	alpha
	312r15–v7	gamma
	312v8–13r5	delta
	313r5–10	epsilon
	313r11–14v9	gamma
	314v10–15r2	delta
	315r3–7	beta
So	315r12–v10	beta

Juhel

Dn	316r2–12	beta
	316r12–18r4	alpha
	318r4–v3	beta
	318v4–19v13	epsilon
	319v14–15	alpha
	319v15–20r2	gamma
	320r3–3v18	beta
	323v18–4v4	delta
	324v4–9	kappa
	324v9–6r19	delta
	326v1–31r17	epsilon
	331r18–v16	delta
	331v19–2v23	epsilon
	333r1–4r17	delta
	334r17–v4	epsilon
	334v5–6	beta
Co	334v10–16	mu

Radulf de Pomerei

Dn	335r1–5	gamma
	335r6–6r12	alpha
	336r13–17	beta
	336r18–v17	epsilon
	337r1–v5	gamma
	337v6–12	alpha
	337v13–8r17	gamma
	338v1–15	beta
	338v15–9v17	delta
	339v18–40r15	beta
	340r15–19	gamma
	340r20–1r7	beta
	341r8–v2	epsilon
	341v3–12	gamma
	341v13–20	beta
	342r1–5	gamma
	342r6–17	alpha
	342r17–v13	beta
	342v13–3v7	delta
	343v7–15	kappa
	343v16–4r1	alpha
	344r2–3	beta
So	344r4–11	beta
	344r12–19	lambda

Walscin de Dowai

Dn	345r1–6	gamma
	345r7–13	beta
	345r14–v6	alpha
	345v6–6v8	gamma
	346v9–7r8	alpha
	347r9–18	epsilon
	347r19–v7	alpha
	347v8–14	beta
	347v14–9v5	epsilon
	349v6–14	beta
So	350r1–v10	beta
	350v11–19	theta
	350v20–1r13	iota
	351r14–2r2	alpha
	352r2–7	theta
	352r8–v2	beta
	352v2–5v9	theta

Willelm de Moion

Dn	356r1–8	epsilon
So	356r9–v12	beta
	356v13–7r7	alpha
	357r7–60v5	beta
	360v5–12	lambda
	360v13–2v10	theta
	362v11–3r20	beta
	363v1–5	iota
	363v6–13	beta
	363v14–4r18	iota
	364r19–v17	beta
	364v18–5r3	alpha

Willelm de Faleise

Dn	366r1–v18	mu
	367r1–20	alpha
	367v1–8v19	beta
	368v19–9r6	delta
So	369r6–18	beta
	369r18–v5	—
	369v6–20	beta

Alvred de Hispania

Dn	371r1–12	epsilon
	371r13–18	gamma
So	371v1–2r3	alpha
	372r4–3r3	beta
	373r3–v12	—
	373v13–17	beta
	373v17–4r6	theta
	374r7–v12	beta
	374v13–14	iota
	374v14–15	eta
	374v17–5r4	beta
	375r5–11	alpha

Odo son of Gamelin

Dn	376r1–21	beta
	376v1–7	alpha
	376v8–11	epsilon
	376v12–7r5	alpha
	377r6–16	gamma
	377r17–v20	alpha
	378r1–5	mu

	378r5–20	gamma
	378v1–14	delta
	378v15–18	gamma
	378v18–20	delta
	379r1–2	epsilon
	379r3–14	gamma
	379r15–20	beta
	379v1–16	gamma
So	380r1–6	lambda

Turstin son of Rolf

Dn	382r1–9	beta
So	382v1–3r5	theta
	383r6–4v3	alpha
	384v4	beta
	384v4–12	alpha
	384v13–17	theta

Willelm son of Wido

So	386r1–19	iota
	386r20–1	beta

Goscelm and Walter

Dn	388r1–9	epsilon
	388r10–16	alpha
	388r17–v8	epsilon
	388v9–9r3	beta
	389r4–91r9	gamma
	391r10–14	beta
	391r15–v11	epsilon
	391v12–2r10	beta
	392r11–17	alpha
	392r18–v15	beta
	392v16–3r15	alpha
	393r16–5v17	delta
	395v18–6r9	epsilon
	396r10–v19	delta
	397r1–5	alpha
	397r5–16	epsilon
	397r17–20	alpha
Co	397v1–6	beta

Goscelm of Exeter

?	398r1–7	omicron

Willelm Capra

Dn	399r1–v11	beta
	399v12–401r7	gamma
	401r7–2v17	epsilon
	402v18–400v4	gamma
	400v5–403r9	beta
	403r10–v2	delta
	403v3–12	gamma
	403v12–4r2	beta
	404r2–5r8	delta
	405r9–14	beta
	405r15–v3	gamma
	405v4–11	delta
	405v12–17	gamma
	405v18–6r4	delta
	406r5–6	beta

fo. 400 should follow fo. 402

Tetbald son of Berner

Dn	407r1–8r2	alpha
	408r3–5	epsilon
	408r6–9r1	gamma
	409r2–7	epsilon
	409r8–v6	beta
	409v7–10v4	alpha
	410v5–6	beta

Ruald Adobed

Dn	411r1–12	beta
	411r12–14r8	epsilon
	414r9–21	beta
	414v1–17	alpha
	414v17–20 . . .	delta

Willelm de Poilli

Dn	415r2	alpha
	415r2–v18	beta
	415v19–16v16	gamma
	416v17–17r2	beta
	417r2–9	delta
	417r10–18r4	alpha

Rotbert de Albemarle

Dn	419r1–v2	beta
	419v3–20r10	alpha
	420r10–v14	beta
	420v15–1r8	alpha
	421r9–14	beta
	421r14–v8	delta
	421v9–20 . . .	alpha

Roger de Corcelle

So	422r1–4v6	alpha
	424v6–5v6	beta
	425v7–6r10	lambda
	426r11–13	beta
	426r13–v2	lambda
	426v2–4	beta
	426v5–19	alpha
	427r1–4	theta
	427r5–8v14	alpha
	428v15–20	theta
	429r1–13	alpha
	429r14–v24	theta
	430r1–8	lambda
	430r8–21	beta
	430v2–1v9	—
	431v10–19	theta
	431v20–2v15	beta
	432v15–20	alpha
	433r1–9	beta
	433r10–v11	alpha
	433v12–4r3	beta
	434r4–5r19	alpha
	435r20–v3	theta
	435v4–12	beta

Edward the sheriff

So	437r1–18	alpha

Willelm de Ou

So	438r1–5	alpha
	438r6–12	beta
	438r13–v1	alpha
	438v2–14	iota
	438v15–9r4	beta
	439r5–14	theta

Roger Arundel

So	441r1–v13	beta
	441v14–19	alpha
	442r1–21	theta
	442v1–6	lambda
	442v6–8	beta
	442v9–3r8	alpha
	443r9–v9	beta
	443v9–14	alpha
	443v15–20	iota
	443v20–4	alpha
	444r1–17	beta
	444r18–v4	alpha
	444v4–5r2	iota
	445r3–8	theta
	445r9–14	iota

Gislebert son of Turald

So	446r1–5	theta
	446r6–15	alpha

Osbern Gifard

So	447r1–6	theta
	447r7–16	beta

Walter Gifard

So	447r16–22	beta

Alvred de Merleberge

So	447v1–8	alpha

Radulf de Mortemer

So	447v10–18	alpha

Arnulf de Hesdinc

So	448v1–9	alpha
	448v10–9r2	iota

Matheu de Moretanie

So	450r1–15	iota
	450r16–17	beta
	450r18–v3	theta

Serlo de Burci

So	452r1–16	iota
	452r17–v20	theta
	453r1–6	alpha
	453r7–4r11	iota
	454r12–20	theta

French knights

Dn	456r1–19	beta
	456r20–v3	epsilon
	456v4–8	alpha
	456v8–19	epsilon
	457r1–9	gamma
	457r10–15	beta
	457r16–v11	alpha
	457v12–19	gamma
	458r1–20	alpha
	458v1–14	gamma
	458v15–9r16	alpha
	459r17–v8	gamma
	459v9–18	delta
	460r1–5	alpha
	460r6–v4	beta
	460v5–14	gamma
	460v15–1r9	alpha
	461r10–v12	gamma
	461v13–17	alpha
	461v18–2r5	beta
	462r6–13	gamma
	462r14–v6	epsilon
	462v7–8	beta
So	462v11–3r4	theta
	463r5–v15	lambda
	463v15–22	alpha
	464r1–12	iota
	464r13–18	theta
	464r18–22	eta
	464v1–8	beta
	464v8–14	theta
	464v15–5r1	iota
	465r2–v7	eta
	465v7–11	iota
	465v12–6r20	alpha
	466v1–5	beta
	466v6–10	alpha
	466v11–14	beta
	466v15–7r3	alpha
	467r5–14	theta
	467r15–19	alpha

Nicol and others

Dn	468r1–7	gamma
	468r8–11	alpha
	468r12–v3	beta
	468v4–19	gamma
	469r1–8	beta
	469r9–13	epsilon
	469r14–v16	gamma
	469v17–70r5	alpha
	470r6–19	gamma
	470v1–1r20	alpha
	471v1–2r3	gamma
	472r4–v20	beta
	473r1–6	gamma
	473r7–12	beta
	473r13–17	gamma
	473r18–19	beta
So	473v1–6	lambda

King's sergeants

Dn	475r1–8	beta
	475r8–15	epsilon
	475r16–v17	gamma
	475v18–6r5	delta
	476r5–10	gamma
	476r11–v4	beta
	476v5–17	alpha
So	477r1–8r13	beta
	478r14–v5	theta
	478v6–10	iota
	478v11–19	beta
	479r1–6	alpha
	479r7–10	beta
	479r11–17	eta
	479r18–v16	beta

	479v17–80r18	theta
	480r19–v8	beta

English thegns

Dn	481r1–v17	gamma
	481v18–2r10	epsilon
	482r11–v19	gamma
	483r1–2	epsilon
	483r3–12	gamma
	483r13–v16	alpha
	483v17–4r2	gamma
	484r3–v20	alpha
	485r1–7	beta
	486v1–7	alpha
	486v8–7r8	gamma
	487r9–13	alpha
	487r14–v11	gamma
	487v12–8r1	beta
	488r2–15	gamma
	488r16–9r2	beta
	489r3–19	gamma
	489v1–8	delta
	489v9–13	epsilon
	489v14–19	beta
	490r1–9	alpha
So	490r13–20	alpha
	490v1–5	—
	490v6–11	theta
	490v12–16	beta
	490v17–1r4	alpha
	491r5–16	theta
	491r17–v10	beta
	491v11–14	theta
	491v17–22	beta
	492r1–14	theta
	492r15–16	alpha
	492r17–21	beta
	492v1–6	alpha
	492v7–15	iota
	492v15–3r1	eta
	493r1–v3	theta
	493v4–6	alpha
	493v7–12	theta
	493v13–14	—

Capp-DnCoSo

Dn	495r1–19	alpha
	495r19–v6	mu
	495v7–13	gamma
	495v14–17	epsilon
	495v18–6r13	beta
	496r13–v17	epsilon
	496v18–19	alpha
	497r1–11	epsilon
	497r11–15	—
	497r15–v12	epsilon
	497v12–15	alpha
	497v15–21	epsilon
	497v21–3	mu
	498r1–13	epsilon
	498r13–9v20	mu
	499v21–500r1	epsilon
	500r2–16	mu
	500r16–2v10	epsilon
	502v11–3v18	alpha
	503v18–4r12	epsilon
	504r12–15	—
	504r15–v11	epsilon
	504v12–19	alpha
	505r1–6	delta
	505r6–v11	alpha
	505v11–13	beta
	505v15–6r11	epsilon
	506r12–13	alpha
	506r13–19	beta
	506r19–20	—
	506v1–5	iota
Co	507r1–v2	zeta
	507v3–8r16	mu
	508r16–v3	alpha
So	508v6–11	alpha
	508v11–10v20	mu
	511r1–24v12	eta
	524v13–15	—
	524v16–5r6	mu

Geld accounts (batch 3)

Do	17r1–24r6	alpha
	24r7–9	mu
	24r9–21	alpha
Dn	65r1–9r20	alpha
	69v1–2	beta
	69v2–71r5	alpha
Co	72r1–3r15	alpha
So	75r1–82r16	alpha
	82r17–v20	beta

Geld accounts (batch 4)

Wi	1r1–v40	ksi
	2r1–8	—
	2r8–3r8	ksi
	3r8–35	—
	3v1–3	—
Wi	7r1–20	rho
	7v1–31	sigma
	8r1–11	rho
	8r12–30	sigma
	8r30–41	tau
	8v1–41	rho
	9r1–6	tau
	9r7–v10	sigma
	9v11–24	mu
Do	11r2–12v10	beta
Wi	13r1–14r20	sigma
	14r20–8	tau
	14r28–16r26	sigma

Other booklets (batch 5)

Dn	63r1–10	alpha
	63r13–21	alpha + beta + others
Co	63v1–4	alpha
	63v7–10	alpha + beta
So	63v13–21	—
	64r1	—
	64r15–v14	alpha + beta + eta
So	526v1–7r19	alpha
4	527v1–8r16	mu
Co	528v1–8	—